THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

brary

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_january-27-february-17-1887_310

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

50° VICTORIÆ, 1887.

VOL. CCCX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF JANUARY 1887

TO

THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY 1887.

FIRST VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK & SON,
AT THE OFFICE FOR "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,"
22, PATERNOSTER ROW. [E.C.]

1887.

8995

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CCX.

THIRD SERIES.

LORDS, THURSDAY, JANUARY 27.

Page

MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT—

The PARLIAMENT opened by Commission.

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech *delivered* by The LORD CHANCELLOR .. 3

ROLL OF THE LORDS—

Garter King of Arms attending, *delivered* at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the Second Session of the Twenty-fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom: The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge—Singly took the Oath.

Select Vestries—

Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1ª.

THE LATE EARL OF IDDESLEIGH—Observations, The Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Salisbury), Earl Granville, Earl Fortescue 6

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech—

The QUEEN'S SPEECH having been *reported* by The LORD CHANCELLOR;—An Address to HER MAJESTY thereon *moved* by *The Earl of Erne*—(the Motion being *seconded* by *Viscount Torrington*) 10

After debate, Address *agreed to*, *nemine dissentiente*, and ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—The Duke of BUCKINGHAM and CHANDOS appointed, *nemine contradicente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session.

COMMITTEE FOR PRIVILEGES—*appointed.*

SUB-COMMITTEE FOR THE JOURNALS—*appointed.*

APPEAL COMMITTEE—*appointed.* [8.0.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JANUARY 27.

ELECTIONS—BELFAST (WESTERN DIVISION)—(Judges' Certificate and Report) 54

DOUBLE RETURN—BELFAST BOROUGH (WESTERN DIVISION) AND SLIGO COUNTY (SOUTHERN DIVISION) ELECTIONS—
Mr. SEXTON elects to sit for the Western Division of Belfast .. 54

ELECTIONS—LONDONDERRY CITY—(Judges' Certificate and Report) .. 55

ELECTIONS—YORK, EAST RIDING (BUCKROSE DIVISION)—(Judges' Certificate and Report) 55

DOUBLE RETURN—LONDONDERRY CITY AND LONGFORD (NORTH)—
Letter received by Mr. Speaker from Justin M'Carthy, esquire, electing to serve for Derry City.

ELECTIONS—SESSIONAL ORDERS—
Moved, "That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to concern himself in the Election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament, except only any Peer of Ireland, at such Elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a Candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament" 56
Motion *agreed to*.

PRIVILEGES—*Ordered*, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed.

Outlawries Bill—
Bill, "for the more effectual preventing Clandestine Outlawries," read the first time; to be read a second time.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE—Notice of Motion, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 57

RESIGNATION OF THE RIGHT HON. LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL—Personal Explanation, Lord Randolph Churchill; Observations, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 57

THE LATE EARL OF IDDESLEIGH — Observations, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith), Mr. W. E. Gladstone 73

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech — [FIRST NIGHT]—
THE QUEEN'S SPEECH having been *reported* by Mr. SPEAKER;—An humble Address thereon *moved* by *Viscount Weymouth*—(the Motion being *seconded* by *Mr. G. W. Balfour*) 77
After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Colonel Saunderson:*)—Motion *agreed to:*—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow*.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Mr. Henry H. Fowler; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 145
[12.30.]

LORDS, FRIDAY, JANUARY 28.

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION *nominated:*—List of the Committee .. 145

Military Armaments and Organization—Question, Observations, The Earl of Wemyss, Lord Ellenborough, The Earl of Northbrook, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) 145

Probation of First Offenders Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl of Belmore*); read 1ª (No. 3) 159

Christchurch (Southampton) Charter (Correction of Error) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord President*); read 1ª (No. 4) 159

Women's Suffrage Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Denman*); read 1ª (No. 5) .. 159

[5.30.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JANUARY 28.

QUESTIONS.

Burmah (Upper)—Military Occupation of the Ruby Mines—Question, Mr. Cremer; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 161

The Treasury and the Bank of England—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 162

Army (Auxiliary Forces)—The Volunteer Capitation Committee—Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 162

Admiralty—Accountant General's Department—Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 163

The Charity Commissioners—Non-Representative Bodies—Question, Mr. Howell; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 164

Marriage Law (England and Scotland)—Question, Mr. Knowles; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) 164

Canada and the United States—The Fisheries' Disputes—Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 165

Evictions (Ireland)—The Glenbeigh Evictions—Question, Mr. T. Fry; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 165

Land Act (Ireland)—Report of the Commission—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 168

Irish Land Commission — Judicial Rents — The Returns — Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach).. 168

Evictions (Ireland)—The Returns—Questions, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 168

Dispensary Districts (Ireland)—Mohigeela — Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 169

The Belfast Riots—The Report of the Royal Commission—Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 169

Mines Regulation Act—Legislation—Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) .. 170

The Chancellor of the Exchequer—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 170

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [SECOND NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January :]—Question again proposed :—Debate *resumed* .. 170

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Bradlaugh* :)—Motion *agreed to* :—Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

MOTIONS.

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill—

Moved, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend 'The Supreme Court of Judicature Act ,1877,"—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) .. 227

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to* :—Bill *ordered* (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Jackson*) ; *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 1.]

Arbitration of Poor Law Questions (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Mason, Mr. E. R. Russell, Mr. Macdonald Cameron, Mr. Watt, Mr. Williamson, Mr. Lacaita*) ; *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 2] 227

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Lane, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Sheil*) ; *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 3] 227

Hares Preservation Bill—*Ordered* (*Colonel Dawnay, Sir John Lubbock, Lord Elcho, Mr. Dillwyn, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Beach, Mr. Staveley Hill*) ; *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 4] 227

Places of Worship (Sites) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Borlase, Mr. Burt, Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. Henry Wilson*) ; *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 5] 227

Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Norton, Viscount Folkestone, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Hoyle*) ; *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 6] .. 228

Agricultural Tenants (Ireland) Relief Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Arthur O'Connor*) ; *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 7] 228

Limited Owners (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Haldane, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Arthur Elliot, Mr. Ferguson*) ; *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 8] 228

Returning Officers' Expenses (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Provand, Mr. Hunter, Mr. J. Bolton, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Watt, Mr. M'Ewan*) ; *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 9] 228

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Cox, Mr. Dillon, Mr. O'Doherty, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Henry Campbell*) ; *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 10] 228

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Mark Stewart, Mr. J. A. Campbell*) ; *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 11] 228

County Government (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. James O'Brien, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Healy*) ; *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 12] 228

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*January* 28.]

Page

Personal Property (Exemption from Sale) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Picton, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Howorth*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 13] 229

Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Dwyer Gray*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 14] .. 229

Theatres (Metropolis) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Woodall, Mr. Lawson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 15] 229

Herb and Ginger Beer Makers' Licence Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. H. S. Wright, Colonel Eyre, Mr. Whitmore, Mr. Broadhurst, Colonel Anstruther, Mr. Byron Reed*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 16] 229

Police Force Enfranchisement Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Whitmore, Mr. Radcliffe Cooke, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Howard Vincent, Lord Claud Hamilton, Colonel Laurie*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 17] .. 229

Burial Grounds Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Richard, Mr. Woodall*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 18] 229

Land Tenure (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Barclay, Sir George Balfour, Dr. Farquharson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 19] .. 230

Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Francis Stevenson, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Sir Savile Crossley, Mr. Channing, Mr. Burt, Mr. Mason*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 20] 230

Truck Law Amendment Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. Mason, Mr. Edmund Robertson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 21] 230

Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Lyell, Mr. M'Lagan, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Lacaita, Dr. Clark, Mr. Ferguson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 22] 230

Mining Royalties Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, Mr. Burt, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Borlase, Mr. Blake*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 23] .. 230

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Carew, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. E. D. Gray, Sir Thomas Esmonde*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 24] 230

Land Law (Wales) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. John Bryn Roberts, Mr. John Roberts, Mr. Warmington, Mr. Bowen Rowlands, Mr. Thomas Ellis*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 25] 230

Leaseholds (Facilities of Purchase of Fee Simple) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Lawson, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. J. Rowlands, Mr. Warmington, Mr. Reid, Mr. Puleston, Mr. T. E. Ellis*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 26] 231

Criminal Law (Ireland) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Sexton, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Chance, Mr. Healy, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Donal Sullivan*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 27] 231

Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Matthew Kenny, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Tuite, Mr. Lalor*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 28] 231

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*January* 28.] *Page*

School Board for London (Pensions) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Richard Temple, Sir Guyer Hunter, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. Francis Powell, Mr. Gent-Davis*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 29] 231

Houses in Towns (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Crilly, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Colonel Nolan, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Leahy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 30] 231

Accumulations Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Haldane*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 31] 231

Parliamentary Elections Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Howell, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Fenwick, Dr. Clark, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Warmington*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 32] 231

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ulster) Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Johnston, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. De Cobain*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 33] 232

Justices of Peace Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Seale-Hayne, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Howell, Mr. Rendel, Sir Bernhard Samuelson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 34] .. 232

Police Constables' Pensions Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Lord Claud Hamilton, Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Sir George Russell, Mr. Gerald Balfour, Mr. Howard Vincent*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 35] 232

National School Teachers (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Tuite, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Conway, Mr. Nolan*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 36] 232

Parochial Boards (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Barclay, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Graham, Mr. Esslemont*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 37] 232

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. William M'Donald, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Chance, Mr. Clancy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 38] 232

Coal Mines Regulation Act (1872) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hayden, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Conway, Mr. Patrick O'Brien*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 39] 233

Representation of the People Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Chance, Mr. Healy, Mr. M'Cartan*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 40] 233

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. James Stevenson, Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Cozens-Hardy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 41] 233

Small Debts (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Thorburn, Mr. Watt*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 42] 233

Registration of Voters' Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Childers, Sir Charles Russell*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 43] 233

London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Sir Robert Fowler, Mr. Hubbard, Colonel Duncan, Mr. R. G. Webster*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 44] 233

Workmen's Certificates Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Gent-Davis, Mr. Byron Reed, Mr. Macartney*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 45] 233

Beer Adulteration Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Quilter, Mr. Heneage, Viscount Wolmer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Herbert Gardner, Mr. Francis Stevenson, Mr. Gurdon*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 46] 234

[*January* 28.]

Page

University Education (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dillon, Dr. Fox, Mr. Henry Gill, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Clancy, Dr. Kenny*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 47] 234

Butter Substitutes Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Mayne, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Lane, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Kenny*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 48] .. 234

Elementary Education (Evening Schools) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. James Stuart, Mr. A. H. Dyke Acland, Mr. H. J. Wilson, Mr. T. E. Ellis, Sir Henry Roscoe*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 49] 234

Technical Education (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hooper, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dwyer Gray*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 50] 234

Access to Mountains (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Bryce, Mr. Haldane, Mr. J. C. Bolton, Sir Henry Roscoe, Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. A. L. Brown*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 51] 234

Crofters (Scotland) Act (1886) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Dr. Clark, Mr. Barclay, Mr. Esslemont, Dr. M'Donald, Mr. Mackintosh*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 52] 234

Church Sites (Compulsory Powers Repeal) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Francis Powell, Mr. John Talbot, Mr. Addison, Mr. Tomlinson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 53] 234

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Harrington, Mr. Sexton, Mr. J. A. Blake, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Hooper, Mr. O'Hea*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 54] 235

Housing of Working Classes Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Pyne, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Dr. Fox, Mr. P. J. Power, Mr. Quinn*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 55] 235

Technical Education (Day Schools) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Henry Roscoe, Sir Lyon Playfair, Mr. Dixon, Sir John Lubbock, Sir Richard Temple*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 56] 235

Piers and Harbours (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Biggar, Mr. Deasy, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Mahony, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Corbett*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 57] .. 235

Quarries Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Thomas Blake, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Burt, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Abraham* (*Glamorgan*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 58] 235

School Board Elections (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Shiress Will, Mr. Lacaita*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 59] 235

Allotments of Land Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Newnes, Mr. Cyril Flower, Mr. Winterbotham, Mr. Pitt-Lewis*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 60] 235

Vestrymen's Qualification Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. James Rowlands, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Howell, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. James Stuart*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 61] 235

Pauper Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) (Superannuation) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Chance, Mr. William Corbet*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 62] .. 236

Settled Land Acts Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Elton, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Puleston, Mr. Tomlinson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 63] 236

Tobacco Cultivation (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Flynn, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. Pyne, Mr. Mayne*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 64] 236

[*January* 28.] Page

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 3) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. T. W. Russell, Lord Ernest Hamilton, Mr. Lea, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Sinclair*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 65] 236

Fairs and Markets (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Dr. Tanner, Dr. Commins, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Lane, Mr. Healy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 66] 236

Leasehold Enfranchisement (by Purchase or Rent-Charge) Bill—*Ordered* (*Colonel Hughes, Mr. Fulton, Mr. Evelyn, Mr. Holloway, Major Banes*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 67] 236

Port and Harbour Authorities (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Thomas Mayne, Mr. Hooper*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 68] 236

Bankruptcy Court (Belfast) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Ewart, Sir James Corry, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Macartney*); *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 69] .. 236

Market Tolls (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Captain M'Calmont, Mr. Smith-Barry, Mr. Macartney*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 70] 237

Voters Qualification and Parliamentary Elections Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Cremer, Mr. Burt, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Pickard, Mr. James Rowlands*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 71] 237

Office under the Crown (Vacating of Seats) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. W. F. Lawrence, Mr. A. D. Elliot, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Francis Stevenson, Mr. E. Robertson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 72] 237

Municipal Corporations Acts (Ireland) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir James Corry, Mr. Ewart, Mr. Johnston*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 73] .. 237

Belfast Government Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Nolan, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Mr. Healy, Mr. M'Cartan, Mr. O'Kelly*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 74] .. 237

Parliamentary Elections (Closing of Public Houses) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Shirley, Mr. Gane, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Caleb Wright*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 75] 237

Merchant Shipping Act (1854) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. King, Mr. Baggallay, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Lacaita*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 76] 237

Municipal Elections (Scotland) (Corrupt Practices) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Lacaita, Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Shiress Will*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 77] 238

Steam Engines and Boilers Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. William Crawford, Mr. Burt, Mr. William Abraham* (*Glamorgan*), *Mr. Pickard, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. A. H. Dyke Acland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 78] 238

Education (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Buchanan, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Thorburn*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 79] 238

Open Spaces (Dublin) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. William Redmond, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Timothy Harrington*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 80] 238

Police Force Enfranchisement (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Seton-Karr, Mr. Puleston, Colonel Saunderson, Mr. Bigwood, Viscount Curzon*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 81] 238

[*January* 28.]

Page

Metropolis Government Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Isaacs, Mr. Kimber, Major-General Goldsworthy, Mr. Baumann, Sir Albert Kaye Rollit, Mr. Morgan Howard, Mr. Hunt, Sir Guyer Hunter, Colonel Duncan*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 82] .. 233

Leaseholds (Purchase of Freeholds) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Connolly*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 83] 238

Religious Prosecutions Abolition Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Courtney Kenny, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Crossley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 84] .. 238

High Sheriff Disqualification (Ireland) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Alderman John O'Connor, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. Cox, Mr. John O'Connor*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 85] 239

Friendly Societies (Transmission of Money) Bill—*Ordered* (*Viscount Curzon, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Captain Fellowes, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Godson, Sir Albert Rollit*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 86] 239

Agricultural Holdings Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Channing, Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Francis Stevenson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 87] 239

Bankruptcy (County Courts) (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Mulholland, Colonel King-Harman, Colonel Waring, Mr. Macartney, Mr. O'Neill*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 88] 239

Electric Lighting Act (1882) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Watt, Mr. Graham, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Howell, Mr. Crossley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 89] .. 239

Justice of the Peace Qualification (Abolition) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Winterbotham, Mr. Burt*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 90] 239

Corn Sales Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Rankin, Sir Joseph R. Bailey, Mr. H. T. Davenport, Mr. Williamson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 91] 239

Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Macartney, Colonel King-Harman, Colonel Waring*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 92] .. 240

Agricultural Labourers' Wages Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Charles Acland, Mr. Theodore Fry, Mr. Channing, Mr. Cossham, Mr. Stewart*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 93] 240

Bankruptcy (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Sexton, Mr. M'Cartan*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 94] .. 240

Beer Adulteration (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Edward Birkbeck, Baron Dimsdale, Sir Savile Crossley, Mr. Charles Hall, Mr. Fellowes, Baron F. de Rothschild*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 95] 240

Steam Boilers Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. William Abraham, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Flynn*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 96] 240

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Joseph Pease, Sir Charles Palmer, Mr. Isaac Wilson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 97] .. 240

Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt Practices) Acts Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. De Lisle, Colonel Saunderson, Mr. Webster, Mr. Macartney*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 98] 240

Early Closing Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. John Barry, Mr. Burt, Mr. A. Cohen, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Whitley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 99] 241

Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act (1886) Amendment (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Provand*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 100] 241

[*January* 28.] Page

Building Societies Act (1874) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. O'Neill, Colonel Waring, Colonel Saundesron*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 101] .. 241

Suffragans' Nomination Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. John Talbot, Mr. Fowell, Baron Dimsdale, Admiral Field, Mr. Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 102] 241

Private Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. William Corbet, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. P. J. Power, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Molloy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 103] 241

Oaths Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Bradlaugh, Sir John Simon, Mr. Courtney Kenny, Mr. Burt, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Richard, Mr. Jesse Collings*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 104] 241

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Act (1878) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Lea, Sir James Corry, Mr. John Blake, Mr. Ewart, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. T. W. Russell*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 105] .. 242

School Fees (Non-Paupers) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Llewellyn, Sir Richard Paget, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Whitmore, Mr. Quilter*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 106] 242

Private Bill Legislation Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Craig Sellar, Sir Lyon Playfair, Mr. Howorth, Mr. John Morley, Mr. Arthur Elliot*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 107] 242

Metropolitan Board of Works (Fire Brigade Expenses) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Webster, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Mr. Tatton Egerton, Mr. Cochrane-Baillie, Mr. Isaacson*): *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 108] 242

Town Holdings—

Select Committee *re-appointed* 242

Truck Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Warmington, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Howard Vincent, Mr. Esslemont*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 109] .. 242

Trees (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Chance, Mr. Gilhooly, Mr. Marum, Mr. P. J. O'Brien, Mr. Sheehan, Sir Joseph M'Kenna*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 110] 242

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturday (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Lea*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 111] .. 243

Small Holdings Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Newnes, Mr. Flower, Mr. Winterbotham, Mr. Pitt-Lewis*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 112] 243

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 4) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Lea, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Sinclair*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 113] .. 243

Fishings, &c. Valuation (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Caldwell, Dr. Cameron, Dr. Clark*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 114] 243

Free Libraries Acts Consolidation Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Caldwell, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Cameron Corbett*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 115] 243

Stipendiary Magistrates (Pensions) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Richard Temple, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Godson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 116] 243

Perpetual Pensions—

Select Committee *appointed* 243

[*January* 28.]

Page

Metropolitan Board of Works (Theatres, &c.) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Mr. Tatton Egerton, Mr. R. G. Webster*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 117] 244

Metropolis Management Acts Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Colonel Hughes, Mr. Whitmore, Sir Algernon Borthwick*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 118] 244

Felonious Use of Firearms Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Howard Vincent, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Seager Hunt, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Hulse*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 119] 244

Shipwreck Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Howard Vincent, Sir Edward Birkbeck*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 120] 244

Public Trustee Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Howard Vincent, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Edward Russell, Mr. Anderson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 121] .. 244

ree Libraries Acts Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Arthur Cohen, Mr. Collins, Sir John Kennaway, Sir Lyon Playfair*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 122] 244

Primogeniture Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Courtney Kenny, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Milnes-Gaskell*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 123] 244

Bankruptcy Courts (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Sexton, Mr. Chance, Mr. O'Hea, Mr. M'Cartan, Mr. Reynolds*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 124] .. 244

Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Sexton, Mr. A. O'Connor, Mr. Deasy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 125] 245

Railway Regulation Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Channing, Mr. Arthur Acland, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Charles Parker, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Lawson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 126] 245

[12.45.]

LORDS, MONDAY, JANUARY 31.

PRIVILEGE—"THE QUEEN *v.* LORD GRAVES,"—Observations, Lord Ribblesdale, Lord Coleridge (Lord Chief Justice of England); Reply, The Lord Chancellor (Lord Halsbury) 245

Women's Suffrage Bill (No. 5)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Denman*) .. 256

Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("now") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day six months,")—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? *Resolved* in the *negative*:—Bill to be read 2ª *this day six months.*

ROLL OF THE LORDS—

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table: The same was ordered to be *printed.* (No. 6.)

Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 7) 258

Lunacy Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 8) .. 258

Cathedral Churches Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Bishop of Carlisle*); read 1ª (No. 9) 258

Electric Lighting Act (1882) Amendment Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Thurlow*); read 1ª (No. 10) 258

[5.30

Page

COMMONS, MONDAY, JANUARY 31.

MOTION.

NEW WRIT FOR THE BOROUGH OF ST. GEORGE'S, HANOVER SQUARE—

Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Saint George's, Hanover Square, in the room of Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, esquire, commonly called Lord Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, who since his Election for the said Borough hath accepted the Office of Steward or Bailiff of Her Majesty's Manor of Northstead, in the County of York,"—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas*) 259

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson* :)—Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 93, Noes 173; Majority 80.—(Div. List, No. 1.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

QUESTIONS.

SCOTLAND—THE TRUCK ACTS—MINES AND WORKS IN SCOTLAND—Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 260

BURMAH—MILITARY EXPEDITION TO THE RUBY MINES—MESSRS. STREETER—Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 260

LAW AND JUSTICE—CASE OF THOMAS THOMPSON, CONVICTED OF MURDER—Question, Mr. W. H. James; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 261

HAMPTON COURT PALACE—SAFETY OF THE ART TREASURES, &C.—Questions, Mr. Dixon-Hartland; Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 261

LAW AND JUSTICE—THE REVISED STATUTES—ISSUE OF A NEW AND CHEAP EDITION—Question, Mr. Howell; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 262

LAW AND JUSTICE—CODIFICATION OF THE CRIMINAL LAW—Question, Mr. Howell; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 263

COMMISSIONERS OF EDUCATION (IRELAND) — SCHOOL LANDS AT CAVAN — Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 263

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1881 — SUB-COMMISSIONERS — SITTINGS AT KILKENNY—Question, Mr. Chance; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 265

METROPOLIS—RENEWAL OF THE COAL AND WINE DUES—Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 265

LIGHTHOUSE ILLUMINANTS—EXPERIMENTS AT THE SOUTH FORELAND—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 266

ORANGE SOCIETIES—OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND MILITIA—Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 266

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACTS—LEGISLATION — Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 267

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—THE LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS—Question, Mr. O'Hea; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 268

IRISH LAND COMMISSIONERS—SALE OF LAND, CO. DONEGAL—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 268

[*January* 31.]

Page

ARMY—QUARTERMASTERS AND RIDING MASTERS—Question, Colonel Duncan; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 269

INLAND REVENUE—THE CARRIAGE TAX AND GUN TAX—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 269

SCOTLAND—THE WESTERN ISLANDS—PROCURATORS FISCAL—Question, Mr. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) .. 269

POST OFFICE—CONVEYANCE OF MAILS TO THE GAMBIA—Questions, Mr. M'Arthur, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) 270

SCOTLAND—THE SKYE CROFTERS—SHERIFF IVORY—Question, Dr. Clark; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) .. 271

AFFAIRS OF SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE—AUSTRIA AND RUSSIA—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 271

RAILWAYS — RETURN OF RATES FOR CARRIAGE OF ENGLISH AND FOREIGN PRODUCE—Question, Mr. Dixon-Hartland; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 272

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS—RETURN OF DUES, &C.—Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) 272

ARMY—THE ROYAL HORSE ARTILLERY — Question, Colonel Hamilton; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 272

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES (IRELAND)—THE RETURNS — Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 273

BELFAST RIOTS—THE REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 273

EGYPT—THE SOUDAN—RELIEF OF EMIN BEY — Question, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 273

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS—Question, Mr. O'Hea; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 274

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [THIRD NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January:]—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* .. 274

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Lord George Hamilton*:)—Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill [Bill 1]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time," — (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) 365

After debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Moved, "That the Bill be committed for To-morrow,"—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) 378

Amendment proposed, to leave out "To-morrow," and insert "this day fortnight,"—(*Mr. Chance*:)—Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Motion *withdrawn*:—Bill *committed* for *Thursday.*

MOTIONS.

Ballot Act (1872) Amendment Bill—
Moved, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend 'The Ballot Act, 1872,"—(*Colonel Saunderson*) 379
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Colonel Saunderson, Colonel Waring, Mr. Macartney*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 138.]

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Jackson, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 127] 380

Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to Women) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Woodall, Mr. Houldsworth, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. M'Laren, Sir Robert Fowler, Mr. Howorth, Mr. Maclure, Mr. Stansfeld*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 128] .. 380

Borough Funds Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Woodall, Mr. Kenrick, Mr. Picton, Mr. Howard Vincent, Mr. Woodhead*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 129] .. 380

Coal Mines, &c., Regulation Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Secretary Matthews, Mr. Stuart-Wortley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 130] 380

Criminal Law (Scotland) Procedure Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Secretary Matthews, Mr. Secretary Balfour, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 131] 380

First Offenders Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Howard Vincent, Lord Randolph Spencer Churchill, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Hoare, Mr. Addison, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Molloy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 132] 380

Agricultural Tenants Relief Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Seale-Hayne, Sir Bernhard Samuelson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 133] 381

Deacons (Church of England) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Gedge, Viscount Folkestone, Mr. Hoare, Mr. MacInnes*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 134] .. 381

Hyde Park Corner (New Streets) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. David Plunket, Mr. Jackson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 135] 381

Public Parks and Works (Metropolis) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. David Plunket, Mr. Jackson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 136] 381

Lodgers' Goods Protection Act (1871) Amendment Bill — *Ordered* (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Howard Vincent, Mr. Gent-Davis*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 137] 381

PUBLIC PETITIONS—
Select Committee *appointed*:—List of the Committee 381

PRINTING—
Select Committee *appointed*:—List of the Committee 382

KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS (HOUSE OF COMMONS)—
Committee *appointed*:—List of the Committee 382

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Cornwall) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Borlase, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. C. T. Dyke Acland, Mr. Bickford-Smith, Mr. Courtney*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 139] 382

Miners' Wages Payment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, Mr. Borlase, Mr. Clancy*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 140] 382

Water Companies (Regulation of Powers) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Fulton, Captain Colomb, Mr. C. R. Spencer*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 141] .. 382

Merchandise Marks Act (1862) Amendment Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. Attorney General*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 142] 383

Rod Fishing (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Laing Brown, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. Angus Sutherland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 143] 383

Sites for Churches, &c. (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Byrne, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Jordan, Colonel Nolan*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 144] .. 383

Sanitation of Houses (Metropolis) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Tomlinson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 145] 383

[1.15.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1.

STATE-DIRECTED EMIGRATION—Petition *presented*, Lord Denman .. 383

Solicitors (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord FitzGerald*); read 1ª (No. 12) 384

[4.30.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

PARLIAMENT—STANDING ORDERS—
Select Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee 384

PARLIAMENT—SELECTION—
Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee 384

Belfast Main Drainage Bill—
Petition and Order of Leave [1st February, 1886] read; Bill read the first and second time; and (the Bill having been reported and considered in the last Session of Parliament),
Moved, "That the Bill be ordered to be read the third time,"—(*Mr. Dodds*) 385
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* to be read the third time on *Friday*.

QUESTIONS.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES—Questions, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) .. 386

COMMISSION ON AGRICULTURE, 1881-2—MAINTENANCE OF THE INDOOR POOR—Question, Mr. E. Hubbard; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 388

POST OFFICE—PARCELS POST BETWEEN FRANCE AND EGYPT—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 388

THE NORTHERN PACIFIC—EVACUATION OF PORT HAMILTON—Questions, Mr. Bryce, Mr. F. S. Stevenson, Mr. Young; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) .. 389

EGYPT — OPENING OF TRADE WITH THE SOUDAN—Questions, Mr. Bryce; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 390

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT — CULTIVATION OF HOPS — Question, Mr. Brookfield; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) 390

THE PARKS (REGENT'S PARK)—DISMISSAL OF A CONSTABLE—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) .. 391

PUBLIC HEALTH—THE SUTTON CEMETERY—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 391

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS FROM GWEEDORE—Question, Mr. O'Hea; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) .. 392

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS — ALLOWANCES TO THE CONSTABULARY—Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 392

POST OFFICE—AN IMPERIAL PENNY POSTAGE—Question, Mr. Edwin De Lisle; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 393

EGYPT—ARMY OF OCCUPATION—HEALTH OF THE TROOPS — Question, Mr. Henry J. Wilson; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 393

NOTICES OF MOTIONS—

Ordered, That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Address, in Answer to Her Majesty's Speech, have precedence this day of the Notices of Motions,—(*Mr. W. H. Smith.*)

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [FOURTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January]:—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 394

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Radcliffe Cooke*:)—Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed 473

After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Handel Cossham*:)—After further short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

Felonious Use of Firearms Bill [Bill 119]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Howard Vincent*) 479

After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Bill *withdrawn.*

MOTIONS.

Mining Leases (Cornwall and Devon) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Acland, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Courtney, Viscount Ebrington, Mr. Bickford-Smith, Mr. Seale-Hayne*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 146] 483

Stannaries Act (1869) Amendment Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Acland, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Courtney, Viscount Ebrington, Mr. Bickford-Smith, Mr. Seale-Hayne*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 147] 483

[12.45.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [FIFTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [January 27:]—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 483

After long debate, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood further adjourned till *To-morrow.*

[5.50.]

[*February* 2.] *Page*

MOTIONS.

Rating of Machinery Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Bernhard Samuelson, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Peacock, Sir Frederick Thorpe Mappin*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 148] 530

Income Tax Amdinistration Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hubbard, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Whitley, Sir George Balfour*) *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 149] 530

Registration of Voters Bill—*Ordered* (*Viscount Ebrington, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Lewis Fry, Mr. Pitt-Lewis*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 150] 530

Deep Sea Oysters Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Mr. Colman*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 151] 531

Greenwich Markets Act (1849) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Boord*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 152] 531

Licensed Premises (Earlier Closing) (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Mark Stewart, Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. Lyell, Mr. Provand*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 153] 531

Distress for Rent Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Burt, Mr. Arthur Williams*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 154] 531

Customs Law Amendment Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Seymour King, Mr. Gourley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 155] 531

LORDS, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3.

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY ON HER MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH .. 531

QUEEN'S SPEECH—HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS *reported* .. 534

Copyhold Enfranchisement Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Hobhouse*); read 1ª (No. 13) 534

Pluralities Act Amendment Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord President*); read 1ª (No. 14) 534

[4.30.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (RULES OF PROCEDURE)—Notice of Motion, Mr. J. W. Lowther 535

QUESTIONS.

LAW AND JUSTICE—PROSECUTION OF REV. WALTER DAVIES—Question, Mr. Henry H. Fowler; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 535

MARRIAGE LAW (ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND)—ATTENDANCE OF REGISTRARS—Question, Mr. Knowles; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) 536

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE EVICTIONS AT WOODFORD—COST OF TRANSPORT, &c.—Question, Mr. Chance; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 537

ARMY—JOHN CAMERON, SEAFORTH HIGHLANDERS—Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 537

Post Office—Postal Communication with the Outer Hebrides—Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 538

Land Act (Ireland) 1870—The Bright Clauses—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 538

Commissioners of Irish Lights—Legislation—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 538

Local Courts of Bankruptcy (Ireland) — Legislation—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 539

Commissioners of Irish Lights—"The Princess Alexandra"—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 539

Army—The Afghan Prize Money—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 539

Royal Military Colleges at Woolwich and Sandhurst—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 540

Post Office—The New Postage Stamps—Report of the Committee upon Stamps—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 540

Post Office (Ireland)—Accommodation at Grangegeith and Slane—Question, Mr. O'Hanlon; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 541

Navy—Prices of Coal, Iron, Steel, &c. to the Dockyards—Question, Mr. Henry H. Fowler; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 542

The Mauritius—The Exchange—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 542

Fisheries (Ireland)—Trawling in Sligo and Killala Bays—Questions, Colonel Nolan, Mr. P. M'Donald; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 543

Sea Fisheries (Ireland)—A Steam Cruiser—Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 543

Metropolitan Board of Works—The Superintending Architect—Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg) 544

Egypt—Army of Occupation—Supplementary Estimates—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 544

Railways (India)—Massacre on the Quetta-Pisheen Railway—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 545

Burial Acts—Consecration of Cemeteries—The Attleborough Burial Board—Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 546

Commons (Metropolis)—Wandsworth Common Act, 1871—Leasing of Land—Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 546

Hall-Marking — Indian Gold and Silver Plate at the Colonial Exhibition—Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 548

United States—The Homestead and Exemption Laws — Question, Mr. E. Robertson; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 548

Home Defences—Garrisons of the Thames Forts—Question, Major Rasch; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 549

Parks (Metropolis)—Cost of Maintenance—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 549

Post Office (England and Wales)—Stationery Clerks in Surveyors' Branch—Question, Mr. Cobb; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 549

Post Office—Negotiations with the Telephone Companies—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 550

Army—Issue of Kit Bags—Question, Viscount Baring; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 551

Court of Bankruptcy (Ireland)—Mr. Thomas Moroney—Question, Mr. P. M'Donald; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 551

Post Office Contracts—Australian Mail Conracts—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 552

Law and Justice—Publication of Evidence in Divorce and other Cases—Questions, Mr. J. Howard, Colonel Laurie; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 553

Evictions (Ireland)—Notices to Relieving Officers—The Glenbeigh Evictions—Questions, Mr. Wootton Isaacson, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 554

The Northern Pacific—Evacuation of Port Hamilton—Question, Captain Colomb; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 554

Charity Commission Schemes—Election of Trustees—Question, Sir John Swinburne; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 555

Parliament—Publication of Evidence given before Royal Commissions and Select Committees—Question, Mr. Hoyle; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 556

The Public Funds—Transmission of Dividends—Question, Mr. Joicey; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 556

Hyde Park Corner (New Streets) Bill—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) .. 557

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—Adjourned Debate [Sixth Night]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January:]—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 557

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Cremer*:)—Question put, and *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill [Bill 1]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) .. 632

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "To-morrow," in order to insert the words "Thursday next,"—(*Mr. Chance,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'To-morrow' stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

COLONIAL SERVICE [PENSIONS]—
Considered in Committee 636
Resolution *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow.*

NATIONAL PROVIDENT INSURANCE—
Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the best system of National Provident Assurance,—(*Mr. Rankin.*)

Church Discipline Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Colonel Sandys, Mr. Wardle, Mr. Joicey*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 156] 637

Contumacy Imprisonment Abolition Bill—*Ordered* (*Colonel Sandys, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Wardle, Mr. Joicey*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 157] .. 637

[1.15.]

LORDS, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4.

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Chancellor*); read 1ª (No. 15) 637

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE *appointed:*—List of the Committee .. 637

PRIVATE BILLS—
All Petitions relating to Standing Orders which shall be presented during the present Session referred to the Standing Orders Committee unless otherwise ordered.

[4.45.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4.

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—IMPROVED POSTAL SERVICE AT KINSALE—Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 638
POST OFFICE CONTRACTS—CONVEYANCE OF MAILS TO NEW YORK—Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 639
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EX-CONSTABLE MARTIN JOYCE—Question, Mr. D. Sullivan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 639
EDUCATION (SCOTLAND)—LENZIE PUBLIC SCHOOLS—Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) .. 640
THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—THE PETTY SESSIONS DISTRICT OF BOYLE—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 640
PRISONS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877—MR. HEALY, GOVERNOR OF CLARE COUNTY PRISON—Questions, Mr. Cox; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 641
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EXTRA POLICE IN COUNTY CLARE—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach).. 641
ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS—CHURCHYARD BOTTOM WOOD, HIGHGATE—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson .. 642
ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS — ST. MARY, HORNSEY — Question, Mr. Picton; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley).. 643
EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—MR. HILLAS, HIGH SHERIFF, SLIGO CO.—Question, Mr. P. M'Donald; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 643

[*February* 4.] *Page*

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—PULLENDIVA PIER — Question, Mr. P. M'Donald; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 644

MERCANTILE MARINE — LIFE-SAVING GEAR ON "KAPUNDA," AND CERTAIN CASUALTIES IN 1886—Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) .. 644

REDUCTION OF RENTS (SCOTLAND)—TRUSTEES OF LANDED ESTATES—Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) 645

FISHERIES (IRELAND) — FISHERMEN OF LOUGH NEAGH — Question, Mr. Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 645

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE ASSIZES—ORDINARY JURORS—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes).. 646

EVICTIONS (IRELAND) — EVICTION AT RATHKEALE — Questions, Colonel Sandys, Mr. W. Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 646

LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)—WILLIAM CRIBBIN, MULLINGAR LUNATIC ASYLUM — Question, Mr. Tuite; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 648

THE HAYTIAN GOVERNMENT—CLAIMS OF BRITISH SUBJECTS—Question, Mr. Chance; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 648

EGYPT—MILITARY EXPEDITION—SCIENTIFIC REPORTS ON THE SOUDAN—Question, Mr. Norris; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 648

EAST AFRICA—THE LONDON CONFERENCE—THE SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR—Question, Mr. F. S. Stevenson; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 649

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS—FEES — Questions, Mr. James Stuart; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 649

POLICE (SCOTLAND) BILL—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald).. .. 651

ARMY—CONVERSION OF HORSE AND FIELD ARTILLERY—Question, Captain Cotton; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope).. 651

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE VOLUNTEER CAPITATION GRANT—Question, Colonel Laurie; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 651

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—RETURNS—Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 652

EAST AFRICA—MASSOWAH—DEFEAT OF AN ITALIAN EXPEDITION—Question, Mr. Legh; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 652

LUNACY ACTS AMENDMENT—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) 653

ARMY—ARMS OF OFFICERS—THE REVOLVERS—Question, Mr. Brookfield; Answer, The Surveyor General of the Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) .. 653

COAL AND IRONSTONE MINES—REPORT OF INSPECTORS, 1886—Question, Mr. Pickard; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) 654

COAL AND IRONSTONE MINES—DAYS OF DRAWING—Question, Mr. Pickard; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 654

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND)—LOANS TO CROFTING PARISHES—Question, Mr. C. S. Parker; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 655

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS—Question, Mr. Wootton Isaacson; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 655

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — THE JURY SYSTEM — CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES — Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 655

INLAND REVENUE—INCOME TAX—FOREIGN FIRMS—Question, Mr. Howorth; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 656

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [SEVENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January:]—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 656

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the 4th paragraph, to add the words "and humbly to represent to Her Majesty that, inasmuch as the expenses of the prolonged occupation of Egypt by a British Force have to be borne by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, the great majority of whom have no direct interest in the Government or affairs of Egypt, and that the retention of our Troops in Egypt is a cause of suspicion and irritation to Continental Governments, and calculated to weaken the influence of this Country in the Councils of Europe, humbly to pray Her Majesty to take immediate steps for recalling the whole of Her Forces from Egypt,"—(*Mr. Cremer*) 659

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

After long debate, Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, in line 9, to leave out the word "immediate,"—(*Mr. Illingworth.*)

Question put, "That the word 'immediate' stand part of the said proposed Amendment:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 247, Noes 127; Majority 120.—(Div. List, No. 3.)

Question put,

"That the words 'and humbly to represent to Her Majesty that, inasmuch as the expenses of the prolonged occupation of Egypt by a British Force have to be borne by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, the great majority of whom have no direct interest in the Government or affairs of Egypt, and that the retention of our Troops in Egypt is a cause of suspicion and irritation to Continental Governments, and calculated to weaken the influence of this Country in the Councils of Europe, humbly to pray Her Majesty to take immediate steps for recalling the whole of Her Forces from Egypt' be there inserted,"—(*Mr. Cremer.*)

The House *divided;* Ayes 97, Noes 263; Majority 166.—(Div. List, No. 4.)

Main Question again proposed 735

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Parnell:*)—Motion *agreed to:*—Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 3) Bill—

Order for Second Reading read 735

After short debate, Second Reading *deferred* till *Tuesday* next.

MOTIONS.

Colonial Service [Pensions] Bill—Resolution [Feb. 3] *reported,* and *agreed to:*— Bill *ordered* (*Sir Herbert Maxwell, Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Jackson*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 158] 736

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill — *Ordered* (*Mr. Finlay, Mr. M'Lagan*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 160] 736

Foynes Harbour (Transfer) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Herbert Maxwell, Mr. Jackson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 159] 736

Elections (Intervention of Peers, &c.)—

Ordered, That a Select Committee be *appointed*, "to consider the Sessional Order with reference to the Intervention of Peers or Prelates in Parliamentary Elections, and to report whether any, and, if so, what alterations are advisable therein:"—List of the Committee 736

[12.45.]

LORDS, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7.

Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill (No. 7)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 737
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* the 15*th instant*.

Lunacy Bill (No. 8)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 741
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly.

India (Madras)—The Covenanted Civil Service—Land Speculations—Case of Mr. Sullivan — Question, Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Secretary of State for India (Viscount Cross) .. 741

Army (Ordnance Department) — Defective Weapons — Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets—Question, Observations, The Earl of Erne; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) 743

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill (No. 15)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 745
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod—

Select Committee *appointed*:—List of the Committee 752

[5.45.]

QUESTIONS.

COMMONS, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7.

Army (Ordnance Department)—Defective Weapons — Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets—Questions, Mr. Hanbury; Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 753

Education Department (Scotland) — Elementary Schools and University Teaching—Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 754

Army—Officers' Quarters—Sale of Premises, Portsmouth, Occupied by the Commanding Officer of Royal Engineers—Question, Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 755

Defences of the Empire—Coaling Station at Castries (West Indies)—Question, Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 756

Law and Justice (Ireland)—Ulster Winter Assizes—Conviction of M'Grath—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 756

Islands of the South Pacific—Island of Malayta—H.M.S. "Opal"—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 757

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[February 7.] *Page*

NORTH BORNEO—ATTACK ON NATIVES—H.M.S. "ZEPHYR"—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 757

POST OFFICE — THE SUBMARINE TELEGRAPH COMPANY — Question, Mr. Montagu; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 758

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—THE FISHERY DISPUTE—Questions, Mr. Gourley; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 758

ADMIRALTY—ADMINISTRATION OF THE DOCKYARDS—Question, Sir William Plowden; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 759

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—THE ROYAL GUN FACTORY, WOOLWICH—DEDUCTIONS FROM PAY—Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 760

POST OFFICE—LETTER CARRIERS' GOOD CONDUCT BADGES—Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 760

INDIA—INCOME TAX ON TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 761

POST OFFICE—CONVEYANCE OF AMERICAN MAILS—Questions, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Whitley; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes), The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 761

ARMY—MILITARY BALLOONING—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 762

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE—CHANCERY TAXING MASTER'S OFFICE—Question, Colonel Duncan; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 763

PARLIAMENT—ORDER—DISALLOWANCE OF QUESTION AS TO LORD COWPER'S COMMISSION ON IRISH LAND—Question, Mr. Sexton; Observations, Mr. Speaker 763

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES—Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. M. J. Kenny, Mr. Henry H. Fowler, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 764

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — THE JURY SYSTEM — CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES — Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 766

BURIAL ACT, 1880 — CONSECRATION OF CEMETERIES — THE REFUSAL OF BISHOPS—Question, Mr. Woodall; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 766

BURIAL GROUNDS BILL—CONSECRATION OF CEMETERIES—Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 766

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)—AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS — Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 767

CONFERENCE OF COLONIAL REPRESENTATIVES — STATE-DIRECTED COLONIZATION—Question, Mr. Seton-Karr; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) 767

VENEZUELA—SEIZURE OF THE SHIPS "HENRIETTA" AND "JOSEPHINE"—CLAIMS OF BRITISH SUBJECTS—Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) .. 768

GOLD AND SILVER PLATE—THE REVENUE ACT, 1887—Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 768

PRISON SITES — HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES—Question, Mr. J. Rowlands; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 769

PRISON SITES — CLERKENWELL PRISONS — Question, Captain Penton; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 770

RAILWAYS (IRELAND) — THE DUBLIN "LOOP LINE" SCHEME — Question, Mr. Ewart; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 770

WAR OFFICE (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—KRUPP GUNS—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 772

ARMY—ROYAL HORSE ARTILLERY—THE "MAIWAND" BATTERY—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 773

FISHERY DEPARTMENT (ENGLAND AND WALES) — BEAM TRAWLING — Questions, Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Marjoribanks; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 773

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [EIGHTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January:] Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 774

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the 8th paragraph, to insert the words, "But humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the relations between the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland has not been seriously disturbed in the cases of those owners who have granted to their tenants such abatements of rents as are called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce, and that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is not to be found in increased stringency of criminal procedure, or in the pursuit of such novel, doubtful, and unconstitutional measures as have recently been taken by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland, but in such a reform of the Law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people,"—(*Mr. Parnell*) 797

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. John Morley*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

TOWN HOLDINGS—NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE—

Moved, "That the Select Committee on Town Holdings do consist of Twenty Members,"—(*Colonel Nolan*) 868

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—List of the Committee .. 869

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS—

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, to inquire into the operation of "The Endowed School Act, 1869," and the amending Acts, and to consider and report how far it may be expedient to amend the powers exercised under them by the Charity Commissioners:—List of the Committee 869

Cottagers' (Allotments) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Finch-Hatton, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Viscount Curzon, Mr. Charles Hall, Captain Selwyn, Viscount Grimston*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 161] 869

PERPETUAL PENSIONS—

Ordered, That the Select Committee on Perpetual Pensions do consist of Seventeen Members:—List of the Committee 869

LORDS, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8.

Glebe Lands Bill—

Bill to facilitate the sale of glebe lands—*Presented* (*The Viscount Cross*) .. 870
After short debate, Bill read 1ª. (No. 16.) [5.0.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8.

Parliament—County of Longford (Northern Division) Election—Return amended 875

QUESTIONS.

Evictions (Ireland)—The Glenbeigh Evictions—Cost of Constabulary—Questions, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. E. Harrington; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 876

Thames Preservation Act, 1885—Conservancy Bye-Laws—Question, Mr. Story-Maskelyne; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 876

Elementary Education (Scotland)—Poor and School Rates in Skye—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 877

Post Office—Foreign Telegraph Stations—Question, Mr. Staveley Hill; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 877

Arklow Harbour Act—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 877

National School Teachers (Ireland) — Delaying Payment of Result Fees—Question. Mr. Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 878

Royal Irish Constabulary — Constable Foster — Question, Mr. O'Hanlon; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 879

Poor Law (Metropolis)—Casual Relief at St. George's Workhouse—Question, Mr. Maclure; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 879

Dogs—Liability for Shooting Stray Dogs—Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 880

Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Winter Assize Courts—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) 881

Registration of Parliamentary Voters (Ireland)—Polling Districts—Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. Cox; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 881

Law and Justice—Winter Assizes Act—Transfer of Prisoners and Witnesses—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 882

Army (Auxiliary Forces)—City of Cork Militia Artillery—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 883

Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Monaghan Militia—Orange Lodges—Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 883

War Office (Ordnance Department)—Guns Supplied to Army and Navy—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 884

Landlord and Tenant (Ireland)—Lord Charlemont's Estate—Interference of the Police—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 884

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*February* 8.] *Page*

Royal Irish Constabulary—Detective Constable Kerr—Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 885

Weights and Measures Act—Sale of Coal in the Midland Mining Districts—Question, Mr. P. Stanhope; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 886

Rabies among Dogs—Police Precautions—Question, Mr. H. S. Wright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) 886

Endowed Schools Acts—The Annual Financial Statement—Question, Mr. Coghill; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir William Hart Dyke) 887

Evictions (Ireland)—Marquess of Lansdowne's Estate, Queen's County—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 887

The Parks (Metropolis)—St. James's Park—Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) .. 888

War Office (Ordnance Department)—Contract for Cartridges for Queensland—Question, Mr. Hunter; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 888

Army—Insanitary State of Dover Barracks—Questions, Mr. Norris; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 888

Public Health—Hydrophobia—M. Pasteur's System—Question, Mr. Coghill; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 889

Law and Justice (Ireland)—Salary of the Attorney General—Question, Mr. Henry H. Fowler; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 890

Civil Service Writers—The Treasury Minute—Question, Mr. Gent-Davis; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) .. 890

The Civil Service—Retirement of Writers—Question, Mr. Gent-Davis; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 890

Ireland—Armagh Town Commissioners—Audit of Accounts—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 891

Labourers (Ireland) Act and Labourers Cottages—Ardee Union—Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 891

Prisons (Ireland)—Re-organization—Increase of Salaries of Officials—Question, Mr. M'Cartan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 892

Crime and Outrage (Ireland)—The Riots at Belfast—The Constabulary—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 893

Evictions (Ireland)—The Glenbeigh Evictions—Questions, Mr. Mahony, Mr. M. Healy; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 893

Evictions (Ireland)—The Glenbeigh Evictions—Questions, Mr. Mahony, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 894

Land (Ireland)—Glebe Land Tenants—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 895

Evictions (Ireland)—Threatened Evictions in Achill—Question, Mr. Channing; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 895

Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases—Questions, Mr. J. E. Ellis, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 896

WAYS AND MEANS—THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT—LOCAL TAXATION—Question, Mr. Stanley Leighton; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 897

PUBLIC HEALTH—CONTAGIOUS DISEASES HOSPITALS IN GARRISON TOWNS—Question, Mr. C. T. D. Acland; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 897

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [NINTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [7th February:]—Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—Debate *resumed* 898

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Coleridge:*)—Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—

Select Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee 1003

Glebe Lands Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Baggallay, Mr. Childers, Mr. John Talbot, Mr. Tomlinson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 162] 1003

[12.40.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [TENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [7th February:]—Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—Debate *resumed* 1004

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. William Redmond:*)—Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTION.

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Joicey, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Lockwood*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 163] 1058

[5.46.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10.

Solicitors (Ireland) Bill (No. 12)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord FitzGerald*) .. 1058

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* the 25*th instant.*

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill (No. 15)—

House in Committee 1059

Amendment made; the Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next.

WAR OFFICE (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—DEFECTIVE WEAPONS—CUTLASSES AND SWORD BAYONETS—Question, Observations, Lord Balfour, The Earl of Morley, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) 1063

[*February* 10.] *Page*

NAVY — H.M.S. "INDUS" — DEFECTIVE SWORD BAYONETS — Question, Observations, The Earl of Erne; Replies, Lord Elphinstone (A Lord in Waiting), The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris):—Short debate thereon 1067

[5.30.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Brixton Market Bill (*by Order*)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 1071

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:" —After short debate, Question put, and *negatived*:—Words *added*:— Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*:—Second Reading *put off* for six months.

QUESTIONS.

INDIA—THE PUNJAB — FORCED LABOUR, &c. — Question, Mr. De Lisle; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 1078

HARBOURS OF REFUGE—LUNDY ISLAND—Question, Mr. Llewellyn; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) .. 1079

EGYPT — ABOLITION OF THE "CORVEE" — Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1079

PUBLIC HEALTH—INSANITARY CONDITION OF BATTERSEA PARK — Question, Mr. Bonsor; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 1080

SEA FISHINGS (SCOTLAND) ACT—DEFECTIVE OPERATION — Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1080

WAR OFFICE (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT) — CONTRACT FOR CARTRIDGES FOR QUEENSLAND — Questions, Colonel Bridgeman, Mr. Hanbury; Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) .. 1081

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIVER BARROW— Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1082

COMMISSIONERS OF IRISH LIGHTS—CLOTHING CONTRACTS—Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1082

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) — STATE-AIDED AND NON-STATE-AIDED SCHOOLS — Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1083

CROFTERS' (SCOTLAND) ACT—SHEEP FARMS AND DEER FORESTS (SCOTLAND)— Question, Dr. R. Macdonald; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1083

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE MILITIA (SCOTLAND)—Question, Dr. R. Macdonald; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1084

NAVY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE NAVAL RESERVE (SCOTLAND)—Question, Dr. R. Macdonald; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1085

CROFTERS' COMMISSION—LEWIS AND SKYE CROFTERS — Question, Dr. R. Macdonald; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1085

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*February* 10.] *Page*

India (Madras)—The Conflagration — Question, Sir Robert Fowler; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 1085

Admiralty — "Old and Unserviceable Stores" — Question, Mr. J. Rowlands; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton); Question, Dr. Tanner [No reply] 1086

Burmah (Upper)—Military Expedition to the Ruby Mines—Messrs. Streeter — Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1087

War Office (Ordnance Department)—Defective Weapons—Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets—Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1087

Army—Practice in Use of the Revolver—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1088

Poor Law (Metropolis)—Holborn Workhouse—Question, Mr. Newnes; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 1083

Landlord and Tenant (Ireland)—Lord Charlemont's Estate—Action of the Police—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1089

Law and Justice (Ireland)—The "Queen *v.* Dillon"—Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) 1090

Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases — The "Queen *v.* Dillon" — Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. T. C. Harrington, Mr. Chance, Mr. Conybeare; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) 1091

Agricultural Statistics—Return of Owner-Farmers — Question, Mr. Jasper More; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) 1094

Commercial Treaty with France, 1882—Surtaxe D'Entrepôt — Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1095

Admiralty—Torpedo Boats — A "Committee of Designs" — Question, Admiral Field; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1095

War Office (Ordnance Department)—Defective Weapons—Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets—Questions, Commander Bethell, Mr. Hanbury, Sir Henry Tyler, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton), The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1096

Admiralty—Dry Dock (Haulbowline)—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 1100

Education Department (Scotland)—Lenzie Public School—Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1100

Admiralty (Shipbuilding)—The "Anson"—Question, Admiral Mayne; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 1101

Army — Billet Money — Question, Sir Joseph Bailey; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1101

Theatres and Public Places (Metropolis)—The Spitalfields Calamity —Question, Mr. Wootton Isaacson; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1102

Newspaper Advertising—Treasury Patronage—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Patronage Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Akers-Douglas) 1102

Royal Irish Constabulary — Service on Evictions — Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1103

British Honduras—Question, Sir Robert Fowler; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) 1104

METROPOLITAN BRIDGES—THE WESTMINSTER BRIDGE ESTATE—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 1104

THE CIVIL SERVICE—SUSPENSION OF APPOINTMENTS—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1104

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE—"BLOCKING"—Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 1105

EGYPT—NEUTRALITY—RUMOURED NEGOTIATIONS—THE NEUTRALIZATION OF EGYPT—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1105

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—JUDGE CURRAN—Questions, Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald, Mr. T. C. Harrington; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1106

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [ELEVENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [7th February:]—Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—Debate *resumed* 1107

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Sexton*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

Marriages (Attendance of Registrars) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Stuart-Wortley*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 164] 1198

City of London Fire Inquests Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Robert Fowler, Mr. Hubbard*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 165] 1198

[12.45.]

LORDS, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11.

WAR OFFICE (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—DEFECTIVE WEAPONS—CUTLASSES AND SWORD BAYONETS—Question, Observations, The Earl of Harrowby; Reply, Lord Elphinstone (A Lord in Waiting) 1198

PRIVATE BILLS—AMENDMENT OF STANDING ORDERS—

Standing Orders Nos. 62, 64, 66, 115, 113, 117, 133A, and 177 *considered* and *amended*; and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 18.) [4.45.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Orkney Roads Bill (*by Order*)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Dodds*) .. 1199

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Lyell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 219, Noes 139; Majority 80.—(Div. List, No. 4.)

Main Question put:—Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

[*February* 11.] *Page*

QUESTIONS.

SCOTLAND—THE SKYE CROFTERS—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1210

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND) — ROBERT HUME, A MANIACAL PRISONER—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1210

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT—RETURN OF MEMBERS, 1880—INDEX OF NAMES—Question, Mr. Dixon-Hartland; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) 1211

ARMY—RIFLE RANGES — Question, Mr. King; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1212

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND) — MOONLIGHTERS AT MILLSTREET, CO. CORK—Questions, Mr. Smith-Barry, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1213

POST OFFICE (IRELAND) — SUB-POSTMASTER OF GURTEEN, CO. GALWAY—Questions, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1214

NEWSPAPERS—POST OFFICE ACT, 1870—NEWSPAPER LIBEL AND REGISTRATION ACT, 1881—Question, Mr. Knowles; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1214

DRAINAGE OF LANDS—COMPENSATION TO RIPARIAN OWNERS—Question, Mr. Ainslie; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) 1215

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE CROSSMAGLEN PRISONERS—Question, Mr. Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1215

AFRICA (WEST COAST)—REVIVAL OF THE SLAVE TRADE—Question, Mr. M'Arthur; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1216

THE INDIAN OCEAN—THE SEYCHELLES ISLANDS—THE CHIEF OFFICER OF POLICE—Question, Commander Bethell; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) 1216

SOUTH AFRICA—AFFAIRS OF ZULULAND—Question, Commander Bethell; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) 1217

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES—Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. R. T. Reid, Mr. J. E. Redmond, Mr. Chance; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1217

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS—Question, Mr. Mahony; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1218

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND) ACT — NAVAN UNION — Question, Mr. Mahony; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1219

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS—Question, Mr. Mahony; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach); Question, Mr. E. Harrington [No reply] 1220

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) 1220

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND) — PETTY SESSION AT HOSPITAL, COUNTY LIMERICK—Questions, Mr. Finucane, Mr. M'Cartan, Mr. W. Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1221

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—INSANITARY STATE OF RATHDOWN WORKHOUSE—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1222

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*February* 11.] *Page*

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—ASSAULT AT COOLGREANEY — Questions, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Dillon; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1222

NAVY (THE DOCKYARDS)—DEVONPORT DOCKYARD—THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE —COLLECTION OF SUBSCRIPTIONS—Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 1223

FISHING BOATS AMENDMENT BILL—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. Heneage; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1224

INLAND REVENUE—STAMP DUTY ON RECEIPTS FROM INCOME TAX AND POOR RATES—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1224

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE MID-WINTER ASSIZES — Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) 1225

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—WINTER ASSIZES—RE-ARRANGEMENT OF CIRCUITS—Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) .. 1225

QUARRIES REGULATION—LEGISLATION—Question, Mr. T. E. Ellis; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) .. 1226

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS—ANNUAL EXPENDITURE ON THE PARKS—Questions, Colonel Hughes, Mr. Webster; Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 1226

JURIES (IRELAND) ACT, 1871—JURY PANEL AT SLIGO — Questions, Dr. Kenny; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) .. 1227

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES—Question, Mr. Chance; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 1228

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES—Question, Mr. Chance; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) 1229

EMIGRATION STATISTICS FOR 1886—Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1230

INDIA (BOMBAY)—ABSTINENCE FROM STRONG DRINK—Question, Mr. S. Smith; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1230

WAR OFFICE (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT) — CONTRACTS FOR CARTRIDGES FOR QUEENSLAND—Questions, Mr. Hanbury, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1231

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — THE JURY SYSTEM — CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES—THE "QUEEN *v.* DILLON"—Questions, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) .. 1233

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — THE JURY SYSTEM — CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES—THE "QUEEN *v.* DILLON, O'BRIEN, AND OTHERS"—Questions, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), Mr. Speaker .. 1233

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — THE JURY SYSTEM — CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES — THE "QUEEN *v.* JOHN DILLON, M.P."—Question, Mr. Cobb; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) .. 1235

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES—Question, Mr. Cobb; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 1236

BURMAH (UPPER)—MILITARY OPERATIONS—COST OF THE WAR—Question, Mr. S. Smith; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1236

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS ON LORD ORMATHWAITE'S PROPERTY—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1236

EGYPT—THE SOUDAN — DISASTER TO THE ITALIAN ARMS AT MASSOWAH — Questions, Mr. W. H. James, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) .. 1237

BULGARIA—PRINCE ALEXANDER OF BATTENBERG—Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1238

EMIGRATION (IRELAND) — PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS, 1882-3 — Question, Captain Colomb; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1240

WAR OFFICE (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT) — DEFECTIVE WEAPONS—CUTLASSES AND SWORD BAYONETS—THE COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY — Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1240

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—INTIMIDATION OF JURORS—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1241

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [TWELFTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [7th February:]—Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—Debate *resumed* 1241

After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 246, Noes 352; Majority 106.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 1348

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned," — (*Mr. Esslemont:*)—Question put, and *agreed to:*- Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* next.

[1.25.]

LORDS, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14.

RAILWAYS—RAILWAY BRAKES—MOTION FOR A RETURN—

Moved, That there be laid before the House—

"Return of the number of servants in the employ of each railway company who are regularly on duty for more than twelve hours consecutively,"—(*The Earl De La Warr*) 1354

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

STATE OF IRELAND—LEGISLATION—Observations, Lord Inchiquin; Reply, The Lord Privy Seal (Earl Cadogan):—Short debate thereon .. 1359

Probation of First Offenders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl of Erne*); read 1ª (No. 20) 1386

[7.0.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Belfast Main Drainage Bill (*by Order*)—

Moved, "That the Order for the Third Reading be taken into consideration To-morrow,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 1386

Motion *agreed to:*—Third Reading *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

QUESTIONS.

Evictions (Ireland) — Conduct of the Constabulary, Co. Limerick —Questions, Mr. Finucane; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1387
Law and Justice (Ireland)—Achill Petty Sessions — Importation of Illicit Whiskey by Coastguards—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 1388
Labourers (Ireland) Acts—John Kavanagh, Co. Wexford—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1388
Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Jury System — Challenges in Criminal Cases — Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes), The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1389
Army—Purchase of Horses for Army Purposes—Question, Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1390
The Parks (Metropolis)—The Expenditure—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) .. 1390
Admiralty—Appointments—The Director of Dockyards—Question, Sir William Plowden; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1392
Ireland—Mr. F. Deverell, County Surveyor of Cavan—Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1392
Admiralty — Dr. Allan Shone, Chaplain, R.N. — Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1392
Charitable Donations and Bequests (Ireland)—The Eaton Bequest—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1393
Navy—Re-testing of Cutlasses—Questions, Dr. Cameron, Colonel Eyre; Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote), The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1393
Arms (Ireland) Act—Mr. James O'Mahoney—Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach).. 1394
Refuge and Life Harbours—Appropriation of Public Money—Question, Admiral Mayne; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1394
Post Office (Ireland)—Postal Accommodation at Newry—Question, Mr. M'Cartan; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 1395
State of Ireland—Police Protection—Denis Brennan—Question, Dr. Kenny; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1395
Post Office (England and Wales)—Dismissal of Female Clerks—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 1396
Merchant Shipping—The Register of Shipping—Vessels moved by Towing—Question, Mr. J. C. Stevenson; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1396
Army (Ordnance Store Department)—Clothing Contracts—Questions, Mr. Coghill, Mr. J. O'Connor (Tipperary, S.); Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1397
Quarries Regulation—Legislation—Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) .. 1399
Post Office—The Telegraph Service—Case of Patrick Ward—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 1399

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*February* 14.]

Coal Mines Regulation Bill—Extension to Ireland—The Truck System—Questions, Mr. Marum, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) .. 1400

Egypt (Finance, &c.)—The Corvee—Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Sir George Campbell; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1401

Army—The Royal Military Academy, Woolwich—Improved Accommodation—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope).. 1402

War Office (Ordnance Department)—Contract for Cartridges for Queensland—The Explosives Act—Question, Mr. De Lisle; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) 1402

Royal Irish Constabulary—District Inspector Tilly—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1403

Morocco—Imprisonment of the Free Negro, Fattah—Question, Mr. A. E. Pease; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1403

Africa (East Coast)—Revival of the Slave Trade—Question, Mr. A. E. Pease; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1404

Education Department (Scotland)—Lenzie Public School—Questions, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Mundella; Answers, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1404

Naval Contracts—Report of the Committee—Question, Admiral Mayne; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 1405

Canada and the United States—Law of Extradition—Question, Mr. W. G. Cavendish-Bentinck; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1405

Mines Regulation Act, 1872—Employment of Women at the Pit's Bank—Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1406

Statistics of Trade and Labour—Labour Bureaux—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1407

Police (Metropolis)—"Prize Competition for Children"—Questions, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answers, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster), The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1407

Trustee Savings Banks—The Cardiff Bank—Questions, Mr. Howell; Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 1409

Egypt—Sir Henry Drummond Wolff—Expenses of his Mission—Questions, Mr. S. Williamson; Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1410

Purchase of Land Act, 1885—Amount of Advances—Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1411

Ireland—Inflammatory Language—Mr. W. O'Brien's Speech at Woodford, Co. Galway—Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach).. .. 1411

Business of the House—The Amendments to the Address—Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith):—Short debate thereon 1412

Parliament—Division Lists—Correction of an Error—Observations, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Speaker 1415

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [THIRTEENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January:] —Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 1415

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the 10th paragraph, to insert the words—"And humbly to express regret that it is not proposed to inquire into the exceptional position of agricultural holders in Scotland bound under nineteen years' leases, contracted and entered upon prior to the recent serious fall in the prices of all agricultural produce; a fall which has rendered stipulated rents inequitable, and in many cases impossible, under the altered circumstances of the Country; the operation of which leases, especially those still covered by the Law of Hypothec, tends to prevent the full development of the productive capabilities of the land,"—(*Mr. Esslemont*) 1425

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 96, Noes 198; Majority 102.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 1471

GREAT BRITAIN—LOCAL HOME RULE—Amendment proposed,

At the end of the 12th paragraph, to insert the words—"But humbly to submit to Her Majesty that the affairs of the Realm have out-grown the capacity of this House; and humbly to pray of Her Majesty to invite Her Majesty's Ministers to consider and submit to Parliament Measures whereby great part of the special affairs of Scotland, and of other parts of Great Britain, may be relegated to bodies representing the several parts of the Kingdom, and the excessive burden on this House may be relieved,"—(*Sir George Campbell*) 1479

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question again proposed:—*Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Dr. Cameron:*)—Motion *agreed to:*—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

Metropolis Management Acts Amendment (No. 2) Bill—(*Mr. Octavius Morgan, Mr. Gilliat, Mr. Kimber*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 167] .. 1493

Allotments and Cottage Gardens Compensation Bill—(*Sir Edward Birkbeck, Mr. Finch-Hatton, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Gurdon, Viscount Curzon, Sir Savile Crossley, Mr. Norton*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 167] 1493

[12.40.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15.

Glebe Lands Bill (No. 16)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Viscount Cross*) .. 1494

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* the 1*st of March* next.

POLICE ACTS (IRELAND)—THE CORPORATION OF LIMERICK—EXTRA POLICE —Question, Observations, The Duke of St. Albans; Reply, The Lord Privy Seal (Earl Cadogan):—Short debate thereon 1503

ARMY—THE ROYAL ARTILLERY—RUMOURED REDUCTION OF THE FORCE—Question, Observations, Lord Napier of Magdala, Lord Ellenborough; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) .. 1513

Church Sites (Compulsory Powers Repeal) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Bishop of Lichfield*); read 1ª (No. 22) 1518

[6.20.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Belfast Main Drainage Bill (*by Order*)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 1519

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Queen's *Consent* signified:—Bill read the third time, and *passed*.

Sutton District Water Bill (*by Order*)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 1526

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:" —After debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor*:)—Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 99, Noes 224; Majority 125.—(Div. List, No. 7.)

Original Question again proposed 1542

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Original Question put, and *agreed to*: —Bill read a second time, and *committed*.

QUESTIONS.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)—MR. L. H. JAMES, LATE OFFICIAL ASSIGNEE—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1543

IRISH LAND COMMISSION—SALES OF HOLDINGS—RESERVATIONS—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1543

LAW AND JUSTICE—CITY OF LONDON COURT—Question, Mr. O'Hanlon; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 1544

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS—LOSS OF THE "KAPUNDA"—Question, Mr. Atherley-Jones; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1544

INDIA—REFORM IN THE INDIAN TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT—Question, Mr. King; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1545

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—ASSAULTS IN WEXFORD CO.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1545

COLLECTOR OF RATES' OFFICE (IRELAND)—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) .. 1546

HARBOURS AND PASSING TOLLS ACT, 1861—GUARANTEE OF LOANS—Question, Mr. C. T. Dyke Acland; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1547

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—MILLSTREET PETTY SESSIONS—SERGEANT MORONEY—Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1547

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*February* 15.] Page

STATE OF IRELAND—"BOYCOTTING" AT MICHELSTOWN—Questions, Mr. Macartney, Mr. M'Cartan; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1548
LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—THOMAS SCULLY AND ROBERT KELLY—Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1549
THE LAND (IRELAND)—REDUCTION OF INTEREST ON MORTGAGES, &c.—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1550
PRISONS (SCOTLAND)—DEATH OF A PRISONER IN CALTON GAOL, EDINBURGH—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1550
BOARD OF TRADE (MARINE DEPARTMENT)—WRECK OF THE "TALLY HO"—ROCKET STATION AT EASTBOURNE—Question, Admiral Field; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) .. 1551
LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)—MYLES MARTIN, CROFTER, A PRISONER IN INVERNESS GAOL—Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1552
INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—ARTERIAL DRAINAGE—DRAINAGE DISTRICTS IN KILKENNY—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1554
DISTRESS IN THE METROPOLIS—UNEMPLOYED DOCK LABOURERS AT POPLAR—Question, Mr. W. Abraham (Glamorgan, Rhondda); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) .. 1555
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—DISTRICT INSPECTOR GREENE—Question, Mr. W. Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1556
FREE LIBRARIES AND MECHANICS' INSTITUTIONS—SUPPLY OF PARLIAMENTARY REPORTS—Question, Mr. C. Wright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) 1556
LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—ORANGE PROCESSIONS IN NORTH ANTRIM—Question, Mr. Pinkerton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1557
BURMAH (UPPER)—THE RUBY MINES—Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 1557
BURMAH (UPPER)—THE RUBY MINES—MILITARY OPERATIONS—Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1558
MADAGASCAR—EXPULSION OF —— WILKINSON—Question, Mr. F. S. Stevenson; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1558
SCOTLAND—DISTRESS IN LANARKSHIRE—Question, Mr. Cunninghame Graham; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1559
ARMY—RANK OF MEDICAL OFFICERS—Question, Sir Guyer Hunter; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1559
ARMY WARRANT—CYPRUS MAIL SERVICE—Question, Sir Edmund Lechmere; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) 1559
THE NORTH SEA FISHERIES—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1560
TRADE AND COMMERCE—INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE SUGAR BOUNTIES—Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1560
COAL MINES—EXPLOSION AT THE WOOD END PITS, LANCASHIRE—Question, Mr. Fenwick; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1560

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*February* 15.] *Page*

Egypt—Port Dues on Shipping—Question, Mr. T. Sutherland; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) .. 1561

Navy (The Dockyards) — Devonport Dockyard—The Imperial Institute — Collection of Subscriptions — Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 1562

Merchant Shipping—The "Andrew Johnson" and the "Thirlmere"—Question, Mr. Provand; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1563

The Parks (Metropolis)—Battersea Park—Question, Mr. Seager Hunt; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) .. 1563

Law and Justice — Grant of Quarter Sessions to Blackburn — Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1564

War Office (Ordnance Department) — Contract for Cartridges for Queensland—Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1565

Law and Justice (Ireland) — Religion of Jurors — Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1565

Law and Justice (Ireland)—Winter Assizes—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) .. 1565

Merchant Shipping — Detention of the "Telegrapho" by the Dominican Government—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) 1566

Parliamentary Elections (Scotland)—Polling Places — Question, Mr. Thorburn; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) .. 1566

Coal and Wine Dues Continuance Bill — Questions, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg); Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor [No reply] 1567

Inland Revenue — A Rating Clause for Hoardings — Question, Mr. Bartley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) .. 1567

Burmah (Upper)—Reported Chinese Invasion — Questions, Mr. Legh, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) 1568

Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases—Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1568

Imperial and Colonial Defences — Coaling Stations in the Eastern Colonies—Question, Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1569

The Royal Commission on the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, and the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1885 — Legislation—Questions, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1570

Bulgaria—The Correspondence—Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 1570

Depression of Trade and Agriculture—Cost of the Commission—Question, Mr. H. Gardner; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1571

Railway Rates and Charges Bill—Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1571

Notices of Motion—

Ordered, That the Order for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Address have precedence this day of the Notices of Motion and Orders of the Day,—(*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [FOURTEENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January:]—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 1571

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the 12th paragraph, to insert the words—"And humbly to represent to Her Majesty that recent events in Skye and Tiree, and the general administration of justice in the Highlands, have caused serious concern to the people of Scotland, and demand full inquiry,"—(*Dr. Cameron*) 1592

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Mahony*:)—After further debate, Question put:—The House *divided; Ayes* 87, Noes 112; Majority 25.—(Div. List, No. 8.)

Original Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted" 1605

After debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Hunter*:)—After further short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

PARLIAMENT—ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS—Observations, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith):—Short debate thereon .. 1648

MOTIONS.

Merchant Shipping (Fishing Boats) Acts Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. Jackson, Sir Herbert Maxwell*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 168] 1649

Waste Lands (Mining) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Philip Stanhope, Sir John Swinburne, Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Paulton, Mr. Howell, Mr. Fenwick*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 169] 1649

Parish Allotments Committees Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Cobb, Mr. Channing, Mr. Fuller, Mr. James Ellis, Mr. Herbert Gardner, Mr. Thomas Ellis*); *presented*, and read the first [Bill 170] 1649

[12.40.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16.

ORDERS OF THE DAY—

Ordered, That the Order for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Address have precedence this day of the other Orders of the Day,—(*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [FIFTEENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [15th February:]—Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—Debate *resumed* 1649

After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided; Ayes* 136, Noes 253; Majority 117.—(Div. List, No. 9.)

Main Question again proposed 1712

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Sexton*:)—After short debate, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure)—Notice of Motion, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 1714

MOTIONS.

Metropolitan Open Spaces Act (1881) Extension Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Dalrymple, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Houldsworth, Mr. Reid, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Salt*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 171] 1714

Parliamentary Elections (Simultaneous Voting) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. H. F. Beaumont, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Craven*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 172] 1714

Municipal Rates Assessment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Dodds, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Craig*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 173] 1714

[5.50]

LORDS, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17.

Resignation of the Earl of Dunraven—Personal Explanation, The Earl of Dunraven; Reply, The Prime Minister (The Marquess of Salisbury) 1715

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill (No. 15)—

Amendment *reported* (according to Order) 1726

Further Amendments made; Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow;* and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 25.)

Law of Evidence Amendment Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Bramwell*); read 1ª (No. 23) 1727

Justices' Jurisdiction Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Lord Bramwell*); read 1ª (No. 24) 1727

[5.15.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Ambleside Railway Bill (*by Order*)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 1728

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 189, Noes 177; Majority 12.—(Div. List, No. 10.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

QUESTIONS.

Burmah (Upper)—The Military Expedition—Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 1748

The Irish Land Commission—Sligo County—Question, Mr. Mulholland; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 1749

The Queen's Jubilee Celebration—The Volunteers—Question, Colonel Laurie; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 1749

[*February* 17.]

INCOME TAX—THE MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT—Question, Captain Selwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) .. 1750

EGYPT—WAR DECORATIONS TO THE ENGLISH TROOPS — Question, General Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1750

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS — RATHDRUM UNION — Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1750

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—GREYSTONES, COUNTY WICKLOW —Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1751

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE—INSPECTION OF IRISH RECORDS—Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1752

POST OFFICE—INVESTMENTS IN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES OF SMALL SUMS— Question, Mr. Bartley; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1752

WAR OFFICE (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—ARMY MANUFACTURING ACCOUNTS — Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1753

POST OFFICE—DISTRIBUTION OF TRADE SAMPLES THROUGH THE BELGIAN POST OFFICE—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1753

COMMISSIONERS OF ENDOWED SCHOOLS (IRELAND)—ABATEMENT OF RENTS— Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1754

CRIMINAL LUNATIC ASYLUM, DUNDRUM—CASE OF ——— LAMBE—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1754

POST OFFICE—MONEY ORDER OFFICE—REMITTANCES FROM AUSTRALIA— Questions, Mr. Henniker Heaton, Mr. O'Hea; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) 1755

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT, 1885—PAYMENT OF OFFICIALS— Question, Mr. Sheil; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1756

INSPECTION OF IRISH FISHERIES—COLLECTION OF STATISTICS—Question, Mr. J. A. Blake; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1756

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — THE JURY SYSTEM — Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1756

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—AVERAGE COST OF PROSECUTIONS—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1757

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—COST OF PROSECUTIONS AT WINTER ASSIZES—Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) .. 1757

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND) — SUB-INSPECTOR MILLING, CORK COUNTY — Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1757

ADMIRALTY — DEFECTIVE WEAPONS — CUTLASSES AND SWORD BAYONETS — Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1758

THE IRISH LAND COURT—SITTINGS IN COUNTY LOUTH—Question, Mr. Nolan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1758

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—ALLEGED "POLICE OUTRAGE AT HOSPITAL, CO. LIMERICK"—Question, Mr. Finucane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1759

[*February* 17.] *Page*

Royal Irish Constabulary—Achill Petty Sessions—Conviction of Policemen—Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1760

Arms (Ireland) Act—The Bantry District—Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 1760

Police Protection— ——— Hegarty—Questions, Mr. Gilhooly; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 1761

Contagious Diseases Acts—Effects of Suspension—Question, Mr. Howorth; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1761

Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases—"The Queen *v.* Dillon"—Question, Mr. Illingworth; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) .. 1762

Inland Revenue—Inhabited House Duty—Lodging Houses—Question, Mr. Seale-Hayne; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) 1762

Army—Royal Barracks, Dublin—Insanitary Condition—Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) 1763

Cornish and Devon Mines—Insanitary Condition—Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1763

The Jury System (Ireland)—Marked Panels—The Jurors' Acts—Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) 1764

The Parks (Metropolis)—Greenwich Park—Question, Colonel Duncan; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) .. 1764

Tithe Rent-Charge (Ireland)—Question, Mr. P. J. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 1765

Army—Case of Private James Gillen—Question, Mr. Peter M'Donald; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 1765

Collectors of Inland Revenue (Ireland)—Question, Mr. Peter M'Donald; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) 1765

Crime and Outrage (Ireland)—The Riots at Belfast—Belfast Private Act, 1865—Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1766

Merchant Shipping—Refuge and Life Harbours—Question, Admiral Mayne; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) .. 1767

Post Office Savings Bank—Limit of Deposits—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) .. 1768

Admiralty—Pensions to Widows of Seamen and Marines—Unclaimed Prize Money, &c.—Question, Admiral Mayne; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1768

Burmah (Upper)—The Shan Chiefs—China—Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 1768

Burmah (Upper)—The Ruby Mines—Questions, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) .. 1769

Salmon Fishing (Scotland)—Tweed Fisheries Acts—Question, Mr. Thorburn; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) .. 1770

Limited Liabilities Acts—Registration of Limited Companies—Question, Mr. J. M. Maclean; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1770

Admiralty—Defective Weapons—Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1771

Literature, Science, and Art—The National Portrait Gallery—Question, Mr. Cochrane-Baillie; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 1772

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY—THE ASSESSMENT—Question, Mr. Wootton Isaacson; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1772

TREES (IRELAND)—RE-AFFORESTING—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) .. 1773

ARMY (SMALL ARMS)—THE LEE-BURTON MAGAZINE RIFLE—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 1773

THE STATIONERY OFFICE — COPYRIGHT IN GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS — Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1774

THE QUEEN'S JUBILEE CELEBRATION—CLERKS AND OTHER EMPLOYES IN THE CIVIL SERVICE—Question, Sir Robert Fowler; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1775

TRADE AND COMMERCE—INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE SUGAR BOUNTIES —Question, Colonel Hill; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1775

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS—THE BISHOP STORTFORD BANK—Question, Mr. Howell; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1775

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—PADDINGTON WORKHOUSE—INCARCERATION OF A FEMALE NOT A LUNATIC—Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) 1776

PARLIAMENT—THE NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE (1882)—RULE 2 (ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE)—Motion, Mr. Dillwyn; Observations, Mr. Speaker 1777

MOTION.

—o—

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — RULES OF PROCEDURE — RESOLUTION—

Moved, "That the consideration of the proposed Rules of Procedure have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motions on every day on which the consideration of those Rules may be set down by the Government,"—(*Mr. William Henry Smith*) 1778

After short debate, Amendment proposed, after the second word "day," in line 3, to insert the words "except on Tuesday, the 22nd instant," (*Mr. Richard.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—After further short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 158, Noes 261; Majority 103.—(Div. List, No. 11.)

Main Question again proposed 1793

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Question, to add the words "except upon the Wednesdays on which Bills relating to Ireland are set down,"—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 107, Noes 212; Majority 105.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 1821

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech—ADJOURNED DEBATE [SIXTEENTH NIGHT]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January:] —Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed* 1825

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH—*continued.*

After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor*:)—After further short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 119, Noes 261; Majority 142.—(Div. List, No. 13.)

Amendment proposed,

At the end of paragraph 12, to insert the words—"Humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the want of employment and general distress prevalent among the working classes in England and Ireland deserve the immediate attention of this House,"—(*Mr. Cox*) 1834

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted:" — After debate, *Moved*, "That the Question be now put,"—(*Mr. William Henry Smith*:)—The House *divided;* Ayes 291, Noes 81; Majority 210.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 1846

Question put, "That those words be there inserted:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 84, Noes 283; Majority 199.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 1849

Main Question again proposed:—*Moved*, "That the Question be now put,"—(*Mr. William Henry Smith*:)—The House *divided;* Ayes 289, Noes 74; Majority 215.—(Div. List, No. 16.)

Main Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 283, Noes 70; Majority 213.—(Div. List, No. 17.)

Entry in the Votes 1852

Moved, "That a Committee be appointed to draw up an Address to be presented to Her Majesty upon the said Resolution,"—(*Mr. William Henry Smith*) 1853

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed*, to draw up an Address to be presented to Her Majesty upon the said Resolution:—List of the Committee 1854

MOTION.

Petty Sessions Districts Boundaries (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Thomas Gill, Mr. Sheil, Mr. Mahony*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 174] .. 1854

[1.10.]

LORDS.

NEW PEERS.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27.

John Glencairn Carter Hamilton, esquire, created Baron Hamilton of Dalzell in the county of Lanark.

Edward Macnaghten, esquire, Q.C., appointed a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary, under the provisions of The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, with the dignity of a Baron for life, by the style and title of Baron Macnaghten of Runkerry in the county of Antrim.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10.

Percy, Lord Shute—Was introduced by virtue of a special limitation in the Patent, &c., dated 17th April 1880, and sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother George William, Lord Shute, and took the Oath.

SAT FIRST.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27.

The Earl Amherst, after the death of his father.
The Earl of Strafford, after the death of his father.
The Lord Monkswell, after the death of his father.

COMMONS.

NEW WRITS ISSUED.

DURING RECESS.

For *Brighton Borough*, *v.* David Smith, esquire, deceased.
For *Middlesex County* (*Brentford Division*), *v.* Octavius Coope, esquire, deceased.
For *Liverpool Borough* (*Exchange Division*), *v.* David Duncan, esquire, deceased.
For *Donegal County* (*Southern Division*), *v.* Bernard Kelly, esquire, deceased.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27.

For *Kent County* (*Dartford Division*), *v.* The Right Hon. Sir William Hart Dyke baronet, Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education.

For *Longford* (*Northern Division*), *v.* Justin M'Carthy, esquire, who having been returned as a Member for the said County of Longford (Northern Division), and also for the City of Londonderry, elected to sit for the City of Londonderry.

For *Antrim County* (*Northern Division*), *v.* Edward Macnaghten, esquire, Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 28.

For *Sligo* (*Southern Division*), *v.* Thomas Sexton, esquire, who, having been returned as a Member for the said County of Sligo (Southern Division), and also for the Borough of Belfast (Western Division), elected to sit for the Borough of Belfast (Western Division).

MONDAY, JANUARY 31.

For *The Borough of St. George's, Hanover Square, v.* Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, esquire, commonly called Lord Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, who since his Election for the said Borough hath accepted the Office of Steward or Bailiff of Her Majesty's Manor of Northstead, in the County of York.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14.

For *Burnley, v.* Peter Rylands, esquire, deceased.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27.

Brighton—William Tindal Robertson, esquire.
Middlesex (*Brentford Division*)—James Bigwood, esquire.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 28.

Liverpool (*Exchange Division*)—Ralph Neville, esquire.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3.

County of Kent (*Dartford Division*)—The Right Hon. Sir William Hart Dyke, baronet.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10.

Borough of St. George's, Hanover Square—Right Hon. George Joachim Goschen.

North Longford Division of the County of Longford—Timothy Michael Healy, esquire.

South Donegal Division of the County of Donegal—John Gordon Swift Mac Neill, esquire.
South Sligo Division of the County of Sligo—Edward Joseph Kennedy, esquire.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17.

North Antrim Division of the County of Antrim—Charles Edward Lewis, esquire.

THE MINISTRY

Of the Most Noble the Marquess of SALISBURY, K.G.,

At the Opening of the Session on the 27th January, 1887.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs	Most Hon. Marquess of Salisbury, K.G.
First Lord of the Treasury	Right Hon. William Henry Smith.
Lord Chancellor of England	Right Hon. Lord Halsbury.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland	Right Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Lord President of the Council	Right Hon. Viscount Cranbrook.
Chancellor of the Exchequer	Right Hon. George Joachim Goschen.
Secretary of State, Home Department	Right Hon. Henry Matthews.
Secretary of State for the Colonies	Right Hon. Sir Henry Thurstan Holland, Bart.
Secretary of State for War	Right Hon. Edward Stanhope.
Secretary of State for India	Right Hon. Viscount Cross, G.C.B.
Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, Bt.
First Lord of the Admiralty	Right Hon. Lord George Francis Hamilton.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Vice President of the Committee of Council on Agriculture	Right Hon. Lord John James Robert Manners.
President of the Board of Trade	Right Hon. Lord Stanley of Preston.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Field Marshal Commanding in Chief	H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.
Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education	Right Hon. Sir William Hart Dyke, Bart.
Secretary for Scotland and Vice President of the Scotch Education Department	Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour.
President of the Local Government Board	Right Hon. Charles Thomson Ritchie.
First Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings	Right Hon. David Robert Plunket.
Lord Privy Seal	Right Hon. Earl Cadogan.
Lords of the Treasury	Hon. Sidney Herbert. Colonel William Hood Walrond. Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell.
Lords of the Admiralty	Admiral Sir Arthur W. Acland Hood, Vice Admiral Sir Anthony Hoskins, Vice Admiral Graham, Captain Lord Charles Beresford. Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, Esq.
Joint Secretaries to the Treasury	Aretas Akers-Douglas, Esq. William Lawies Jackson, Esq.
Secretary to the Admiralty	Arthur Bower Forwood, Esq.
Secretary to the Board of Trade	Baron Henry de Worms.
Secretary to the Local Government Board	Walter H. Long, Esq.
Under Secretary, Home Department	Charles Beilby Stuart-Wortley, Esq.
Under Secretary, Foreign Department	Right Hon. Sir James Fergusson, Bart.
Under Secretary for Colonies	Right Hon. Earl of Dunraven.
Under Secretary for War	Right Hon. Lord Harris.
Under Secretary for India	Sir John Eldon Gorst, Q.C.
Paymaster General	Right Hon. Earl Beauchamp.
Postmaster General	Right Hon. Henry Cecil Raikes.
Surveyor General of Ordnance	Hon. Henry S. Northcote.
Financial Secretary to the War Department	Hon. W. St. John Brodrick.
Judge Advocate General	Right Hon. William Thackeray Marriott, Q.C.
Attorney General	Sir Richard Everard Webster, Q.C.
Solicitor General	Sir Edward George Clarke, Q.C.

SCOTLAND.

Lord Advocate	Right Hon. John Hay Athole Macdonald, Q.C.
Solicitor General	James Patrick Bannerman Robertson, Esq.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant	Most Hon. Marquess of Londonderry.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Attorney General	Right Hon. Hugh Holmes, Q.C.
Solicitor General	John George Gibson, Esq., Q.C.

QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

Lord Steward	Right Hon. Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe.
Lord Chamberlain	Right Hon. Earl of Lathom.
Master of the Horse	His Grace the Duke of Portland.
Treasurer of the Household	Right Hon. Viscount Folkestone.
Comptroller of the Household	Right Hon. Lord Arthur Hill.
Vice Chamberlain of the Household	Right Hon. Viscount Lewisham.
Captain of the Corps of Gentlemen at Arms	Right Hon. Viscount Barrington.
Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard	Right Hon. Earl of Kintore.
Master of the Buckhounds	Right Hon. Earl of Coventry.
Chief Equerry and Clerk Marshal	Lord Alfred H. Paget.
Mistress of the Robes	Her Grace the Duchess of Buccleuch.

ROLL OF THE
LORDS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL

IN

THE SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

OF

THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

50° VICTORIÆ, 1887.

MEM.—*According to the Usage of Parliament, when the House appoints a Select Committee, the Lords appointed to serve upon it are named in the Order of their Rank, beginning with the Highest; and so, when the House sends a Committee to a Conference with the Commons, the Lord highest in Rank is called first, and the rest go forth in like Order: But when the Whole House is called over for any Purpose within the House, or for the Purpose of proceeding forth to Westminster Hall, or upon any public Solemnity, the Call begins invariably with the Junior Baron.*

His Royal Highness THE PRINCE OF WALES.

His Royal Highness ALFRED ERNEST ALBERT Duke of EDINBURGH.

His Royal Highness ARTHUR WILLIAM PATRICK ALBERT Duke of CONNAUGHT AND STRATHEARN.

His Royal Highness LEOPOLD CHARLES EDWARD GEORGE ALBERT Duke of ALBANY.

His Royal Highness GEORGE WILLIAM FREDERICK CHARLES Duke of CAMBRIDGE.

EDWARD WHITE Archbishop of CANTERBURY.

HARDINGE STANLEY Lord HALSBURY, *Lord High Chancellor.*

WILLIAM Archbishop of YORK.

GATHORNE Viscount CRANBROOK, *Lord President of the Council.*

GEORGE HENRY Earl CADOGAN, *Lord Privy Seal.*

HENRY Duke of NORFOLK, *Earl Marshal of England.*

ARCHIBALD HENRY ALGERNON Duke of SOMERSET.

Charles Henry Duke of Richmond.
Augustus Charles Lennox Duke of Grafton.
Henry Charles Fitzroy Duke of Beaufort.
William Amelius Aubrey de Vere Duke of Saint Albans.
George Godolphin Duke of Leeds.
Francis Charles Hastings Duke of Bedford.
William Duke of Devonshire.
George Charles Duke of Marlborough.
Charles Cecil John Duke of Rutland.
William Alexander Louis Stephen Duke of Brandon. (*Duke of Hamilton.*)
William John Arthur Charles James Duke of Portland.
William Drogo Duke of Manchester.
Henry Pelham Archibald Douglas Duke of Newcastle.
Algernon George Duke of Northumberland.
His Royal Highness Ernest Augustus William Adolphus George Frederick Duke of Cumberland and Teviotdale.
Henry Duke of Wellington.
Richard Plantagenet Campbell Duke of Buckingham and Chandos.
George Granville William Duke of Sutherland.
Harry George Duke of Cleveland.
Hugh Lupus Duke of Westminster.

John Marquess of Winchester.
Henry Charles Keith Marquess of Lansdowne.
John Villiers Stuart Marquess Townshend.
Robert Arthur Talbot Marquess of Salisbury.
John Alexander Marquess of Bath.
James Marquess of Abercorn. (*Duke of Abercorn.*)
Hugh de Grey Marquess of Hertford.
John Patrick Marquess of Bute.
William Alleyne Marquess of Exeter.
William Marquess of Northampton.
John Charles Marquess Camden.
Henry Marquess of Anglesey.
George Henry Hugh Marquess of Cholmondeley.
George William Thomas Marquess of Ailesbury.
Frederick William John Marquess of Bristol.
Archibald Marquess of Ailsa.
George Augustus Constantine Marquess of Normanby.
George Frederick Samuel Marquess of Ripon.
William Marquess of Abergavenny.
Gavin Marquess of Breadalbane.

William Henry Earl of Mount Edgcumbe, *Lord Steward of the Household.*
Edward Earl of Lathom, *Lord Chamberlain of the Household.*
Charles Henry John Earl of Shrewsbury.
Edward Henry Earl of Derby.
Warner Francis John Plantagenet Earl of Huntingdon.
George Robert Charles Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery.
William Reginald Earl of Devon.
Henry Charles Earl of Suffolk and Berkshire.
Rudolph William Basil Earl of Denbigh.
Francis William Henry Earl of Westmorland.
Montagu Earl of Lindsey.
Harry Earl of Stamford.
George James Earl of Winchilsea and Nottingham.
Edwyn Francis Earl of Chesterfield.
Edward George Henry Earl of Sandwich.
Arthur Algernon Earl of Essex.
William George Earl of Carlisle.
William Henry Walter Earl of Doncaster. (*Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Anthony Earl of Shaftesbury.
——— Earl of Berkeley.
Montagu Arthur Earl of Abingdon.
Aldred Frederick George Beresford Earl of Scarbrough.
George Thomas Earl of Albemarle.
George William Earl of Coventry.
Victor Albert George Earl of Jersey.
William Henry Earl Poulett.
John Francis Erskine Earl of Mar. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Sholto George Watson Earl of Morton. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Walter Henry Earl of Mar and Kellie. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Claude Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorn. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

George Earl of Haddington. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

John Trotter Earl of Lindsay. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

David Stanley William Earl of Airlie. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Alexander Earl of Leven and Melville. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

George John Earl of Northesk. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Douglas Mackinnon Baillie Hamilton Earl of Dundonald. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

George William Hamilton Earl of Orkney. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Sewallis Edward Earl Ferrers.

William Walter Earl of Dartmouth.

Charles Earl of Tankerville.

Charles Wightwick Earl of Aylesford.

Francis Thomas De Grey Earl Cowper.

Arthur Philip Earl Stanhope.

Thomas Augustus Wolstenholme Earl of Macclesfield.

Douglas Beresford Malise Ronald Earl Graham. (*Duke of Montrose.*)

William Frederick Earl Waldegrave.

Bertram Earl of Ashburnham.

Charles Augustus Earl of Harrington.

Isaac Newton Earl of Portsmouth.

George Guy Earl Brooke and Earl of Warwick.

Sidney Carr Earl of Buckinghamshire.

William Thomas Spencer Earl Fitzwilliam.

Frederick George Earl of Guilford.

Charles Philip Earl of Hardwicke.

Henry Edward Earl of Ilchester.

Reginald Windsor Earl De La Warr.

Jacob Earl of Radnor.

John Poyntz Earl Spencer.

Allen Alexander Earl Bathurst.

Arthur Wills John Wellington Blundell Trumbull Earl of Hillsborough. (*Marquess of Downshire.*)

Edward Hyde Earl of Clarendon.

William David Earl of Mansfield.

John James Hugh Henry Earl Strange. (*Duke of Athole.*)

William Henry Earl of Mount Edgcumbe. (*In another Place as Lord Steward of the Household.*)

Hugh Earl Fortescue.

Henry Howard Molyneux Earl of Carnarvon.

George Henry Earl Cadogan. (*In another Place as Lord Privy Seal.*)

James Howard Earl of Malmesbury.

John Vansittart Danvers Earl of Lanesborough. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Edward Nugent Earl of Milltown. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Henry John Reuben Earl of Portarlington. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Hugh Earl Annesley. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

John Henry Reginald Earl of Clonmell. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

George Charles Earl of Lucan. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Somerset Richard Earl of Belmore. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

James Francis Earl of Bandon. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

James Earl of Caledon. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Francis Robert Earl of Rosslyn.

William George Robert Earl of Craven.

William Hillier Earl of Onslow.

Charles Earl of Romney.

Walter John Earl of Chichester.

Seymour John Grey Earl of Wilton.

Edward James Earl of Powis.

Horatio Earl Nelson.

Lawrence Earl of Rosse. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Sydney William Herbert Earl Manvers.

Horatio Earl of Orford.

Henry Earl Grey.

Hugh Cecil Earl of Lonsdale.

Dudley Francis Stuart Earl of Harrowby.

Henry Thynne Earl of Harewood.

William Hugh Earl of Minto.

Alan Frederick Earl Cathcart.

James Walter Earl of Verulam.

Adelbert Wellington Brownlow Earl Brownlow.

Henry Cornwallis Earl of Saint Germans.
Albert Edmund Earl of Morley.
Orlando George Charles Earl of Bradford.
Frederick Earl Beauchamp.
John Earl of Eldon.
Richard William Penn Earl Howe.
George Edward John Mowbray Earl of Stradbroke.
Francis Charles Earl of Kilmorey. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Charles Stewart Earl Vane. (*Marquess of Londonderry.*)
William Archer Earl Amherst.
John Frederick Vaughan Earl Cawdor.
William George Earl of Munster.
Robert Adam Philips Haldane Earl of Camperdown.
Thomas George Earl of Lichfield.
John George Earl of Durham.
Granville George Earl Granville.
Henry Earl of Effingham.
Henry John Earl of Ducie.
Charles Alfred Worsley Earl of Yarborough.
James Henry Robert Earl Innes. (*Duke of Roxburghe.*)
Thomas William Earl of Leicester.
William Earl of Lovelace.
Lawrence Earl of Zetland.
Charles William Francis Earl of Gainsborough.
Francis Charles Granville Earl of Ellesmere.
George Henry Charles Earl of Strafford.
Kenelm Charles Edward Earl of Cottenham.
William Henry Earl Cowley.
Archibald William Earl of Winton. (*Earl of Eglintoun.*)
William Humble Earl of Dudley.
John Francis Stanley Earl Russell.
John Earl of Kimberley.
Richard Earl of Dartrey.
William Ernest Earl of Feversham.
Frederick Temple Earl of Dufferin.
John Robert Earl Sydney.
Henry George Earl of Ravensworth.
Edward Montagu Stuart Granville Earl of Wharncliffe.
Thomas George Earl of Northbrook.
Arthur William Earl Cairns.
Edward Robert Lytton Earl of Lytton.
Edward Earl of Lathom. (*In another Place as Lord Chamberlain of the Household.*)
George Watson Earl Sondes.
Roundell Earl of Selborne.
Walter Stafford Earl of Iddesleigh.
Alexander William George Earl of Fife.
Cornwallis Earl de Montalt.
Robert Viscount Hereford.
Henry Viscount Bolingbroke and St. John.
Evelyn Viscount Falmouth.
George Stanley Viscount Torrington.
Charles William Viscount Leinster. (*Duke of Leinster.*)
Francis Wheler Viscount Hood.
Mervyn Edward Viscount Powerscourt. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
James Viscount Lifford. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Henry William Crosbie Viscount Bangor. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Hayes Viscount Doneraile. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
Cornwallis Viscount Hawarden. (*Elected for Ireland.*) (*In another Place as Earl de Montalt.*)
Carnegie Parker Viscount St. Vincent.
Henry Viscount Melville.
William Wells Viscount Sidmouth.
George Frederick Viscount Templetown. (*Elected for Ireland.*)
John Campbell Viscount Gordon. (*Earl of Aberdeen.*)
Edward Fleetwood John Viscount Exmouth.
John Luke George Viscount Hutchinson. (*Earl of Donoughmore.*)
Richard Somerset Viscount Clancarty. (*Earl of Clancarty.*)
Wellington Henry Viscount Combermere.
Henry Charles Viscount Canterbury.
Rowland Clegg Viscount Hill.
Charles Stewart Viscount Hardinge.
George Stephens Viscount Gough.
Charles Viscount Eversley.
Charles Lindley Viscount Halifax.
Alexander Nelson Viscount Bridport.
Edward Berkeley Viscount Portman.

Gathorne Viscount Cranbrook. (*In another Place as Lord President of the Council.*)

Robert Viscount Sherbrooke.

Richard Bickerton Pemell Viscount Lyons.

Henry Bouverie William Viscount Hampden.

Garnet Joseph Viscount Wolseley.

William John Viscount Oxenbridge.

Richard Assheton Viscount Cross.

Frederick Bishop of London.

Joseph Barber Bishop of Durham.

Edward Harold Bishop of Winchester.

John Thomas Bishop of Norwich.

James Colquhoun Bishop of Bangor.

Henry Bishop of Worcester.

Charles John Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

Thomas Legh Bishop of St. Albans.

James Bishop of Hereford.

William Connor Bishop of Peterborough.

Harvey Bishop of Carlisle.

Arthur Charles Bishop of Bath and Wells.

John Fielder Bishop of Oxford.

Richard Bishop of Chichester.

Joshua Bishop of St. Asaph.

William Basil Bishop of St. David's.

Anthony Wilson Bishop of Rochester.

William Dalrymple Bishop of Lichfield.

John Charles Bishop of Liverpool.

Ernest Roland Bishop of Newcastle.

Richard Bishop of Llandaff.

George Howard Bishop of Truro.

William Bishop of Chester.

George Bishop of Southwell.

Dudley Charles Lord de Ros.

Alfred Joseph Lord Mowbray.

George Manners Lord Hastings.

Edward Southwell Lord de Clifford.

Thomas Crosby William Lord Dacre.

Charles Henry Rolle Lord Clinton.

Robert Nathaniel Cecil George Lord Zouche of Haryngworth.

Charles Edward Hastings Lord Botreaux. (*Earl of Loudoun.*)

Francis Robert Lord Camoys.

Henry Lord Beaumont.

Henry Lord Willoughby de Broke.

Sackville George Lord Conyers.

Hubert George Charles Lord Vaux of Harrowden.

Ralph Gordon Lord Wentworth.

Alfred Thomas Townshend Lord Braye.

Robert George Lord Windsor.

William Henry John Lord North.

St. Andrew Lord St. John of Bletso.

Frederick George Lord Howard de Walden.

William Joseph Lord Petre.

Frederick Benjamin Lord Saye and Sele.

John Francis Lord Arundell of Wardour.

John Stuart Lord Clifton. (*Earl of Darnley.*)

John Baptist Joseph Lord Dormer.

George Henry Lord Teynham.

Augustus Frederick Fitz-herbert Lord Stafford.

George Frederick William Lord Byron.

Lewis Henry Hugh Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.

William Coutts Lord Ashford.

Horace Courtenay Gammell Lord Forbes. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Charles William Lord Sinclair. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Charles Lord Blantyre. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Alexander Hugh Lord Balfour of Burley. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Walter Hugh Lord Polwarth. (*Elected for Scotland.*)

Richard Edmund Saint Lawrence Lord Boyle. (*Earl of Cork and Orrery.*)

George Lord Hay. (*Earl of Kinnoul.*)

Digby Wentworth Bayard Lord Middleton.

Frederick George Brabazon Lord Ponsonby. (*Earl of Besborough.*)

Alfred Nathaniel Holden Lord Scarsdale.

George Florance Lord Boston.

Charles George Lord Lovell and Holland. (*Earl of Egmont.*)

George William Henry Lord Vernon.

Edward St. Vincent Lord Digby.

George Douglas Lord Sundridge. (*Duke of Argyll.*)

Edward Henry Julius Lord Hawke.

Henry Thomas Lord Foley.

Arthur de Cardonnel Lord Dinevor.

Thomas Lord Walsingham.

William Lord Bagot.

Charles Henry Lord Southampton.

John Richard Brinsley Lord Grantley.

George Bridges Harley Dennett Lord Rodney.

Philip Reginald Lord Somers.

Richard Henry Lord Berwick.

Edward Lennox Lord Sherborne.

John Henry De La Poer Lord Tyrone. (*Marquess of Waterford.*)

Henry Bentinck Lord Carleton. (*Earl of Shannon.*)

Charles Lord Suffield.

Dudley Wilmot Lord Dorchester.

Lloyd Lord Kenyon.

Charles Cornwallis Lord Braybrooke.

Edward Lord Fisherwick. (*Marquess of Donegall.*)

Henry Charles Lord Gage. (*Viscount Gage.*)

Thomas John Lord Thurlow.

William George Lord Auckland.

Charles George Lord Lyttelton.

Henry George Lord Mendip. (*Viscount Clifden.*)

George Lord Stuart of Castle Stuart. (*Earl of Moray.*)

Alan Plantagenet Lord Stewart of Garlies. (*Earl of Galloway.*)

James George Henry Lord Saltersford. (*Earl of Courtown.*)

William Lord Brodrick. (*Viscount Midleton.*)

Frederick Henry William Lord Calthorpe.

Peter Robert Lord Gwydir.

Charles Robert Lord Carrington.

William Henry Lord Bolton.

George Lord Northwick.

Thomas Lyttleton Lord Lilford.

Thomas Lord Ribblesdale.

Edward Lord Dunsany. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Edward Donough Lord Inchiquin. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

John Thomas William Lord Massy. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Robert Lord Clonbrock. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Charles Mark Lord Headley. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Edward Henry Churchill Lord Crofton. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Hercules Edward Lord Langford. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Dayrolles Blakeney Lord Ventry. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Henry Francis Seymour Lord Moore. (*Marquess of Drogheda.*)

John Henry Wellington Graham Lord Loftus. (*Marquess of Ely.*)

William Lord Carysfort. (*Earl of Carysfort.*)

George Ralph Lord Abercromby.

Charles Edmund Lord Ellenborough.

Augustus Frederick Arthur Lord Sandys.

Henry North Lord Sheffield. (*Earl of Sheffield.*)

William Macnaghten Lord Erskine.

George John Lord Monteagle. (*Marquess of Sligo.*)

George Arthur Hastings Lord Granard. (*Earl of Granard.*)

Hungerford Lord Crewe.

———— Lord Gardner.

John Thomas Lord Manners.

John Adrian Louis Lord Hopetoun. (*Earl of Hopetoun.*)

Richard Lord Castlemaine. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Charles Lord Meldrum. (*Marquess of Huntly.*)

George Frederick Lord Ross. (*Earl of Glasgow.*)

Lowry Egerton Lord Grinstead. (*Earl of Enniskillen.*)

William Hale John Charles Lord Foxford. (*Earl of Limerick.*)

Victor Albert Francis Charles Lord Churchill.

George Robert Canning Lord Harris.

Reginald Charles Edward Lord Colchester.

Schomberg Henry Lord Ker. (*Marquess of Lothian.*)

Henry Francis Lord Minster. (*Marquess Conyngham.*)

James Edward William Theobald Lord Ormonde. (*Marquess of Ormonde.*)

Francis Richard Lord Wemyss. (*Earl of Wemyss.*)

John Strange Lord Clanbrassill. (*Earl of Roden.*)

William Lygon Lord Silchester. (*Earl of Longford.*)

Clotworthy John Eyre Lord Oriel. (*Viscount Massereene.*)

Hugh Lord Delamere.

Orlando Watkin Weld Lord Forester.

John William Lord Rayleigh.

Edric Frederic Lord Gifford.

Hubert George Lord Somerhill. (*Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

James Ludovic Lord Wigan. (*Earl of Crawford and Balcarres.*)

Uchter John Mark Lord Ranfurly. (*Earl of Ranfurly.*)

George Lord De Tabley.

Charles Stuart Henry Lord Tenterden.

William Conyngham Lord Plunket.

William Henry Ashe Lord Heytesbury.

Archibald Philip Lord Rosebery. (*Earl of Rosebery.*)

Richard James Lord Clanwilliam. (*Earl of Clanwilliam.*)

William Draper Mortimer Lord Wynford.

William Henry Lord Kilmarnock. (*Earl of Erroll.*)

Arthur James Francis Lord Fingall. (*Earl of Fingall.*)

William Philip Lord Sefton. (*Earl of Sefton.*)

Robert Bermingham Lord Clements. (*Earl of Leitrim.*)

Thomas Lord Kenlis. (*Marquess of Headfort.*)

William Lord Chaworth. (*Earl of Meath.*)

Charles Adolphus Lord Dunmore. (*Earl of Dunmore.*)

Augustus Frederick George Warwick Lord Poltimore.

Llewelyn Nevill Vaughan Lord Mostyn.

Henry Spencer Lord Templemore.

Valentine Frederick Lord Cloncurry.

John St. Vincent Lord De Saumarez.

Thomas Lord Denman.

William Frederick Lord Abinger.

Philip Lord De L'Isle and Dudley.

Alexander Hugh Lord Ashburton.

Edward Richard Lord Hatherton.

Archibald Brabazon Sparrow Lord Worlingham. (*Earl of Gosford.*)

William Frederick Lord Stratheden.

Geoffrey Dominick Augustus Frederick Lord Oranmore and Browne. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Simon Lord Lovat.

William Bateman Lord Bateman.

James Molyneux Lord Charlemont. (*Earl of Charlemont.*)

Algernon Hawkins Thomond Lord Kintore. (*Earl of Kintore.*)

George Ponsonby Lord Lismore. (*Viscount Lismore.*)

Derrick Warner William Lord Rossmore.

Robert Shapland George Julian Lord Carew.

Charles Frederick Ashley Cooper Lord De Mauley.

Arthur Lord Wrottesley.

Charles Douglas Richard Lord Sudeley.

Frederick Henry Paul Lord Methuen.

Henry Edward John Lord Stanley of Alderley.

William Henry Lord Leigh

Beilby Lord Wenlock.

William Lord Lurgan.

Thomas Spring Lord Monteagle of Brandon.

James Lord Seaton.

John Manley Arbuthnot Lord Keane.

John Lord Oxenfoord. (*Earl of Stair.*)

Hussey Crespigny Lord Vivian.

Henry William Lord Congleton.

Denis St. George Lord Dunsandle and Clanconal. (*Elected for Ireland.*)

Victor Alexander Lord Elgin. (*Earl of Elgin and Kincardine.*)

William Henry Forester Lord Londesborough.

Charles Robert Claude Lord Truro.

Arthur Lord De Freyne.

Edward Burtenshaw Lord Saint Leonards.

George Fitz-Roy Henry Lord Raglan.

Gilbert Henry Lord Aveland.

Valentine Augustus Lord Kenmare. (*Earl of Kenmare.*)

Henry Lord Belper.

Richard Wogan Lord Talbot de Malahide.
Robert Lord Ebury.
Charles Compton William Lord Chesham.
Frederic Augustus Lord Chelmsford.
John Lord Churston.
Henry Lord Leconfield.
Wilbraham Lord Egerton.
Godfrey Charles Lord Tredegar.
Fitz Patrick Henry Lord Lyveden.
Henry Charles Lord Brougham and Vaux.
Arthur Fitz-Gerald Lord Kinnaird.
Richard Luttrell Pilkington Lord Westbury.
Francis William Fitzhardinge Lord Fitzhardinge.
Luke George Lord Annaly.
Robert Offley Ashburton Lord Houghton.
William Lord Romilly.
George Philips Alexander Lord Barrogill. (*Earl of Caithness.*)
Thomas Lord Clermont.
James Herbert Gustavus Meredyth Lord Meredyth. (*Lord Athlumney.*)
Windham Thomas Lord Kenry. (*Earl of Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Charles Stanley Lord Monck. (*Viscount Monck.*)
John Major Lord Hartismere. (*Lord Henniker.*)
Hedworth Hylton Lord Hylton.
George Sholto Gordon Lord Penrhyn.
Gustavus Russell Lord Brancepeth. (*Viscount Boyne.*)
John Henry Lord Kesteven.
Arthur Lord Ormathwaite.
Edward Lord O'Neill.
Robert Cornelis Lord Napier.
Jenico William Joseph Lord Gormanston. (*Viscount Gormanston.*)
John Hamilton Lord Lawrence.
James Plaisted Lord Penzance.
John Lord Dunning. (*Lord Rollo.*)
James Lord Balinhard. (*Earl of Southesk.*)
William Lord Hare. (*Earl of Listowel.*)
Francis Edward Lord Howard of Glossop.
Bernard Edward Barnaby Lord Castletown.
John Emerich Edward Lord Acton.
Thomas Charles Lord Robartes.
George Grenfell Lord Wolverton.
Algernon William Fulke Lord Greville.
Thomas Towneley Lord O'Hagan.
William Lord Sandhurst.
Frederic Lord Blachford.
Francis Lord Ettrick. (*Lord Napier.*)
James Charles Herbert Welbore Ellis Lord Somerton. (*Earl of Normanton.*)
Henry Austin Lord Aberdare.
James Lord Moncreiff.
John Duke Lord Coleridge.
William Lord Emly.
Chichester Samuel Lord Carlingford.
Thomas Francis Lord Cottesloe.
Edmund Lord Hammond.
John Slaney Lord Hampton.
John Lord Winmarleigh.
Charles Alexander Lord Douglas. (*Earl of Home.*)
John William Lord Ramsay. (*Earl of Dalhousie.*)
John Henry Lord Fermanagh. (*Earl of Erne.*)
William Richard Lord Harlech.
Henry Gerard Lord Alington.
John Lord Tollemache.
Robert Tolver Lord Gerard.
Mortimer Lord Sackville.
Charles Bowyer Lord Norton.
George William Lord Shute. (*Viscount Barrington.*)
William Lord Watson. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.*)
Lawrence Hesketh Lord Haldon.
Ivor Bertie Lord Wimborne.
Arthur Edward Lord Ardilaun.
Alexander Dundas Ross Lord Lamington.
Charles Frederick Lord Donington.
Arthur Edwin Lord Trevor.
Montagu William Lord Rowton.
William Francis Lord Mount-Temple.
Edward Hugessen Lord Brabourne.
Arthur Oliver Villiers Lord Ampthill.
William Montagu Lord Tweeddale. (*Marquess of Tweeddale.*)

William Ulick Tristram Lord Howth. (*Earl of Howth.*)

Donald James Lord Reay.

Harcourt Lord Derwent.

Henry James Lord Hothfield.

Dudley Coutts Lord Tweedmouth.

George William Wilshere Lord Bramwell.

John David Lord Fitz Gerald. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.*)

Frederick Beauchamp Paget Lord Alcester.

Alfred Lord Tennyson.

James Lord Strathspey. (*Earl of Seafield.*)

John George Lord Monk Bretton.

Walter Charles Lord Northbourne.

Arthur Saunders William Charles Fox Lord Sudley. (*Earl of Arran.*)

John Robert William Lord de Vesci. (*Viscount de Vesci.*)

Marmaduke Francis Lord Herries.

Hardinge Stanley Lord Halsbury. (*In another Place as Lord High Chancellor.*)

Mervyn Edward Lord Powerscourt (*In another Place as Viscount Powerscourt.*)

Anthony Henley Lord Northington (*Lord Henley.*)

Nathaniel Mayer Lord Rothschild.

Edward Charles Lord Revelstoke.

Robert Lord Monkswell.

Arthur Lord Hobhouse.

Ralph Robert Wheeler Lord Lingen.

Edward Lord Ashbourne.

Rowland Lord Saint Oswald.

Robert James Lord Wantage.

William Baliol Lord Esher.

Thomas Lord Deramore.

Henry John Lord Montagu of Beaulieu.

William Buller Fullerton Lord Elphinstone.

Charles John Lord Colville of Culross.

Farrer Lord Herschell.

Charles Henry Lord Hillingdon.

Henry Lord Hindlip.

Edmund Lord Grimthorpe.

Richard de Aquila Lord Stalbridge.

William Lord Kensington.

Michael Arthur Lord Burton.

John Glencairn Carter Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.

Thomas Lord Brassey.

Henry Lord Thring.

Frederick Arthur Lord Stanley of Preston.

Edward Lord Macnaghten. (*A Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.*)

LIST OF THE COMMONS.

THE NAMES OF MEMBERS

Returned to serve in the Twenty-fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, summoned to meet at Westminster the Fifth Day of August, One Thousand Eight Hundred and Eighty Six, as by the several Returns filed in the Office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery appears. Corrected to the Meeting of the Parliament on the 27th January, 1887.

BEDFORD.

Northern, or Biggleswade Division,
Viscount Baring.

Southern, or Luton Division,
Cyril Flower.

BEDFORD BOROUGH.
Samuel Whitbread.

BERKS.

Northern, or Abingdon Division,
Philip Wroughton.

Southern, or Newbury Division,
William George Mount.

Eastern, or Wokingham Division,
Sir George Russell, bt.

READING BOROUGH.
Charles Townshend Murdoch.

WINDSOR (NEW) BOROUGH.
Robert Richardson-Gardner.

BUCKS.

Northern, or Buckingham Division,
Egerton Hubbard.

Mid, or Aylesbury Division,
Baron Ferdinand James de Rothschild.

Southern, or Wycombe Division,
Viscount Curzon.

CAMBRIDGE.

Northern, or Wisbech Division,
Charles William Selwyn.

Western, or Chesterton Division,
Charles Hall.

Eastern, or Newmarket Division,
George Newnes.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY.
Rt. Hon. Alexander James Beresford Beresford-Hope, LL.D.,
Rt. Hon. Henry Cecil Raikes, M.A.

CAMBRIDGE BOROUGH.
Robert Uniacke Penrose Fitzgerald.

CHESTER.

Wirral Division,
Edward Thomas Davenant Cotton.

Eddisbury Division,
Henry James Tollemache.

Macclesfield Division,
William Bromley-Davenport.

Crewe Division,
Walter Glowe Bright McLaren.

Northwich Division,
Robert Verdin.

Altrincham Division,
Sir William Cunliffe Brooks, bt.

CHESTER—*cont.*

HYDE DIVISION,

Joseph Watson Sidebotham.

KNUTSFORD DIVISION,

Hon. Alan de Tatton Egerton.

BIRKENHEAD BOROUGH.

Lieut.-General Sir Edward Bruce Hamley, K.C B.

CHESTER BOROUGH.

Robert Armstrong Yerburgh.

STOCKPORT BOROUGH.

Louis John Jennings,
Sydney Gedge.

CORNWALL.

WESTERN, or ST. IVES DIVISION,

Sir John St. Aubyn, bt.

NORTH-WESTERN, or CAMBORNE DIVISION,

Charles Augustus Vansittart Conybeare.

TRURO DIVISION,

William Bickford Smith.

MID, or ST. AUSTELL DIVISION,

William Copeland Borlase.

SOUTH-EASTERN, or BODMIN DIVISION,

Leonard Henry Courtney.

NORTH-EASTERN, or LAUNCESTON DIVISION,

Charles Thomas Dyke Acland.

PENRYN AND FALMOUTH BOROUGH.

William George Cavendish Bentinck.

CUMBERLAND

NORTHERN, or ESKDALE DIVISION,

Robert Andrew Allison.

MID, or PENRITH DIVISION,

James William Lowther.

COCKERMOUTH DIVISION,

Sir Wilfrid Lawson, bt.

WESTERN, or EGREMONT DIVISION,

Lord Muncaster.

CARLISLE BOROUGH.

William Court Gully.

WHITEHAVEN BOROUGH.

Rt. Hon. George Augustus Frederick Cavendish Bentinck.

DERBY.

HIGH PEAK DIVISION,

William Sidebottom.

NORTH-EASTERN DIVISION,

Thomas Dolling Bolton.

CHESTERFIELD DIVISION,

Alfred Barnes.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Lord Edward Cavendish.

MID DIVISION,

James Alfred Jacoby.

ILKESTON DIVISION,

Thomas Watson.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Henry Wardle.

DERBY BOROUGH.

Thomas Roe,
Rt. Hon. Sir William George Granville Venables Vernon Harcourt, knt.

DEVON.

EASTERN, or HONITON DIVISION,

Sir John Henry Kennaway, bt.

NORTH-EASTERN, or TIVERTON DIVISION,

Lt.-Col. William Hood Walrond.

NORTHERN, or SOUTH MOLTON DIVISION,

Viscount Lymington.

NORTH-WESTERN, or BARNSTAPLE DIVISION,

George Pitt Lewis.

WESTERN, or TAVISTOCK DIVISION,

Viscount Ebrington.

SOUTHERN, or TOTNES DIVISION,

Francis Bingham Mildmay.

TORQUAY DIVISION,

Richard Mallock.

MID, or ASHBURTON DIVISION,

Charles Seale-Hayne.

DEVONPORT BOROUGH.

John Henry Puleston,
George Edward Price.

EXETER BOROUGH.

Hon. Henry Stafford Northcote.

PLYMOUTH BOROUGH.

Sir Edward Bates, bt.
Sir Edward George Clarke, knt.

DORSET.

NORTHERN DIVISION,

Hon. Edwin Berkeley Portman.

EASTERN DIVISION,

George Hawkesworth Bond.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Charles Joseph Theophilus Hambro.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Henry Richard Farquharson.

DURHAM.

JARROW DIVISION,

Sir Charles Mark Palmer, bt.

HOUGHTON-LE-SPRING DIVISION,

Nicholas Wood.

CHESTER-LE-STREET DIVISION,

James Joicey.

NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,

Llewellyn Archer Atherley-Jones.

MID DIVISION,

William Crawford.

SOUTH-EASTERN DIVISION,

Major General Sir Henry Marshman Havelock-Allan, bt., V.C., C.B.

BISHOP AUCKLAND DIVISION,

John Mellor Paulton.

BARNARD CASTLE DIVISION,

Sir Joseph Whitwell Pease, Bt.

DARLINGTON BOROUGH.

Theodore Fry.

DURHAM BOROUGH.

Thomas Milvain.

GATESHEAD BOROUGH.

Hon. Walter Henry James.

HARTLEPOOLS (THE) BOROUGH.

Thomas Richardson.

SOUTH SHIELDS BOROUGH.

James Cochran Stevenson.

STOCKTON BOROUGH.

Joseph Dodds.

SUNDERLAND BOROUGH.

Samuel Storey,
Edward Temperley Gourley.

ESSEX.

SOUTH-WESTERN, or WALTHAMSTOW DIVISION,

William Thomas Makins.

ESSEX—*cont.*

SOUTHERN, or ROMFORD DIVISION,

James Theobald.

WESTERN, or EPPING DIVISION,

Right Hon. Sir Henry John Selwin-Ibbetson, bt.

NORTHERN, or SAFFRON WALDEN DIVISION,

Herbert Colstoun Gardner.

NORTH-EASTERN, or HARWICH DIVISION,

James Round.

EASTERN, or MALDON DIVISION,

Charles Wing Gray.

MID, or CHELMSFORD DIVISION,

William James Beadel.

SOUTH-EASTERN DIVISION,

Major Frederick Carne Rasch.

COLCHESTER BOROUGH.

Henry John Trotter.

WEST HAM BOROUGH.

North Division,

James Forrest Fulton.

South Division,

George Edward Banes.

GLOUCESTER.

MID, or STROUD DIVISION,

George Holloway.

NORTHERN, or TEWKESBURY DIVISION,

Sir John Edward Dorington, bt.

EASTERN, or CIRENCESTER DIVISION,

Arthur Brend Winterbotham.

FOREST OF DEAN DIVISION,

Thomas Blake.

SOUTHERN, or THORNBURY DIVISION,

Hon. John William Plunkett.

BRISTOL BOROUGH.

West Division,

Rt. hon. Sir Michael Edward Hicks-Beach, bt.

North Division,

Lewis Fry.

East Division,

Handel Cossham.

South Division,

Lt.-Col. Edward Stock Hill.

CHELTENHAM BOROUGH.

James Tynte Agg-Gardner.

GLOUCESTER BOROUGH.

Thomas Robinson.

HANTS.

Northern, or Basingstoke Division,
Rt. hon. George Sclater-Booth.

Western, or Andover Division,
William Wither Bramston Beach.

Eastern, or Petersfield Division,
Viscount Wolmer.

Southern, or Fareham Division,
Lieut.-Gen. Sir Frederick Wellington John FitzWygram, bt.

New Forest Division,
Francis Compton.

CHRISTCHURCH BOROUGH.
Charles Edward Baring Young.

PORTSMOUTH BOROUGH.
Major.-Gen. Sir William Crossman, K.C.M.G.
Sir Samuel Wilson.

SOUTHAMPTON BOROUGH.
Alfred Giles.
Adm. Sir John Edmund Commerell, V.C., K.C.B.

WINCHESTER BOROUGH.
Arthur Loftus Tottenham.

HEREFORD.

Northern, or Leominster Division,
James Rankin.

Southern, or Ross Division,
Michael Biddulph.

HEREFORD BOROUGH.
Sir Joseph Russell Bailey.

HERTFORD.

Northern, or Hitchin Division,
Robert Dimsdale (Baron of the Russian Empire).

Eastern, or Hertford Division,
Abel Smith.

Mid, or St. Alban's Division,
Viscount Grimston.

Western, or Watford Division,
Thomas Frederick Halsey.

HUNTINGDON.

Southern, or Huntingdon Division,
Arthur Hugh Smith Barry.

Northern, or Ramsay Division,
William Henry Fellowes.

ISLE OF WIGHT.

Sir Richard Everard Webster, knt.

KENT.

Western, or Sevenoaks Division,
Hon. Charles William Mills.

North-Western, or Dartford Division,
Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart Dyke, bt.

South-Western, or Tunbridge Division,
Robert Norton.

Mid, or Medway Division,
Hon. John Stewart Gathorne-Hardy.

North-Eastern, or Faversham Division,
Hon. Herbert Thomas Knatchbull-Hugessen.

Southern, or Ashford Division,
William Pomfret Pomfret.

Eastern, or St. Augustine's Division,
Aretas Akers-Douglas.

Isle of Thanet Division,
Edward Robert King-Harman.

CANTERBURY BOROUGH.
John Henniker Heaton.

CHATHAM BOROUGH.
Sir John Eldon Gorst, knt.

DEPTFORD BOROUGH.
William John Evelyn.

DOVER BOROUGH.
Major Alexander George Dickson.

GRAVESEND BOROUGH.
John Bazley White, jun.

GREENWICH BOROUGH.
Thomas William Boord.

HYTHE BOROUGH.
Sir Edward William Watkin, bt.

LEWISHAM BOROUGH.
Rt. Hon. Viscount Lewisham.

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH.
Alexander Henry Ross.

ROCHESTER BOROUGH.
Col. Francis Charles Hughes-Hallett.

WOOLWICH BOROUGH.
Col. Edwin Hughes.

LANCASTER.

North Lancashire,

North Lonsdale Division,
George William Ainslie.

Lancaster Division,
James Williamson.

Lancaster—*cont.*

Blackpool Division,
Sir Matthew White Ridley, bt.

Chorley Division,
Lieut.-Gen. Randle Joseph Feilden.

North-East Lancashire,

Darwen Division,
Viscount Cranborne.

Clitheroe Division,
Rt. Hon. Sir Ughtred James Kay-Shuttleworth, bt.

Accrington Division,
Robert Trotter Hermon Hodge.

Rossendale Division,
Rt. Hon. Marquess of Hartington.

South-East Lancashire,

Westhoughton Division,
Frank Hardcastle.

Heywood Division,
Isaac Hoyle.

Middleton Division,
Thomas Fielden.

Radcliffe-cum-Farnworth Division,
Robert Leake.

Eccles Division,
Hon. Alfred John Francis Egerton.

Stretford Division,
John William Maclure.

Gorton Division,
Richard Peacock.

Prestwich Division,
Robert Gray Cornish Mowbray.

South-West Lancashire,

Southport Division,
George Nathaniel Curzon.

Ormskirk Division,
Arthur Bower Forwood.

Bootle Division,
Lieut.-Colonel Thomas Myles Sandys.

Widnes Division,
Tom Cottingham Edwards-Moss.

Newton Division,
Thomas Wodehouse Legh.

Ince Division,
Henry Blundell-Hollinshead Blundell.

Leigh Division,
Caleb Wright.

ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE BOROUGH.
John Edmund Wentworth Addison.

Lancaster—*cont.*

BARROW-IN-FURNESS BOROUGH.
William Sproston Caine.

BLACKBURN BOROUGH.
William Coddington.
William Henry Hornby.

BOLTON BOROUGH.
Herbert Shepherd-Cross.
Lieut. Colonel Francis Charles Bridgeman.

BURNLEY BOROUGH.
Peter Rylands.

BURY BOROUGH.
Right Hon. Sir Henry James, knt.

LIVERPOOL BOROUGH.

Kirkdale Division,
George Smyth Baden-Powell, C.M.G.

Walton Division,
John George Gibson,

Everton Division,
Edward Whitley.

West Derby Division,
Lord Claud Hamilton.

Scotland Division,
Thomas Power O'Connor.

Exchange Division,
Ralph Neville.

Abercromby Division,
William Frederick Lawrence.

East Toxteth Division,
Baron Henry de Worms.

West Toxteth Division,
Thomas Bland Royden.

MANCHESTER BOROUGH.

North-West Division,
William Henry Houldsworth.

North Division,
Charles Ernest Schwann.

North-East Division,
Right Hon. Sir James Fergusson, bt.

East Division,
Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour.

South Division,
Sir Henry Enfield Roscoe, knt.

South-West Division,
Jacob Bright.

OLDHAM BOROUGH.
James Mackenzie Maclean.
Elliott Lees.

LANCASTER—*cont.*

PRESTON BOROUGH.

William Edward Murray Tomlinson.
Robert William Hanbury.

ROCHDALE BOROUGH.

Thomas Bayley Potter.

SALFORD BOROUGH.

North Division,

Edward Hardcastle.

West Division,

Lees Knowles.

South Division,

Henry Hoyle Howorth.

STALYBRIDGE BOROUGH.

Tom Harrop Sidebottom.

ST. HELENS BOROUGH.

Henry Seton-Karr.

WARRINGTON BOROUGH.

Sir Gilbert Greenall, bt.

WIGAN BOROUGH.

Francis Sharp Powell.

LEICESTER.

EASTERN, or MELTON DIVISION,
Right Hon. Lord John Manners.

MID, or LOUGHBOROUGH DIVISION,
Edwin Joseph Lisle March Phillips de Lisle.

WESTERN, or BOSWORTH DIVISION,
James Ellis.

SOUTHERN, or HARBOROUGH DIVISION,
Thomas Keay Tapling.

LEICESTER BOROUGH.

James Allanson Picton.
Alexander M'Arthur.

LINCOLN.

WEST LINDSEY, or GAINSBORO' DIVISION,
Henry Eyre.

NORTH LINDSEY, or BRIGG DIVISION,
Samuel Danks Waddy.

EAST LINDSEY, or LOUTH DIVISION,
Arthur Raymond Heath.

SOUTH LINDSEY, or HORNCASTLE DIVISION,
Right Hon. Edward Stanhope.

NORTH KESTEVEN, or SLEAFORD DIVISION,
Right Hon. Henry Chaplin.

LINCOLN—*cont.*

SOUTH KESTEVEN, or STAMFORD DIVISION.
John Compton Lawrance.

HOLLAND, or SPALDING DIVISION,
Hon. Murray Edward Gordon Finch-Hatton.

BOSTON BOROUGH.

Henry John Atkinson.

GRANTHAM BOROUGH.

Malcolm Low.

GREAT GRIMSBY BOROUGH.

Right Hon. Edward Heneage.

LINCOLN BOROUGH.

Frederick Harold Kerans.

MIDDLESEX.

ENFIELD DIVISION,

Rt. Hon. Viscount Folkestone.

TOTTENHAM DIVISION,
Joseph Howard.

HORNSEY DIVISION,
Sir James Macnaghten M'Garel-Hogg, bt., K.C.B.

HARROW DIVISION,

William Ambrose.

EALING DIVISION,
Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton.

BRENTFORD DIVISION,

James Bigwood.

UXBRIDGE DIVISION,
Frederick Dixon Dixon-Hartland.

BETHNAL GREEN BOROUGH.

North-East Division,

George Howell.

South-West Division.

Edward Hare Pickersgill.

CHELSEA BOROUGH.

Charles Algernon Whitmore.

FINSBURY BOROUGH.

Holborn Division,

Colonel Francis Duncan.

Central Division,

Frederick Thomas Penton.

East Division,

James Rowlands.

FULHAM BOROUGH.

William Hayes Fisher.

MIDDLESEX—*cont.*

HACKNEY BOROUGH.

North Division,

Major-Gen. Sir Lewis Pelly, K.C.B., K.C.S.I.

Central Division,

Surgeon-General Sir William Guyer Hunter, K.C.M.G.

South Division,

Sir Charles Russell, knt.

HAMMERSMITH BOROUGH.

Major-Gen. Walter Tuckfield Goldsworthy.

HAMPSTEAD BOROUGH.

Rt. Hn. Sir Henry Thurstan Holland, bt.

ISLINGTON BOROUGH.

North Division,

George Christopher Trout Bartley.

West Division,

Richard Chamberlain.

East Division,

Cowley Lambert.

South Division,

Sir Albert Kaye Rollit, knt.

KENSINGTON BOROUGH.

North Division,

Sir Roper Lethbridge, knt.

South Division,

Sir Algernon Borthwick, knt.

LONDON UNIVERSITY.

Sir John Lubbock, bt.

MARYLEBONE BOROUGH.

East Division,

Lord Charles William De La Poer Beresford.

West Division,

Frederick Seager-Hunt.

PADDINGTON BOROUGH.

North Division,

Lionel Louis Cohen.

South Division,

Rt. Hon. Lord Randolph Henry Spencer Churchill.

ST. GEORGE, HANOVER SQUARE.

Lord Algernon Percy.

ST. PANCRAS BOROUGH.

North Division,

Hon. Charles Wallace Alexander Napier Cochrane-Baillie.

East Division,

Robert Grant Webster.

MIDDLESEX—St. Pancras Boro'—*cont.*

West Division,

Harry Lawson Webster Lawson.

South Division,

Sir Julian Goldsmid, bt.

SHOREDITCH BOROUGH.

Hoxton Division,

James Stuart.

Haggerston Division,

William Randal Cremer.

STRAND BOROUGH.

Right Hon. William Henry Smith.

TOWER HAMLETS BOROUGH.

Whitechapel Division,

Samuel Montagu.

St. George Division,

Right Hon. Charles Thomson Ritchie.

Limehouse Division,

Edward Samuel Norris.

Mile End Division,

Spencer Charrington.

Stepney Division,

Frederick Wootton Isaacson.

Bow and Bromley Division,

John Charles Ready Colomb.

Poplar Division,

Sydney Charles Buxton.

WESTMINSTER BOROUGH.

William Lehmann Ashmead-Bartlett Burdett-Coutts.

LONDON CITY.

Sir Robert Nicholas Fowler, bt.
Right Hon. John Gellibrand Hubbard.

MONMOUTH.

NORTHERN DIVISION,

Thomas Phillips Price.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Cornelius Marshall Warmington.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Col. Hon. Frederick Courtenay Morgan.

MONMOUTH BOROUGH.

Sir George Elliot, bt.

NORFOLK.

NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,

Lord Henry Bentinck.

NORFOLK—*cont.*

SOUTH-WESTERN DIVISION,
William Amhurst Tyssen-Amherst.

NORTHERN DIVISION,
Herbert Hardy Cozens-Hardy.

EASTERN DIVISION,
Sir Edward Birkbeck, bt.

MID DIVISION,
Robert Thornhagh Gurdon.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,
Francis Taylor.

GREAT YARMOUTH BOROUGH.
Sir Henry Whatley Tyler, knt.

KING'S LYNN BOROUGH.
Alexander Weston Jarvis.

NORWICH BOROUGH.
Jeremiah James Colman.
Samuel Hoare.

NORTHAMPTON.

NORTHERN DIVISION,
Lord Burghley.

EASTERN DIVISION,
Francis Allston Channing.

MID DIVISION,
Hon. Charles Robert Spencer.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,
Sir Rainald Knightley, bt.

NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH.
Henry Labouchere,
Charles Bradlaugh.

PETERBOROUGH BOROUGH.
Hon. William John Wentworth Fitzwilliam.

NORTHUMBERLAND.

WANSBECK DIVISION,
Charles Fenwick.

TYNESIDE DIVISION,
Wentworth Blackett Beaumont.

HEXHAM DIVISION,
Miles MacInnes.

BERWICK-UPON-TWEED DIVISION,
Sir Edward Grey, bt.

MORPETH BOROUGH.
Thomas Burt.

NORTHUMBERLAND—*cont.*

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE BOROUGH.
Right Hon. John Morley.
James Craig.

TYNEMOUTH BOROUGH.
Richard Sims Donkin.

NOTTINGHAM.

BASSETLAW DIVISION,
William Beckett.

NEWARK DIVISION,
Viscount Newark.

RUSHCLIFFE DIVISION,
John Edward Ellis.

MANSFIELD DIVISION,
Cecil George Savile Foljambe.

NOTTINGHAM BOROUGH.
West Division,
Henry Broadhurst.

East Division,
Arnold Morley.

South Division,
Henry Smith Wright.

OXFORD.

NORTHERN, or BANBURY DIVISION,
Sir Bernhard Samuelson, bt.

MID, or WOODSTOCK DIVISION,
Francis William Maclean.

SOUTHERN, or HENLEY DIVISION.
Hon. Francis Parker.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY.
Rt. Hon. Sir John Robert Mowbray, bt., D.C.L.
John Gilbert Talbot, D.C.L.

OXFORD BOROUGH.
Alexander William Hall.

RUTLAND.

George Henry Finch.

SALOP.

WESTERN, or OSWESTRY DIVISION,
Stanley Leighton.

NORTHERN, or NEWPORT DIVISION,
Lt.-Col. William Slaney Kenyon Slaney.

MID, or WELLINGTON DIVISION,
Alexander Hargreaves Brown.

SALOP—*cont.*

SOUTHERN, or LUDLOW DIVISION,
Robert Jasper More.

SHREWSBURY BOROUGH.
James Watson.

SOMERSET.

NORTHERN DIVISION,
Evan Henry Llewellyn.

WELLS DIVISION,
Sir Richard Horner Paget, bt.

FROME DIVISION,
Viscount Weymouth.

EASTERN DIVISION,
Henry Hobhouse.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,
Viscount Kilcoursie.

BRIDGWATER DIVISION,
Edward James Stanley.

WESTERN, or WELLINGTON DIVISION,
Charles Isaac Elton.

BATH BOROUGH.
Edmond Robert Wodehouse,
Lt.-Col. Robert Peter Laurie.

TAUNTON BOROUGH.
Hon. Samuel Charles Allsopp.

STAFFORD.

LEEK DIVISION,
Harry Tichborne Davenport.

BURTON DIVISION,
Sydney Evershed.

WESTERN DIVISION,
Hamar Alfred Bass.

NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,
Justinian Heathcote Edwards-Heathcote.

LICHFIELD DIVISION,
Sir John Swinburne, bt.

KINGSWINFORD DIVISION,
Alexander Staveley Hill.

HANDSWORTH DIVISION,
Henry Wiggin.

HANLEY BOROUGH.
William Woodall.

NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME BOROUGH.
Douglas Harry Coghill.

STAFFORD—*cont.*

STAFFORD BOROUGH.
Thomas Salt.

STOKE-UPON-TRENT BOROUGH.
William Leatham Bright.

WALSALL BOROUGH.
Sir Charles Forster, bt.

WEDNESBURY BOROUGH.
Hon. Philip James Stanhope.

WEST BROMWICH BOROUGH.
James Ernest Spencer.

WOLVERHAMPTON BOROUGH.
West Division,
Sir William Chichele Plowden, K.C.S.I.
East Division,
Rt. hon. Henry Hartley Fowler.
South Division,
Rt. hon. Charles Pelham Villiers.

SUFFOLK.

NORTHERN, or LOWESTOFT DIVISION,
Sir Savile Brinton Crossley, bt.

NORTH-EASTERN, or EYE DIVISION,
Francis Seymour Stevenson.

NORTH-WESTERN, or STOWMARKET DIVISION,
Edward Greene.

SOUTH, or SUDBURY DIVISION,
William Cuthbert Quilter.

SOUTH-EASTERN, or WOODBRIDGE DIVISION,
Lt.-Col. Robert Hamilton Lloyd Anstruther.

BURY ST. EDMUNDS BOROUGH.
Lord Francis Hervey.

IPSWICH BOROUGH.
Charles Dalrymple.
Lord Elcho.

SURREY.

NORTH-WESTERN, or CHERTSEY DIVISION,
Frederick Alers Hankey.

SOUTH-WESTERN, or GUILFORD DIVISION,
Hon. William St. John Fremantle Brodrick.

SOUTH-EASTERN, or REIGATE DIVISION,
Sir James John Trevor Lawrence, bt.

SURREY—*cont.*

MID, or EPSOM DIVISION,
Rt. hon. George Cubitt.

KINGSTON DIVISION,
Sir John Whittaker Ellis, bt.

NORTH-EASTERN, or WIMBLEDON DIVISION,
Henry Cosmo Orme Bonsor.

BATTERSEA AND CLAPHAM BOROUGH.

Battersea Division.
Octavius Vaughan Morgan.

Clapham Division.
John Saunders Gilliat.

CAMBERWELL BOROUGH.

North Division,
John Richards Kelly.

Peckham Division,
Arthur Anthony Baumann.

Dulwich Division.
John Morgan Howard.

CROYDON BOROUGH.
Hon. Sidney Herbert.

LAMBETH BOROUGH.

North Division,
Major-Gen. Charles Crawfurd Fraser.

Kennington Division,
Robert Gent-Davis.

Brixton Division.
Ernest Baggallay.

Norwood Division,
Thomas Lynn Bristowe.

NEWINGTON BOROUGH.

West Division,
Charles Wallwyn Radcliffe Cooke.

Walworth Division,
Lewis Henry Isaacs.

SOUTHWARK BOROUGH.

West Division,
Arthur Cohen.

Rotherhithe Division,
Charles Edward Hamilton.

Bermondsey Division,
Alfred Lafone.

WANDSWORTH BOROUGH.
Henry Kimber.

SUSSEX.

NORTH-WESTERN, or HORSHAM DIVISION,
Sir Walter Barttelot Barttelot, bt., C.B.

SOUTH-WESTERN, or CHICHESTER DIVISION,
Earl of March.

NORTHERN, or EAST GRINSTEAD DIVISION,
Hon. Alfred Erskine Gathorne-Hardy.

MID, or LEWES DIVISION,
Sir Henry Fletcher, bt.

SOUTHERN, or EASTBOURNE DIVISION,
Rear-Admiral Edward Field.

EASTERN, or RYE DIVISION,
Lieut.-Col. Arthur Montagu Brookfield.

BRIGHTON BOROUGH.
Rt. Hon. William Thackeray Marriott.
William Tindal Robertson.

HASTINGS BOROUGH.
Wilson Noble.

WARWICK.

NORTHERN, or TAMWORTH DIVISION,
Philip Albert Muntz.

NORTH-EASTERN, or NUNEATON DIVISION,
John Stratford Dugdale.

SOUTH-WESTERN, or STRATFORD-ON-AVON DIVISION,
Frederick Townsend.

SOUTH-EASTERN, or RUGBY DIVISION,
Henry Peyton Cobb.

ASTON MANOR BOROUGH.
George Kynoch.

BIRMINGHAM BOROUGH.

Edgbaston Division,
George Dixon.

West Division,
Rt. hon. Joseph Chamberlain.

Central Division.
Rt. hon. John Bright.

North Division,
William Kenrick.

East Division,
Right Hon. Henry Matthews.

Bordesley Division,
Jesse Collings.

South Division,
Joseph Powell Williams.

WARWICK—*cont.*

COVENTRY BOROUGH.

Henry William Eaton.

WARWICK AND LEAMINGTON BOROUGH.

Rt. hon. Arthur Wellesley Peel.

WESTMORELAND.

NORTHERN, or APPLEBY DIVISION,

Hon. William Lowther.

SOUTHERN, or KENDAL DIVISION,

Earl of Bective.

WILTS.

NORTHERN, or CRICKLADE DIVISION,

Mervyn Herbert Nevill Story-Maskelyne.

NORTH-WESTERN, or CHIPPENHAM DIVISION,

Lord Henry Bruce.

WESTERN, or WESTBURY DIVISION,

George Pargiter Fuller.

EASTERN, or DEVIZES DIVISION,

Walter Hume Long.

SOUTHERN, or WILTON DIVISION,

Sir Thomas Fraser Grove, bt.

SALISBURY BOROUGH.

Edward Henry Hulse.

WORCESTER.

WESTERN, or BEWDLEY DIVISION,

Sir Edmund Anthony Harley Lechmere, bt.

SOUTHERN, or EVESHAM DIVISION,

Sir Richard Temple, bt.

MID, or DROITWICH DIVISION.

John Corbett.

NORTHERN DIVISION,

Benjamin Hingley.

EASTERN DIVISION,

George Woodyatt Hastings.

DUDLEY BOROUGH.

Brooke Robinson.

KIDDERMINSTER BOROUGH.

Augustus Frederick Godson.

WORCESTER BOROUGH.

Hon. George Higginson Allsopp.

YORK.

North Riding,

THIRSK AND MALTON DIVISION,

Lieut.-Col. Hon. Lewis Payn Dawnay.

RICHMOND DIVISION,

George William Elliot.

CLEVELAND DIVISION,

Henry Fell Pease.

WHITBY DIVISION,

Ernest William Beckett.

East Riding,

HOLDERNESS DIVISION,

George Richard Bethell, R.N.

BUCKROSE DIVISION,

William Alexander McArthur.

HOWDENSHIRE DIVISION,

Arthur Duncombe.

West Riding, Northern Part,

SKIPTON DIVISION,

Walter Morrison.

KEIGHLEY DIVISION,

Isaac Holden.

SHIPLEY DIVISION,

Joseph Craven.

SOWERBY DIVISION,

Edward Crossley.

ELLAND DIVISION,

Thomas Wayman.

West Riding, Southern Part,

MORLEY DIVISION,

Charles George Milnes Gaskell.

NORMANTON DIVISION,

Benjamin Pickard.

COLNE VALLEY DIVISION,

Henry Frederick Beaumont.

HOLMFIRTH DIVISION,

Henry Joseph Wilson.

BARNSLEY DIVISION,

Courtney Stanhope Kenny.

HALLAMSHIRE DIVISION,

Sir Frederick Thorpe Mappin, bt.

ROTHERHAM DIVISION,

Arthur Herbert Dyke Acland.

DONCASTER DIVISION,

Walter Sewallis Shirley.

YORK—*cont.*

West Riding, Eastern Part,

RIPON DIVISION,

John Lloyd Wharton.

OTLEY DIVISION,

John Barran.

BARKSTON ASH DIVISION,

Robert Gunter.

OSGOLDCROSS DIVISION,

John Austin.

PUDSEY DIVISION,

Briggs Priestley.

SPEN VALLEY DIVISION,

Joseph Woodhead.

BRADFORD BOROUGH.

West Division,

Alfred Illingworth.

Central Division,

Right Hon. John George Shaw Lefevre.

East Division,

Henry Byron Reed.

DEWSBURY BOROUGH.

Sir John Simon, bt., Serjeant-at-Law.

HALIFAX BOROUGH.

Thomas Shaw.
Rt. Hon. James Stansfeld.

HUDDERSFIELD BOROUGH.

William Summers.

KINGSTON-UPON-HULL BOROUGH.

East Division,

Frederick Brent Grotrian.

Central Division,

Henry Seymour King.

West Division,

Charles Henry Wilson.

LEEDS BOROUGH.

North Division,

William Lawies Jackson.

Central Division,

Gerald William Balfour.

East Division,

John Lawrence Gane.

West Division,

Herbert John Gladstone.

South Division,

Rt. Hon. Sir Lyon Playfair, K.C.B.

MIDDLESBOROUGH BOROUGH.

Isaac Wilson.

YORK—*cont.*

PONTEFRACT BOROUGH.

Hon. Rowland Winn.

SCARBOROUGH BOROUGH.

Joshua Rowntree.

SHEFFIELD BOROUGH.

Attercliffe Division,

Hon. Bernard John Seymour Coleridge.

Brightside Division,

Rt. Hon. Anthony John Mundella.

Central Division,

Charles Edward Howard Vincent.

Hallam Division,

Charles Beilby Stuart-Wortley.

Ecclesall Division,

Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett.

WAKEFIELD BOROUGH.

Sir Edward Green, bt.

YORK BOROUGH.

Alfred Edward Pease.
Frank Lockwood.

WALES.

ANGLESEA.

Thomas Lewis.

BRECKNOCK.

William Fuller Maitland.

CARDIGAN.

William Bowen Rowlands.

CARMARTHEN

EASTERN DIVISION,

David Pugh.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Walter Rice Howell Powell.

CARMARTHEN BOROUGH.

Sir Emile Algernon Arthur Keppel Cowell Stepney, bt.

CARNARVON.

SOUTHERN OR EIFION DIVISION,

John Bryn Roberts.

NORTHERN OR ARFON DIVISION,

William Rathbone.

CARNARVON BOROUGH.

Edmund Swetenham.

DENBIGH.

EASTERN DIVISION,

Rt. hon. George Osborne Morgan.

WESTERN DIVISION,

William Cornwallis West.

DENBIGH BOROUGH.

Hon. George Thomas Kenyon.

FLINT.

Samuel Smith.

FLINT BOROUGH.

John Roberts.

GLAMORGAN.

EASTERN DIVISION,

Alfred Thomas.

RHONDDA DIVISION,

William Abraham.

WESTERN OR GOWER DIVISION,

Frank Ash Yeo.

MID DIVISION,

Christopher Rice Mansel Talbot.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Arthur John Williams.

CARDIFF BOROUGH.

Sir Edward James Reed, K.C.B.

MERTHYR TYDVIL BOROUGH.

Henry Richard.
Charles Herbert James.

SWANSEA BOROUGH.

Swansea Town,

Lewis Llewellyn Dillwyn.

Swansea District,

Sir Henry Hussey Vivian, bt.

MERIONETH.

Thomas Edward Ellis.

MONTGOMERY.

Stuart Rendel.

MONTGOMERY BOROUGH.

Hon. Frederick Stephen Archibald Hanbury-Tracy.

PEMBROKE.

William Davies.

PEMBROKE AND HAVERFORDWEST BOROUGH.

Rear Adm. Richard Charles Mayne.

RADNOR.

Hon. Arthur Henry John Walsh.

SCOTLAND.

ABERDEEN.

EASTERN DIVISION,

Peter Esslemont.

WESTERN DIVISION,

Robert Farquharson, M.D.

ABERDEEN BURGH.

North Division.

William Alexander Hunter.

South Division,

James Bryce.

ARGYLL.

John Wingfield Malcolm.

AYR.

NORTHERN DIVISION,

Hon. Hugh Frederick Hislop Elliot.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,

Hon. Greville Richard Vernon.

AYR DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Richard Frederick Fotheringham Campbell.

KILMARNOCK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Stephen Williamson.

BANFF.

Robert William Duff.

BERWICK.

Right Hon. Edward Marjoribanks.

BUTE.

James Patrick Bannerman Robertson.

CAITHNESS.

Gavin Brown Clark.

WICK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

John Macdonald Cameron.

CLACKMANNAN AND KINROSS.

Rt. hon. John Blair Balfour.

DUMBARTON.

Sir Archibald Orr Ewing, bt.

DUMFRIES.

Sir Robert Jardine, bt.

DUMFRIES DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Robert Threshie Reid.

EDINBURGH.

Rt. Hon, William Ewart Gladstone,

EDINBURGH—*cont.*

EDINBURGH BURGH.

East Division,
Robert Wallace.

West Division,
Thomas Ryburn Buchanan.

Central Division,
William McEwan.

South Division,
Rt. Hon. Hugh Culling Eardley Childers.

EDINBURGH AND ST. ANDREW'S UNIVERSITIES.

Right Hon. John Hay Athole Macdonald, LL.D.

LEITH DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Ronal Crawfurd Munro Ferguson.

ELGIN AND NAIRN.

Charles Henry Anderson.

ELGIN DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Alexander Asher.

FIFE.

EASTERN DIVISION,
Herbert Henry Asquith.

WESTERN DIVISION,
Hon. Robert Preston Bruce.

KIRKCALDY DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Sir George Campbell, knt.

ST. ANDREW'S DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Henry Torrens Anstruther.

FORFAR.

James William Barclay.

DUNDEE BURGH.

Edmund Robertson,
Charles Carmichael Lacaita.

MONTROSE DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

John Shiress Will.

HADDINGTON.

Richard Burdon Haldane.

INVERNESS.

Charles Fraser-Mackintosh.

INVERNESS DISTRICT OF BURGHS.

Robert Bannatyne Finlay.

KINCARDINE.

General Sir George Balfour, K.C.B.

KIRKCUDBRIGHT.

Mark John Stewart.

LANARK.

GOVAN DIVISION,
William Pearce.

PARTICK DIVISION,
Alexander Craig Sellar.

NORTH-WESTERN DIVISION,
Robert Bontine Cunningham Graham.

NORTH-EASTERN DIVISION,
Donald Crawford.

MID DIVISION,
Stephen Mason.

SOUTHERN DIVISION,
James Henry Cecil Hozier.

GLASGOW BURGH.

Bridgeton Division,
Edward Richard Russell.

Camlachie Division,
Hugh Watt.

St. Rollox Division,
James Caldwell.

Central Division,
John George Alexander Baird.

College Division,
Charles Cameron, M.D., LL.D.

Tradeston Division,
Archibald Cameron Corbett.

Blackfriars and Hutchesontown Division,
Andrew Dryburgh Provand.

GLASGOW AND ABERDEEN UNIVERSITIES.

James Alexander Campbell, LL.D.

LINLITHGOW.

Peter McLagan.

ORKNEY AND SHETLAND.

Leonard Lyell.

PEEBLES AND SELKIRK

Walter Thorburn.

PERTH.

EASTERN DIVISION,
Robert Stewart Menzies.

WESTERN DIVISION,
Sir Donald Currie, K.C.M.G.

PERTH BURGH.

Charles Stuart Parker.

RENFREW.

Eastern Division,
Michael Hugh Shaw Stewart.

Western Division,
Sir Archibald Campbell Campbell, bt.

GREENOCK BURGH.
Thomas Sutherland.

PAISLEY BURGH.
William Boyle Barbour.

ROSS AND CROMARTY.

Roderick Macdonald.

ROXBURGH.

Hon. Arthur Ralph Douglas Elliot.

HAWICK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.
Alexander Laing Brown.

STIRLING.

Joseph Cheney Bolton.

FALKIRK DISTRICT OF BURGHS.
William Pirrie Sinclair.

STIRLING DISTRICT OF BURGHS.
Right Hon. Henry Campbell-Bannerman.

SUTHERLAND.

Angus Sutherland.

WIGTON.

Sir Herbert Eustace Maxwell, bt.

IRELAND.

ANTRIM.

North Antrim Division,

Mid Antrim Division,
Hon. Robert Torrens O'Neill.

East Antrim Division,
James Martin M'Calmont.

South Antrim Division,
William Grey Ellison Macartney.

BELFAST BOROUGH.
East Belfast Division,
Edward Samuel Wesley de Cobain.

South Belfast Division,
William Johnston.

West Belfast Division,
Thomas Sexton.

North Belfast Division,
William Ewart.

ARMAGH.

North Armagh Division,
Lieut.-Col. Edward James Saunderson.

Mid Armagh Division,
Sir James Porter Corry, bt.

South Armagh Division,
Alexander Blane.

CARLOW.

John Aloysius Blake.

CAVAN.

West Cavan Division,
Joseph Gillis Biggar.

East Cavan Division,
Thomas O'Hanlon.

CLARE.

East Clare Division,
Joseph Richard Cox.

West Clare Division,
Jeremiah Jordan.

CORK.

North Cork Division,
James Christopher Flynn.

North-East Cork Division,
Edmund Leamy.

Mid Cork Division,
Charles Kearns Deane Tanner.

East Cork Division,
William John Lane.

West Cork Division,
James Gilhooly.

South Cork Division,
Joseph Edward Kenny.

South-East Cork Division,
John Hooper.

CORK CITY.
Charles Stewart Parnell.
Maurice Healy.

DONEGAL.

North Donegal Division,
James Edward O'Doherty.

West Donegal Division,
Patrick O'Hea.

East Donegal Division,
Arthur O'Connor.

South Donegal Division,

DOWN.

North Down Division,
Lieut.-Col. Thomas Waring.

East Down Division,
Richard William Blackwood Ker.

West Down Division,
Right Hon. Lord Arthur Hill.

South Down Division,
Michael McCartan.

NEWRY BOROUGH.
Justin Huntly McCarthy.

DUBLIN.

North Dublin Division,
John Joseph Clancy, M.A.

South Dublin Division,
Sir Thomas Henry Grattan Esmonde.

DUBLIN CITY.

College Green Division,
Timothy Daniel Sullivan.

Dublin Harbour Division,
Timothy Charles Harrington.

St. Stephen's Green Division,
Edmond Dwyer Gray.

St. Patrick's Division,
William Martin Murphy.

DUBLIN UNIVERSITY.
Rt. Hon. David Robert Plunket, LL.D.
Right Hon. Hugh Holmes.

FERMANAGH.

North Fermanagh Division,
William Hoey Kearney Redmond.

South Fermanagh Division,
Henry Campbell.

GALWAY.

Connemara Division,
Patrick James Foley.

North Galway Division,
Colonel John Philip Nolan.

East Galway Division,
Mathew Harris.

South Galway Division,
David Sheehy.

GALWAY TOWN.
John Pinkerton.

KERRY.

North Kerry Division,
John Stack.

West Kerry Division,
Edward Harrington.

South Kerry Division,
John O'Connor.

East Kerry Division,
Jeremiah Daniel Sheehan.

KILDARE.

North Kildare Division,
James Laurence Carew.

South Kildare Division,
James Leahy.

KILKENNY.

North Kilkenny Division,
Edward Mulhallen Marum.

South Kilkenny Division,
Patrick Alexander Chance.

KILKENNY CITY.
Thomas Dunn.

KING'S COUNTY.

Birr Division,
Bernard Charles Molloy.

Tullamore Division,
Joseph Francis Fox.

LEITRIM.

North Leitrim Division,
Michael Conway.

South Leitrim Division,
Luke Patrick Hayden.

LIMERICK.

West Limerick Division,
William Abraham.

East Limerick Division,
John Finucane.

LIMERICK CITY.
Henry Joseph Gill.

LONDONDERRY.

North Derry Division,
Henry Lyle Mulholland.

South Derry Division,
Thomas Lea.

LONDONDERRY CITY.
Charles Edward Lewis.

LONGFORD.

North Longford Division,
Justin McCarthy.

South Longford Division,
Laurence Connolly.

LOUTH.

North Louth Division,
Joseph Nolan.

South Louth Division,
Thomas Patrick Gill.

MAYO.

North Mayo Division,
Daniel Crilly.

West Mayo Division,
John Deasy.

East Mayo Division,
John Dillon.

South Mayo Division,
James Frederick Xavier O'Brien.

MEATH.

North Meath Division,
Pierce Mahony.

South Meath Division,
Edward Sheil.

MONAGHAN.

North Monaghan Division,
Patrick O'Brien.

South Monaghan Division,
Sir Joseph Neale McKenna, knt.

QUEEN'S COUNTY.

Ossory Division,
William Archibald Macdonald.

Leix Division,
Richard Lalor.

ROSCOMMON.

North Roscommon Division,
James O'Kelly.

South Roscommon Division,
Andrew Commins.

SLIGO.

North Sligo Division,
Peter McDonald.

South Sligo Division,
Thomas Sexton.

TIPPERARY.

North Tipperary Division,
Patrick Joseph O'Brien.

Mid Tipperary Division,
Thomas Mayne.

South Tipperary Division,
John O'Connor.

East Tipperary Division,
Thomas Joseph Condon.

TYRONE.

North Tyrone Division,
Lord Ernest Hamilton.

Mid Tyrone Division,
Matthew Joseph Kenny.

East Tyrone Division,
William James Reynolds.

South Tyrone Division,
Thomas Wallace Russell.

WATERFORD.

West Waterford Division,
Jasper Douglas Pyne.

East Waterford Division,
Patrick Joseph Power.

WATERFORD CITY.

Richard Power.

WESTMEATH.

North Westmeath Division,
James Tuite.

South Westmeath Division,
Donal Sullivan.

WEXFORD.

North Wexford Division,
John Edward Redmond.

South Wexford Division,
John Barry.

WICKLOW.

West Wicklow Division,
Garrett Michael Byrne.

East Wicklow Division,
William Joseph Corbet.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

Second Session of the *Twenty-Fourth Parliament* of the
United Kingdom of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*,
appointed to meet 5 August, 1886, in the Fiftieth
Year of the Reign of

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION 1887.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 27th January, 1887.

THE PARLIAMENT, which had been Prorogued successively from Saturday the 25th day of September, 1886, to the 11th day of November; thence to the 9th day of December; thence to the 13th day of January, 1887; and from thence to the 27th day of January, met this day for the despatch of Business.

The Session was opened by Commission.

The House of Peers being met;

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House,

"That Her Majesty, not thinking fit to be personally present here this day, has been pleased to cause a Commission to be issued under the Great Seal, in order to the opening and holding of this Parliament."

Then Five of the Lords Commissioners—namely, The Lord Chancellor (Lord Halsbury); The Lord Chamberlain (The Earl of Lathom); The Secretary of State for India (The Viscount Cross); The Earl of Kintore (Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard); and The Earl of Coventry (Master of the Buckhounds) — being in their Robes, and seated on a Form placed between the Throne and the Woolsack, commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to let the Commons know "The Lords Commissioners desire their immediate Attendance in this House, to hear the Commission read."

Who being at the Bar, with their Speaker:—The Commission was read by the Clerk:—Then

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

The LORD CHANCELLOR *delivered* Her Majesty's Speech to both Houses of Parliament, as follows:—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"My relations with all foreign Powers continue to be friendly.

"The affairs of South Eastern Europe are still in an unsettled condition; but I do not apprehend that any disturbance of European peace will result from the unadjusted controversies which have arisen in that region. While deploring the events which compelled Prince Alexander of Bulgaria to retire from the Government of that Principality, I have not judged it expedient to interfere in the proceedings for the election of his successor until they arrive at that stage at which my assent is required by the stipulations of the Treaty of Berlin.

"The task which has been undertaken by my Government in Egypt is not yet accomplished; but substantial advance has been made towards the assurance of external and internal tranquillity.

"In Burmah operations have been conducted by my troops with bravery and skill for the purpose of extirpating the brigandage which has grown up during recent years of misgovernment. The bands of marauders by whom Upper Burmah has been long infested have been dispersed, and many of the leaders have laid down their arms. I entertain a confident hope that the general pacification of the country will be effected during the present season.

"Commercial Treaties have been concluded with the Kingdoms of Greece and Roumania.

"Papers on these subjects will be laid before you.

"*Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"The Estimates for the coming year will be submitted to you. They have been framed with a careful regard to economy and to the efficiency of the public service.

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"The condition of Ireland still requires your anxious attention. Grave crimes have happily been rarer during the last few months than during a similar period in the preceding year. But the relations between the owners and occupiers of land, which in the early part of the autumn exhibited signs of improvement, have since been seriously disturbed in some districts by organized attempts to incite the latter class to combine against the fulfilment of their legal obligations. The efforts of my Government to cope with this evil have been seriously impeded by difficulties incident to the method at present prescribed by Statute for dealing with such offences. Your early attention will be called to proposals for reforms in legal procedure which seem necessary to secure the prompt and efficient administration of the criminal law.

"Since I last addressed you, the Commissioners directed to inquire into certain subjects of great importance to the material welfare of Ireland have been actively prosecuting their labours. The Report of the Commission on the operation of the recent Acts dealing with the tenure and purchase of land will be shortly laid before you, and will doubtless receive from you the early and careful attention which the serious importance of the subject demands.

"Bills for the improvement of Local Government in England and Scotland will be laid before you; and, should circumstances render it possible, they will be followed by a measure dealing with the same subject in Ireland.

"A Bill for improving and cheapening the process of Private Bill legislation in England, Scotland, and Ireland will be submitted to you.

"You will be asked to consider measures having for their object to remove hindrances which exist to the cheap and rapid Transfer of Land, to facilitate the provision of Allotments for Small Householders, and to provide for the readier Sale of Glebe Lands.

"The Commission which I issued in 1885 to inquire into the lamentable depression under which Trade and Agriculture have been suffering for many years has presented a valuable Report, which, together with the important evidence collected by them, will be laid before you.

"A Bill for altering the mode of levying Tithes in England and Wales will be submitted to you.

"In regard to Scotland, you will be asked to consider measures for the reform of the Universities, for completing recent legislation as to the powers of the Secretary for Scotland, and for amending the procedure of Criminal Courts.

"Measures dealing with the regulation of Railway rates, and for preventing the fraudulent use of Merchandize marks, will also be brought under your consideration.

"In the performance of these and all your other momentous duties, I earnestly pray that the blessing of Almighty God may attend your labours."

Then the Commons withdrew.

House adjourned during pleasure.

House resumed.

PRAYERS.

ROLL OF THE LORDS—Garter King of Arms attending, *delivered* at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the Second Session of the Twenty-fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom: The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge—Singly took the Oath.

SAT FIRST.

The Earl Amherst, after the death of his father.

The Earl of Strafford, after the death of his father.

NEW PEERS.

John Glencairn Carter Hamilton, Esquire, having been created Baron Hamilton of Dalzell in the county of Lanark—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Edward Macnaghten, Esquire, Q.C., appointed a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary, under the provisions of The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, with the dignity of a Baron for life, by the style and title of Baron Macnaghten of Runkerry in the county of Antrim—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

Several Lords—took the Oath.

SAT FIRST.

The Lord Monkswell, after the death of his father.

Several Lords—Took the Oath.

SELECT VESTRIES.

Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1^a.

THE LATE LORD IDDESLEIGH.

OBSERVATIONS.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY):

My Lords, before we proceed to business, I cannot refrain from notifying to your Lordships that there is one melancholy circumstance connected with our meeting upon this occasion. Since we last met—nay, only a few days ago—a noble Lord, who was one of the most illustrious Members of this House, has passed away from among us—I mean the late Lord Iddesleigh. To all of us it is a severe loss. To me, my Lords, I need not say that, in the circumstances of his death—I having seen it myself, suddenly, in the midst of his work—it left an impression upon my mind which I feel can never be effaced, and which brought home to me keenly that celebrated exclamation of Burke—"What shadows we are; what shadows we pursue!" My Lords, Lord Iddesleigh was well known to many of us; but to this House as a whole he had not had the opportunity of making himself acquainted, and many of your Lordships had had no opportunity of judging of his skill in debate, or of his powers of persuasion. But he was well known—better known, perhaps, than any other statesman of his time—socially, to great numbers of us. He was well known to those of us who have been in the House of Commons as one of its most distinguished ornaments; and he was known to those of us who have sat in the Councils of the Queen as one of the wisest and shrewdest Councillors she has ever had. My Lords, as a friend, as a member of society, he was probably more beloved than any statesman we have seen in our time. His gentle temper, his unfailing high spirits and courteousness, his uniform kindness to all, made him universally appreciated and regarded. As a debater he was known in the other House as one who might not move to passion, but who carried conviction, both by the weight of his arguments and by the force of his character. As a Councillor I should say that he was especially shining. It was those who sat with him in council who valued most the peculiar qualities of his mind. I should note two peculiarities which distinguished him from other men. One was that, from the field of his political vision, the element of personal antagonism was almost—if not entirely—absent. He judged of every question by its merits, and it never seemed to have occurred to him to inquire by whom it had been supported. And another, and not less curious, peculiarity was the remarkable caution of the man—remarkable, I may say, because it was not mere caution. He was eminently cautious—as cautious as any man with whom I have ever conversed—but the peculiarity of it was this, that the caution had in it no shade of timidity. While his temper was cold and abstract, his counsel always erred, if it erred at all, on the side of caution; but when perplexity or real danger arose there was no man who was freer from any counsel of fear than Lord Iddesleigh. This made him a man whose influence within the Cabinet, within the Councils of his Party, was far higher and greater than appeared by his actions in the public eye. This House, and the country, and our Party have lost a wise, a self-restrained, a noble Councillor; his soul was never soiled by any mere vulgar ambition; he devoted his life and his strength, without care for any apparent reward, in the service of his country and his Queen.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, although I cannot speak with the authority of the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) in the eloquent, comprehensive, and touching remarks which he has just made, yet I am sure your Lordships will not object to my adding a few words upon the subject. I apprehend that we all feel that this sudden loss has cast a gloom over our proceedings to-day. The noble Marquess alluded to Sir Stafford Northcote's recent accession to this House. It is not a very long time ago since we welcomed him here, surrounded with an atmosphere of regard and respect, which he accumulated during his long and laborious services in "another place." There is always some danger, when speaking of the death of an eminent man at the time it takes place, of using some exaggeration; but when the noble Marquess spoke of Sir Stafford Northcote's powers in debate, I could not forget that some eight years ago, when speaking of Lord Iddesleigh (then Sir Stafford Northcote), I spoke of him as a formidable foe of 20 years, but a dear friend of many more. Now, with regard to this word "formidable," I have observed that some, while paying a tribute to Sir Stafford Northcote's character and great ability, have spoken of him as something of a feeble opponent. Well, I doubt whether in these days of political warfare lookers-on are always as good judges as those who cross the steel in the fray; and I can only say that often, and often again, I have heard some of the ablest of my political Colleagues in "another place" admire and sometimes complain of the sagacity, the skill, and the readiness with which Sir Stafford Northcote had sustained their attack, and the vigour with which he had returned the blow. My first business connection with Sir Stafford Northcote was some 36 years ago, when, in very difficult times, he agreed to be the Secretary of the Commission of 1851. I may say this, because I know it, that it was the opinion of the late Prince Consort, and of some of the ablest men of the Kingdom who composed that Commission, that no public body ever had a Secretary so able and so useful as Sir Stafford Northcote, so industrious, so accurate was he, and so easily and readily did he dispose of the most difficult questions. Later on Sir Stafford Northcote put me under personal and political obligations. I obtained the sanction of the Queen and of the Prime Minister to offer to him the post of Member of the Commission to America to settle the Alabama Claims. The matter was a difficult one. The Commission was not popular, and the work was almost certain to be severely criticized. Sir Stafford Northcote, with the utmost readiness and with the sanction of Mr. Disraeli, accepted that post. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Ripon) near me can testify to the services which he rendered on that occasion. With his usual modesty, he refused the offers of a high honour made to him. He was willing to co-operate with political opponents for a great public object; but he declined to receive rewards and honours from them. I venture to trust that the remembrance of Sir Stafford Northcote's character will have some effect in diminishing any chance of that bitterness of discussion which sometimes not unnaturally arises in moments of great political excitement.

EARL FORTESCUE: I will not take up your Lordships' time; but I crave indulgence to supplement the touching eulogies that have been pronounced on my departed friend. I just wish to mention that on the last morning of Lord Iddesleigh's truly noble life he told me he had gone through his Foreign Office boxes, and he believed he should leave without a single arrear when he delivered up the Seals of his Office, as he expected to do, to Her Majesty the next day, thus fitly closing his patriotic, distinguished, and most exemplary career.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

The QUEEN'S SPEECH *reported* by The LORD CHANCELLOR.

THE EARL OF ERNE (who wore the uniform of a Lord Lieutenant), in rising to move an Address in reply to Her Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne, said: I have, in the first place, to bespeak at your Lordships' hands that consideration and forbearance which your Lordships invariably extend to those who labour under the disability of addressing you for the first time.

My Lords, it is impossible not to feel that we meet to-day under the shadow of a great loss. It would be presumptuous in me, speaking in the presence of so many of his late Colleagues in the Cabinet, as well as of those who have been so long associated with him, either as allies or opponents in public life, to dwell upon the eminent services rendered to his Party, his country, and his Queen by the late Lord Iddesleigh. But having served under him in an official, though subordinate, position in the House of Commons for eight Sessions, during which time I was brought into daily—I may say hourly—intercourse with him, I may, perhaps, be permitted to say this—that I never knew anyone who possessed in such an unusual degree the power of attracting to himself, not only the admiration and esteem, but the warm personal affection, of all those with whom he was brought into contact. The secret of this power lay in that absolute unselfishness and that rare consideration for the feelings and the wishes of others which were the chief characteristics of his nature. I, for one, can never forget the numberless acts of kindness I received at his hands during the period of my official connection with him. My Lords, his gentle and unselfish spirit has been taken from us, and the nation is the poorer for his loss; but his memory remains a bright example to us and to future generations of all that an English statesman, an English patriot, and an English gentleman should be.

My Lords, this Session, whatever surprises the future may have in store for us, is, in all probability, destined to be memorable as the one which will witness the 50th anniversary of the accession to the Throne of Her Gracious Majesty. This reign has already exceeded in length, with, I believe, but two exceptions, those of all its Predecessors: it has exceeded them all immeasurably in the marvellous strides made in prosperity and in the arts of civilization by the people of this country. Not a little of this progress is due to the noble example set by the Queen, and the tender solicitude invariably exhibited by her for the welfare of her people; and I feel sure that your Lordships will, when the time arrives, join heartily in tendering your congratulations to Her Majesty on the auspicious anniversary, and in prayers for the prolongation of her long and glorious reign.

The opening paragraph of the Speech from the Throne deals, as is customary, with Foreign Affairs, and we are informed that the relations between this country and Foreign Powers continue to be on a friendly footing, and that, in spite of all the disquieting rumours which we have heard of late about the state of Europe, no disturbance of the peace is anticipated from the unsettled state of affairs in its South-Eastern regions. While yielding to none in admiration of the heroism exhibited by Prince Alexander of Bulgaria, in recognition of his devotion to the interests of his adopted country, and in condemnation of the cruel and cowardly outrages which accompanied his dethronement, your Lordships will hardly expect that this country will embark in any Quixotic enterprize for his restoration; but you will doubtless await with patience the time when we shall be called upon, in common with the other Powers of Europe, to give our assent to the election of his Successor in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin.

The condition of Egypt has been for a long time the source of much anxiety. We have heard of late with satisfaction that it has been considered safe to materially reduce the number of British troops in that country; and I think we may now fairly look forward to the time when, owing to the restoration of internal tranquillity and financial stability, it will be possible for us to withdraw altogether, and to leave that country to develop of itself those resources with which Nature has so abundantly furnished her.

Your Lordships will be glad to hear that the operations in Burmah, which, as I may recall with pride, were initiated and are being brought to a conclusion by two eminent Irishmen, are progressing satisfactorily. Operations of this nature, small though they may appear, cannot fail to be a drain on the resources of the country which conducts them; but I believe that this drain will be more than compensated for by the stability which the pacification of Burmah will confer upon the frontiers of our Indian Empire adjacent to it.

Passing by the subject of the Commercial Treaties with Greece and Roumania, which, I have no doubt, will realize the benefits anticipated from them. I must now turn to a less agreeable topic, but one which, nevertheless, monopolizes the greatest share of public attention at the present time. The state of Ireland for many years—though at times there have been gleams of sunshine and glimpses of improvement—has not been an agreeable subject for one like myself to dwell upon—one who was born there, who has lived among the people, and who hopes to be permitted to spend the remainder of his life amongst them; but I believe that I should be unworthy of the trust which has been committed to me, were I to fail to speak out what I believe to be the truth on this subject, however painful it may be to me to do so.

My Lords, to rightly appreciate the state of affairs now existing in Ireland it is necessary to go back to what happened at the last General Election. At that time the constituencies of this country, constituencies but recently established upon the broadest and most democratic basis, declared by an unmistakable majority—a majority which, I fully believe, but for the magic of one great name, would have been largely increased—that the Union as heretofore existing between Great Britain and Ireland should be preserved. Charged with this mandate the present Government came into power, and, indeed, the maintenance of the Union may be said to be the reason of their existence; and for a time it seemed as if the Irish people as a whole had accepted the verdict of the nation, and that a new era of peace and prosperity was about to dawn. Crime diminished; rents began to be paid with greater punctuality; and the tenant farmers began to avail themselves of the facilities for acquiring the fee simple of their holdings provided by the Land Purchase Act of my noble and learned Friend the Lord Chancellor of Ireland (Lord Ashbourne). But this state of things did not suit the Irish agitators, or their allies on this side of the water. A peaceful and a prosperous Ireland would mean, for them, their occupation gone, and their sources of wealth from the other side of the Atlantic dried up. They also saw that as long as the alliance between the two sections of the Unionist Party remained intact their chances of attaining the object of their desires—the Repeal of the Union—was *nil.* They therefore invented the notorious Plan of Campaign, with the deliberate object of driving a wedge into the ranks of the Unionist Party, in the hope that by raising the agrarian cry they might detach from it those of its Members whose views upon questions of land were more advanced than the rest. My Lords, if there is any country in the civilized world in which the raising of an agrarian agitation is utterly unjustifiable, that country is Ireland. The Irish tenant holds an unique position among occupiers of the soil, and enjoys advantages conferred upon him at the expense of the landlord which tenants elsewhere may well envy. Not only is he secured against his rent being raised on account of improvements executed by himself or his predecessors in title—though a distinguished Member of the Government which passed the last Land Act, recently writing in a periodical, seems to be ignorant of the fact—not only can he sell these improvements, together with the goodwill of his holding, to the highest bidder, but if he considers his rent excessive he can go into Court and have it fixed by a tribunal specially appointed for the purpose. With tenants thus situated, the authors of the Plan of Campaign step in and deliberately supersede the law. They tell them that they are not to pay a rent agreed upon between themselves and their landlords, or fixed by a judicial tribunal, as the case may be, but only so much of it as they choose or are advised to offer; and if the landlord has a spark of spirit in him, and refuses to be dictated to, he may go without his money. I ask, was there ever such an audacious and impudent travesty and mockery of right and justice? My Lords, I feel that it is unnecessary for me to enter at length into a denunciation of these tactics; they have been declared to be an illegal and criminal conspiracy by the highest tribunal in the land, the Court of Queen's Bench—they have been condemned as immoral by the preponderance of public opinion in this country. My Lords, on an occasion like this, I should wish, as far as possible, to avoid any observations of a recriminatory character; but I cannot help saying that I hope that during the course of the debate on the Address in this or the other House of Parliament we shall be favoured with a more explicit and emphatic condemnation of the Plan of Campaign by the responsible Leaders of the Opposition than has been hitherto vouchsafed to us.

My Lords, Her Majesty's Government have been blamed for not having acted with more vigour and promptitude in grappling with this movement, and I think even their strongest opponents will admit that they have strained the virtues of patience and forbearance to bursting point; but it must be always borne in mind that there is one great initial difficulty that every Government in Ireland, armed only with the ordinary powers conferred by law, has to face; and it is this—that the public mind has been so debauched and demoralized by a long series of pernicious and immoral agitation that resistance to the law and repudiation of debts has come to be looked upon in large portions of the country not only as not a crime, but as something laudable and praiseworthy, and that the class of men from whom common jurors are drawn have been either so taught to disregard the solemn obligations of an oath, or so intimidated, if they are suspected of a disposition to pay heed to it, that in cases of an agrarian or political character, trial by jury, in all but a few favoured spots, has become nothing short of a farce.

I remember last year that my noble Friend the noble Duke (the Duke of Abercorn), who on that occasion performed the task now allotted to me, gave your Lordships a very graphic description of the terrible state to which the unfortunate people were reduced who came under the operation of what is known as the system of "Boycotting," and dwelt with considerable force upon the horrors of that system. My Lords, I will not travel over the same ground again; but I can assure your Lordships that that system still continues in full force in many parts of the country, though so complete is the reign of terror that has been established that its victims bow to its decrees without resistance, and we consequently do not hear so much of it as we otherwise would. My Lords, I do not, of course, pretend to know what the proposals with regard to the changes in the form of legal procedure alluded to in this paragraph may be; but I hope they may be found to give more summary powers in dealing with "Boycotting," and also that they will provide for some alteration in the mode of trial by jury, whether by change of venue, the empannelling of special juries, and, in extreme cases, the abolition of trial by jury altogether, and the substitution for it of trial by Judges. But advantageous as these changes, if carried out, will be, I cannot conceal my opinion that no real good will be effected till the National League has been declared to be an illegal organization, and suppressed as such, in the same way that the late lamented Mr. Forster crushed its prototype and predecessor, the Land League.

My Lords, in carrying out the task which they have imposed upon themselves, Her Majesty's Government will receive the support of all the best elements of society in Ireland. Though a Member of your Lordships' House, I can speak in a representative capacity: I can speak as the elected head of a large and powerful body of men, long distinguished for their enthusiastic loyalty and their devoted attachment to the cause of the Union. But, above and beyond these, I can speak for the whole body of Irish Loyalists, the English "Garrison," as they have been contemptuously called, whether Catholic or Protestant, Whig or Tory, landlord or merchant, farmer or shopkeeper, labourer or artizan. My Lords, I venture to say that this community has given, in proportion to its numbers, more soldiers and statesmen, who have contributed to build up and maintain the greatness of the Empire, than any community which that Empire contains. On these grounds, if on no other, they have a claim to appeal to this country for assistance and protection; but on far wider and far higher grounds—on grounds of truth, and right, and justice—I appeal to your Lordships, on their behalf, to assist the Government in putting an end to a state of things which is a scandal to civilization and a danger to the Empire, and I am confident I shall not appeal in vain.

The next paragraph of the Speech refers to the Commissions which were appointed last autumn to inquire into matters relating to the development of the resources of Ireland; and we are told that the Report of that Commission, to which the question of Land Purchase was specially referred, will shortly be laid before us. I hope we may have early legislation in the direction of the extension of the Land Purchase Act of 1885. There is no use in denying the fact that whatever may have been the advantages conferred upon the tenants by recent Land Acts, the relations between them and their landlords have been thereby brought into a state of hopeless muddle and confusion; and it is impossible that the resources of the land can be properly developed till the dual ownership now existing is abolished, and the land reverts again into single hands. I believe your Lordships will agree that in the extension of the provisions of this Act the only solution—if a solution be practicable—of the land difficulty in Ireland is to be found. But of this I must warn the Government—that such is the demoralization now prevailing in Ireland, that I know for a fact that many tenants who have purchased their holdings under my noble and learned Friend's Act are openly proclaiming their intention of repudiating the repayment of the instalments of the purchase money, and that unless the law be enforced and the fulfilment of contracts made obligatory there will be the same difficulty in collecting their instalments as there now is in collecting rents; and in that case I should advise your Lordships, in the interests of the taxpayers, to have nothing to do with Land Purchase.

I shall touch but briefly on the remaining topics mentioned in the Speech. I am deeply sensible of the kindness your Lordships have extended to me—a kindness which I feel all the more, as I cannot but be aware that some of the observations I have felt it my duty to make cannot have been very palatable to all of your Lordships, and I am anxious not to abuse your forbearance; but I may, perhaps, be permitted to notice with satisfaction that the subject of Local Government occupies a prominent place in the Queen's Speech. I believe it will be admitted on all hands that the time has arrived—if, indeed, it had not arrived long ago—when the elective element may be safely entrusted with the management of local affairs in counties in England and Wales; at the same time, I hope that place may still be found for that body which has hitherto controlled them with so much credit to themselves and advantage to the community. I observe in this paragraph, what I may call a pious aspiration, that it may be possible to deal with Local Government in Ireland and Scotland also; but from my experience of Business in the other House of Parliament I fear I should be exciting false hopes in your Lordships' breasts were I to hold out an expectation that effective legislation in that quarter were possible, for this Session at all events.

My Lords, the success which has attended the operations of what is known as Lord Cairns's Act shows that questions of Land Transfer and Allotments are such as can be dealt with advantageously by the Conservative Party; and I believe that changes in this direction will be found to strengthen the tenure of that kind of property in which your Lordships are chiefly interested. But, my Lords, I believe the country has no great inclination at the present time to attend to these and to other minor details of legislation. Two things are principally expected of Her Majesty's Government: that they should maintain the honour and interests of the Empire abroad and its unity and integrity at home; and in the full belief and expectation that in carrying out this policy they will be supported by a large majority of your Lordships' House, as I am sure they will be by the majority of the people of the country, I have now the honour to move the adoption of the humble Address in answer to the Gracious Speech from the Throne.

VISCOUNT TORRINGTON (who was attired in the uniform of an officer of the Rifle Brigade), in rising to second the Motion, said: My Lords, I crave your indulgence for a brief period, while I venture to draw your attention to some important points dwelt upon in Her Most Gracious Majesty's Speech.

My noble Friend who has just so eloquently addressed your Lordships has dealt so fully with the Irish Question that I scarcely like to trespass upon your time while I add my testimony, based on many years' official experience on the Staff in Ireland, to the anarchic state of that unfortunate country. Ireland continues to groan under a cruel, tyrannical, and inhuman despotism exercised by the National League, rendering insecure the lives, liberties, and property of the law-abiding, and crushing out from among the people of that unhappy island even the very vestiges of civilization. The Irish, though impulsive, and easily led astray by unscrupulous agitators, practising chiefly on their cupidity, can be converted into peaceable and orderly citizens by firm and consistent government; and it is this course which I rejoice to see Her Majesty's Government are determined unflinchingly to follow. My Lords, the recent attack on the citadel of the Constitution has failed through the laudable and patriotic co-operation of the Liberal Unionists; and it only needs now the strict and continuous administration of the law, equally in all parts of the Kingdom, to enable us to maintain intact the existing Union, which has added so much in the past to the greatness, prosperity, and even the security of both countries.

This desire to maintain the existing Union naturally causes our thoughts to turn to the hope of Imperial Federation, which would bind together the Mother Country and her Colonies and Dependencies in the enduring bonds of mutual protection and advancement, and retain them in the paths of peace and prosperity. It is the hope of many, and, indeed, the belief, that this result will be surely, although gradually, brought about. The realization of this hope will, no doubt, be materially aided by the beneficent action of the Imperial Institute.

My Lords, when we regard foreign affairs, it is gratifying to note that the survey of the situation is pacific and reassuring. But, as practical people, we cannot banish from our minds the deplorable and perilous tension under which the Continental Powers are kept through their colossal armaments—ready at a moment's notice to take the field. Our policy is based on a desire for peace and the loyal fulfilment of the stipulations of existing Treaties; but, in order to realize these aims, we must take care that our Army and Navy are kept in the most efficient condition to meet all possible contingencies, our motto being that of our Volunteers, "Defence, not Defiance."

The preposterous rumour that anyone in authority in this country contemplated interfering in the election of a Ruler for the Bulgarian Principality has been most emphatically disclaimed; and it is scarcely necessary for me to add that, where British interests are not primarily and immediately involved, the initiative is no part of our duty.

Egypt would make rapid progress, both moral and material, if all those who profess to be interested in her welfare were to co-operate loyally in England's self-denying policy.

My gallant Friend (Sir Frederick Roberts), with that force of character and those high military qualities of the possession of which he has shown so many signal proofs, aided by the valour and endurance of our troops, both Native and European, and assisted by incomparable Administrations drawn from the Civil Service of India, will, ere long, bring about the pacification and settlement of Upper Burmah, and, by bestowing upon its people the blessings of civilized government, render them as contented and prosperous as their kinsmen in the neighbouring Province.

I feel convinced, my Lords, that the country is thoroughly in accord with Her Majesty's Government as to the propriety of the course they propose to pursue with regard to the various matters of domestic legislation mentioned in the Speech; and I venture to think that from no quarter in the House will serious exception be taken to the measures to be brought before your Lordships.

My Lords, before resuming my seat, I will, with your permission, touch on an absorbing topic. The nation is to be congratulated that not only we in the United Kingdom, but those our fellow-subjects throughout the wide Dominions of this Empire, are permitted by God's Providence to celebrate the 50th anniversary of our beloved Queen's most happy reign. Our hearts beat in unison, and the prayer "God bless her" is offered up through the length and breadth of her glorious Empire by a loyal and affectionate people. My Lords, in conclusion I beg to second the Address moved by my noble Friend (the Earl of Erne).

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, I have listened with interest and pleasure to the speeches made by the noble Earl the Mover of the Address and the distinguished officer who seconded the Motion; and I congratulate the noble Marquess on his having been able this year, unlike last year, to find two independent and unsalaried Peers who would consent to do the work so well. The noble Earl, I know, is an old Parliamentary hand, and I am not entitled to pay a compliment to him; but I must say that I was very much struck by what he said, even when I differed from him. My second-hand information about Ireland does not agree with his; but all the same, and making allowance for what he may have been prompted to say as the head of the Orange Party, I must say the general tone of his speech was good, and, I thought, an appropriate opening to this debate. Then his remarks with respect to the late Earl of Iddesleigh were especially touching. Both the noble Lords in their speeches supplied an omission in the Royal Speech, which contains no allusion whatever to the coming interesting Jubilee of Her Majesty's long reign. My Lords, the opening of Parliament exemplifies to a great degree the glorious, though sometimes lamentable, uncertainty of political affairs. None of your Lordships could have imagined two weeks ago the position in which the Government present themselves to Parliament to-day. The noble Earl has said that we require a strong Government, and I quite agree that that is the case, particularly with reference to the position of foreign affairs and the condition of Ireland. I have heard it stated quite lately, not only that the Government is strong, but that it is stronger than before the resignation of the late Leader of the House of Commons and Chancellor of the Exchequer. I admit that it has one very great element of strength, that of being able, with the assistance of a Liberal minority, to command, for the present at any rate, the support of a large majority in the House of Commons. I also admit that the accession to the Government of a man of the high character and ability possessed by Mr. Goschen is a further element of strength. On all sides there seems to be an agreement that it is good for the country, good for himself, and good for us whom he has left, that he should have joined the Government. I very much agree with that. In some points Mr. Goschen is more Liberal than those whom he joins. He has himself said that he differs from the Conservative Party on four out of five questions; but I am of opinion—and I do not think I am wrong—that on some of the best points of Conservatism he is a sounder Conservative than many of the Leaders of the great Conservative Party itself. There is one point on which he may have some difficulty. No one has described so well that the present Government is a Government on sufferance. He stated emphatically at Willis's Rooms that the Ministers had the Offices, but Lord Hartington had the whole power. Now, if any difference arises—and differences will arise among the best of friends—what will Mr. Goschen have to do? Will he side with the man who has the Office, or with him who has the power? Now, my Lords, beyond the two points I have mentioned I fail to see how the strength of Her Majesty's Government has been greatly increased. We were told up to a recent period that Lord Randolph Churchill was the second most important—that he was the most brilliant and popular Member of the Government. He left the Government upon a difference, or differences, as to which we shall be fully informed this evening by his statements, and by those of the noble Marquess and of Mr. Smith. I cannot tell how far these statements will justify the assurance we used to receive of the united harmony of the Government. The step the noble Marquess at once took showed his own sense of the great loss he sustained. He approached Lord Hartington again. Discounting as much as you like what the instinct of self-preservation and political tenacity of life may do, there is no doubt that the subordination of all personal claims to his wish to strengthen the Government was highly creditable to him; but it was, to a certain degree, an acknowledgment of the weakness of the Conservative Party, and we have heard rumours that it was felt as such by some of them. Lord Hartington refused. Although he might like the flag with a motto on it which seemed to us to be delusive, he did not wish to put on the uniform, or the livery, as the case may be. His refusal cannot be said to have strengthened the Government. It was then almost ostentatiously announced that an offer had been made to a noble Earl, a Friend and late Colleague of mine, and that a Transatlantic message had been sent to Lord Lansdowne to the same effect. These were very judicious offers; but on what grounds it was thought that they were likely to accept after Lord Hartington's refusal is not clear. Then, as to the lamented death of Lord Iddesleigh. We all know ourselves, and it is impossible, after the touching testimony the noble Marquess gave of his value as a Colleague, not to feel that his loss is anything but a gain to Her Majesty's Government. There is another point connected with the reconstruction of the Government to which some attention has been directed. I remember alluding to it some 15 months ago, and I regret that I did not then bring it to the full consideration of your Lordships' House—I mean the transfer, with salary, of the sinecure Office of First Lord of the Treasury to another Minister — a proceeding which is a fine example of the Tory Democratic contempt for all tradition, and especially when, in addition to this, there is a combination of the Offices of Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary. Now, I believe that this combination is bad for the country, bad for the Sovereign, bad for the Cabinet, and most unfair to the noble Marquess himself. I have had some opportunities of observing the work of the Prime Minister. It is true that at some moments it is not overwhelming. But there are periods when, almost every hour of the day, the Prime Minister is required to advise the Queen, to maintain harmony in the

Cabinet, to regulate the action of the Departments, to superintend the preparation of legislation, to watch over the Parliamentary proceedings of both Houses. When I first entered the Foreign Office, in a subordinate capacity, the despatches were some 17,000 in the year. When I succeeded Lord Palmerston for two months, in 1851 and 1852, they had risen to 34,000. In 1870 I believe they were 70,000, and—the noble Marquess will correct me—I am informed they have now risen to more than 90,000. Lord Palmerston told us that the routine work took him eight hours a-day, and this exclusive of diplomatic conversations, Parliamentary attendance, and the performance of all Court and social duties. Now, of all the Offices I have ever known the Foreign Office is the one in which it is least possible for the Secretary of State to remain ignorant of the general work of the Office. He would be found out in a week. It is not possible for a man to have the mental and physical strength to carry on the two Offices in their full operation. My Lords, I should have thought that the ablest man would have felt the great advantage of having a competent statesman with whom to advise on all important questions. It frequently happens that the mere suggestion of the omission of a sentence, or even of a word, of a despatch prevents great and complicated evils from arising. With regard to the Sovereign, I think it is wrong that the authority upon which His or Her Majesty place their commands should be limited in this way to one person. I am sure it is bad for the country that one man should unite so much unchecked power in his hands. My noble Friends who have been in Office know that when Parliament is not sitting and when the Cabinet is dispersed the noble Marquess is in almost absolute command. It is perfectly impossible that one man can bear that great responsibility. I know the noble Marquess's ability—his intellectual activity. That only makes it more certain that he will soon break down. I never meet a well-known blue brougham but I say—"See, he has not time to walk even from Arlington Street to Downing Street." There is another remark which I cannot help making. I saw it recorded during the autumn that Foreign Ministers and Ambassadors used to visit the Prime Minister immediately after seeing the Foreign Minister. Lord Aberdeen, Lord Palmerston, Lord John Russell, and Mr. Gladstone always set their faces against this practice except on special occasions. It is quite clear that the foreign Representatives like it very much, as it gives them two strings to their bow, and enables them to write much longer and more interesting despatches. But this way of doing business is unfair to the Secretary of State, and is certainly not favourable to the Public Service. I am old-fashioned enough to think that the really good system is for the Foreign Minister to do the work of the Foreign Office, subject to the general superintendence of the Prime Minister. The reconstruction of the Government is a matter of great importance. We are, however, imperfectly informed as to the future proceedings of the Government until we hear the noble Marquess's statement. At the beginning of October we had a remarkable speech from the then Leader of the House of Commons at Dartford, in which he described the future policy of the Government. That speech was praised by the Conservative Press, and was joyfully accepted by the Liberals as an indication that the Government were adopting a Liberal, almost a Radical, policy. As far as I remember, the noble Lord promised greatly to reduce expenditure and taxation. He promised a reversal of Lord Palmerston's foreign policy in the East, as no longer suitable for this country; he promised a Local Government Bill, which should not be tampered with; he promised that the House of Commons should be enabled by the Government to fulfil their pledges to the agricultural labourers on the lines of Mr. Jesse Collings's proposals; and with regard to Ireland he promised that this Session the Government would lay the foundation of measures of local government, which no Government and no Party could shirk. My Lords, it may be said that it is hardly fair to quote a noble Lord who has, unfortunately, been since shown to have decided differences from his Colleagues. If I remember rightly, the noble Lord at the end of October made a speech at Bradford in which he entirely confirmed what he had previously said, and which, he said, was merely a repetition of the Prime Minister's speech made a year ago. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach in his Bristol speech made no objection, and said that the Government would fulfil all the pledges which they had given to the Radical constituencies. But another Member of the Government was still more explicit, no less a person than the present Leader of the House of Commons, whose word is respected by all. He spoke after both of Lord Randolph's two speeches. Did he repudiate on behalf of the Government what the noble Lord had said? You shall hear—

> "I cannot undertake to tell you what is the whole policy of Her Majesty's Government upon every possible question, still less to repeat to you all that has been said with such infinite skill, power, and completeness by my noble Colleague and Leader in the House of Commons, Lord Randolph Churchill. The noble Lord has told you what are the views of Her Majesty's Government upon most of the important questions of the day, and it will not surprise you to hear that Her Majesty's Government are agreed one with another. When Lord Randolph Churchill speaks, he speaks with the full assent, knowledge, and consent of all his Colleagues in the Cabinet."

Then comes a little cut at poor us—

> "Without drawing invidious distinctions, this has not always been the case with recent Governments. We are a united Government, and we are determined to serve the country as a united Government as long as we can do so. When we can be no longer united, we will go and shall cease to be a Government."

Though this latter threat has not been carried out, the whole extract proves conclusively that on the last day of October the policy of the Government on finance, on foreign policy, on cows and acres, and on local government, both in England and Ireland, was such as I have quoted from Lord Randolph's speeches. Now, judging by the light of later events, it does not seem probable that this policy will be carried out. It is quite true that there is a promise of a Local Government Bill; but there is no indication whether it is to be Lord Randolph Churchill's Bill or Mr. Long's, or that which was shadowed forth by Mr. Balfour. There is nothing, moreover, in the Queen's Speech which indicates whether there is to be a complete reversal of the spirited foreign policy of which we have heard so much. As to the great reduction promised by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer and the present Leader of the House of Commons in expenditure and taxation, we have now nothing but a vague and unmeaning phrase about efficiency and economy. I have only a word to say on the Colonies, which are entirely omitted from the Speech, though there are Colonial matters of urgent importance. I should be glad to know what progress has been made with the questions concerning the Samoa Islands, the New Hebrides, and the claims of Germans and Portuguese in the centre of Africa. There are also the two old festering questions of a triangular character with the United States and with France as to the North American fisheries. I had hoped that before this we should have been informed of some advance which does not brook much delay. A Conference has been announced of an inter-colonial character. There may be some doubt as to immediate practical results; but such communications, under the Presidency of men of judgment and tact like Mr. Stanhope or Sir Henry Holland, cannot but be useful. I do not wish to say much upon foreign affairs. I desire to press for no information beyond what the noble Marquess thinks it is right to afford, as he must be fully aware of our anxiety to hear all that can properly be told. The great military nations of the Continent have certainly pushed the principle of the due preparation for war, being the best preservative of peace, almost to the bending point. I look with great hope to the noble Marquess being able to give some soothing assurances on this point. In Egypt measures originated during Mr. Gladstone's last Administration but one seem to be making some, though slow, progress. We have always rejoiced that circumstances have brought the Government into general agreement with the doctrines we have always held as to the Balkan Peninsula. I cannot speak with the same satisfaction of a speech made by the noble Marquess on this subject at the Guildhall. It was much cheered in the City, and it was praised by his supporters; but the result of it on the Continent seems to have been that Russia felt herself deeply insulted; that Germany, the most powerful factor in the matter, thought herself ignored; and that Austria believed she had been told that she was mistress of the situation, and was sure, in whatever course she took, to be blindly followed by us.

Your Lordships will, perhaps, bear with me, if I make a few observations as to the state of Ireland. The Speech deplores the present relations between landlords and tenants, but states that great crimes are scarcer in Ireland than during "the preceding year." I believe that instead of the preceding year "the preceding five or six years" might have been used. The noble Earl (the Earl of Erne) attributed this to the vigour of the Government; but I have been informed, by persons who have been close and watchful observers, that absence of severe crime is much more owing to the encouragement which Ireland has received by the sympathy of a large number of persons in England and Scotland, that has induced them to believe that it is not necessary to have recourse to violence. The Irish should know that anything in the nature of violence or outrage, if I may be allowed to use a cynical quotation, "is not merely a crime, but a blunder." There is no course which could more absolutely alienate the sympathy of this country than any resort to such lamentable courses. The noble Lord attacked his political opponents by saying that they had not been sufficiently active in denouncing the Plan of Campaign. I do not think that we shall hear this attack from the Front Bench, for two reasons—first, that when noble Lords on the other side were themselves in Opposition, they absolutely refused to give the slightest repudiation of the inducements which were undoubtedly offered to the Orangemen to do that which was contrary to the law, and when in Office they remained perfectly quiescent for two months in the face of the Plan of Campaign, waiting for others to denounce that which they themselves believed to be illegal and immoral. I do not myself think that Her Majesty's Government can be acquitted of all responsibility in connection with the Plan of Campaign and with eviction. The noble Marquess will remember that last year he alluded to the statement that it was said that prices had fallen so low as to make payment of rent impossible; and he said he entirely refused to admit that statement in its full extent. But in the other House of Parliament Her Majesty's Government strenuously opposed Mr. Parnell's Bill of last Session, which, whether it was right or was wrong, would certainly have prevented many evictions from taking place. They utterly denied that the fall of prices made it difficult for the tenants to pay their rents, although that denial was perfectly inconsistent with their own action in appointing a Commission of Inquiry into the subject; and they added that there was no danger of evictions, because the Government would be able to deal with the question after the Commission had reported and before evictions could practically take place. In supporting the second reading of Mr. Parnell's Bill, Mr. Gladstone carefully stated that he did not agree with all its details; but he said that he thought, the Government having admitted the principle of the Bill by appointing the Commission of Inquiry into the facts, it was undesirable that evictions should, in the meantime, take place in the case of persons who were utterly unable to pay their rent. Her Majesty's Government now propose, as far as I can make out, to meet the present lamentable state of affairs by a measure for improving the procedure of the Criminal Law. It is a grave matter for a Government to apply for increased powers, and an equal responsibility rests with the Opposition how to deal with such a demand. Now, this Bill may be a great or a small matter; it may be good or bad; it may be inefficient, or it may affect the liberties of the subject; it may be exceptional, applied to Ireland alone, or it may apply to England and Scotland as well. Your Lordships will approve of my not anticipating the proper moment for such a discussion. But I must remind your Lordships that the Government, in "another place," more than once during the last Session, distinctly pledged themselves to simultaneous action as to any legislation regarding the local government of England, Scotland, and Ireland. By the Speech we are promised a measure at a very early period dealing with England and Scotland; but as the question of a Bill for local government in Ireland is relegated, not, indeed, to the end of 20 years of resolute administration, but to a perfectly vague and shadowy future, it is sad to consider the relations which now exist between the landlords and tenants of Ireland. I do not think you will do me the injustice of doubting that we all feel the deepest sympathy with the large majority of landlords, of whom so great a number of the best are in this House, and who have done so much, by moderation and forbearance, to meet the circumstances of the case. I am afraid that if I were to appeal to them whether they think Mr. Gladstone and his political Friends understand Ireland and know how to govern it, they would give an unfavourable answer. [" Hear, hear! "] I thought so. But I put to them exactly the same question with regard to Her Majesty's present Government. I would ask them whether there is any independent unofficial Irish Peer in this House who will get up in his place and state that he can honestly and sincerely declare that, in his opinion, Her Majesty's present Government know how to deal with the government of Ireland, and have shown that they have that knowledge by the way that they have administered the affairs of Ireland, either during the late or the present Administration? If no Peer is chivalrous enough to respond, I would put to them the logical inference. If they believe that neither of the two great Parties of English public men are able or willing to govern Ireland as it properly should be governed, would it not be desirable to consider whether they themselves, in conjunction with our Irish fellow-subjects, should not attempt the task?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): It is my pleasant duty to express the gratification and admiration with which I am sure we all listened to the speeches of the noble Lords behind us (the Earl of Erne and Viscount Torrington). The speech of the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) has been more addressed to the condition of the Government than to the contents of Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, and I will try, as far as I can, to ease his mind on some points in respect to which the present condition of Her Majesty's Government moves his disinterested concern; and, in doing so, I am bound to say that though he exercised his duty as an opponent in attacking all our weaknesses in places where he thought we were weak, he did so in a kindly spirit to myself, which I, of course, acknowledge. But I am afraid he is too much in the habit of believing all that he reads in the newspapers. He seems to imagine that we sent an ostentatious offer to one noble Lord, and a sensational kind of telegram to another noble Lord, and he proceeded to make a charge against Her Majesty's Government that we were anxious to advertise our doings. I can assure him that if we had been anxious and able to hide our light under a bushel on that occasion we should have been very glad to do so. In the same way the noble Earl has found somewhere or other, in some strange place, an assertion that the present Government are considerably stronger because they have lost the services of a very distinguished orator who was the Leader of the House of Commons when it last met. I can assure him such an idea has never entered into the mind of the Government. We fully recognize the great loss we have suffered. We believe that though the cause of difference which separates us is deep, it is not likely to grow more extensive. My noble Friend (Lord Randolph Churchill) undoubtedly was deeply impressed, in the Office of Chancellor of the Exchequer—which, from all that reaches me, he filled with remarkable ability and skill—with that which must have impressed most men who have long taken an interest in public affairs—namely, the rapid and most injurious rise in the public expenditure. There is no one who has given his attention to the subject who has not felt a desire to find some way by which that expenditure might be lowered. We did not differ from my noble Friend in that; but he resigned upon this point—that he desired to give expression to his most patriotic and laudable wish for economy by a process which seemed to us to be so rough and so indiscriminate that it would not attain the end of economy, but, on the other hand, would have a very injurious effect on the efficiency of the Public Service. We were not prepared to cut off a considerable lump sum from the Estimates which my right hon. Friends at the head of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) and the War Office (Mr. W. H. Smith) declared to be necessary for the defence of the country; and our feeling of the necessity, at whatever sacrifice, of holding to that view was and is stimulated by the aspect of affairs all over the world, and by the evidence, to which no one could shut his eyes, that a time of a critical character might be before us. But I assure the noble Earl he is entirely wrong in thinking that we came to that resolution without the deepest sense of the loss that we were incurring; and I venture to hope that the difference of opinion that separates us is not one of a permanent description, and that the Conservative Party in the future will have the advantage of the services of my noble Friend. But the criticisms of the noble Earl on the condition of the Government did not stay there. He made many pokes in his own playful fashion into the sides of his Friend Mr. Goschen. Mr. Goschen knows the noble Earl's mode of warfare, and he is competent to defend himself; but with respect to Mr. Goschen, I will honestly confess that, after the great loss we have suffered, I conceive it to be a matter of the most extreme importance to obtain his assistance, and I should have been glad if I could have obtained the assistance of more of those who hold the opinions we do on the subject of the Union with Ireland. I feel it to be of great importance, not only that we should bring into the service of the Government Mr. Goschen's unequalled powers as a financier—and I must say that during a long period of Opposition I have never uttered a word, as far as I know, to the detriment of those powers—but also that we should mark before the public eye, and establish in the warfare of the House of Commons, the fact that, for the moment, the guardianship of the Union supersedes every other subject of political interest, and that in the presence of that one great necessity all conflicts over past differences, all minor subjects of controversy, must be silent. The noble Earl seems to think that it was a sign of great weakness, and something of humiliation, that I addressed myself to noble Lords who were not in the Government, asking them to join us. Has he never been in a Government which has asked those outside to join them?

Earl GRANVILLE: Yes; but it did not strengthen us.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: Of course, the noble Earl is an authority on that point. I remember that one of those he applied to was Mr. Gladstone, and I quite admit the comment he has just made—that it did not strengthen them. It is a common effort on the part of those who have the charge of recommending Advisers to Her Majesty—it is their duty—to bring in as many as can agree upon the main, burning questions of the day; and if you will consider it you will see that our system of dividing politicians into two Parties cannot be worked at all, unless you allow that those two Parties shall be arranged according to their opinions on the main subjects which divide men at the moment. You cannot expect to divide the political world into two halves, and that each half on all possible subjects shall think the same. It would be an ideal and impossible state of things. But if you look into the history of this country since Parliamentary Government began you will find that Parties range themselves, not according to their opinions on 20 smaller subjects which might occupy a portion of their time, but on some one great issue by which men's minds were turned. First, it was a dynastic issue; later on you had the American War; then you had the French Revolution; then you had the great question of Reform; next, the great question of Protection; now we have the great question of Ireland. So it has been from the first. The great question of the day has been accepted as the dividing line which is to separate the Ministry from the Opposition, and men have joined together, by reason of their agreement on that great question, without regard to the other subsidiary questions on which they are divided. I do not recognize the accuracy of the quotation in which the noble Earl said that Mr. Goschen and we differed in four questions out of five. Even if that had been true, and that fifth had been the Union with Ireland, I should have said he did right to join us. Then the noble Earl proceeds to criticize the Ministerial arrangements which were necessary in consequence of that junction. When you have a great object to pursue you must arrange your Offices in order to attain it. Mr. Goschen, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, under the circumstances, could hardly have been Leader of the House of Commons. It was necessary to provide an Office for the Leader of the House of Commons, and the only Office available was that which I filled—the First Lord of the Treasury—and therefore it was necessary that I should take another. The noble Earl seems to think that Mr. Smith will have a sinecure. My impression is that the Leadership of the House of Commons is no sinecure for anyone who undertakes it. He will have plenty of work for one man, and will earn his salary. But with respect to myself, I am grateful to the noble Earl for the care he has shown in regard to my health, and I will try to avoid the various pitfalls he has pointed out to me; but I cannot help thinking that his description of what goes on at the Foreign Office was drawn from recollections a little more remote than the present day. I am aware he was at the Foreign Office at a recent period; but he has formed his ideas of the Office a little earlier. The work has been diminished since Lord Palmerston's day by the fact of two Under Secretaries having been appointed, and the use of the telegraph has very much diminished the number of important despatches. That same circumstance takes away a disadvantage to which the noble Earl pointed, which I should be the first to recognize—namely, that there is only one mind, in a case where the Prime Minister is also Foreign Secretary, addressed to the determination of the various burning questions which come up for decision. Of course, when you only used despatches those despatches did not reach the other Members of the Cabinet for some considerable time, and the check on the Foreign Minister, except in regard to the widest principles of policy, was not very active or efficient. But that is all changed now. The practical business of the Office is now nearly all done by the telegraph; and the telegrams are seen, as the noble Earl knows, by all the Members of the Cabinet about as fast as they arrive. The knowledge of what is done is prompt and intimate to all the Members of the Cabinet, and the Foreign Minister is 20 times more under the control of his Colleagues than he was in the time of Lord Palmerston. Lord Palmerston was practically supreme, and the control over the Prime Minister was a very imaginary control indeed. The control which Lord John Russell, during the Ministry of 1847-1852, exercised over Lord Palmerston until the very last hour was, I imagine, as slight as any control could be. But in the present day, from the entire change which has been brought about by the telegraph, I do not think that the apprehensions of the noble Earl have any foundation, and I believe that my Colleagues have the fullest opportunity of controlling everything that I can do. I think it right to make these observations—though we do not usually discuss what goes on in the Foreign Office—because it would be a very unfortunate doctrine to go abroad that the Foreign Minister was without check in exercising his very important functions. The noble Lord then turned to matters in the Gracious Speech from the Throne. He did not give much of his attention to them, and the observations that he made do not call for any very particular reply from me. In respect to Ireland, I confess I deeply regret that we did not have from the noble Earl any kind of condemnation of the Plan of Campaign. I think, considering the sanction that it has received from persons in high ecclesiastical positions from whom we should have expected a very different doctrine—considering how it has received the support of the whole of that Irish Party which has been accepted by the Opposition as their strongest support and surest alliance, considering how it is supplanted in that very doctrine of Home Rule which noble Lords opposite accepted as a panacea for Ireland—I think we had a right to expect some opinion from them, and to know whether the inheritors of some of the proudest traditions of English statesmen did or did not falter in their denunciation of a scheme of deliberate robbery. I am told that the change that has taken place, or that took place for a time, in the rate of crime in Ireland was due to no Government action of ours, but was due to the promises of concessions of the noble Earl opposite. Well, it is perfectly true that if you give to a man whom you meet upon the highway all that he demands he will probably abstain from any breach of the Eighth, or, at least, of the Sixth Commandment. It is perfectly true that if you yield to outrage all that outrage is destined to obtain, it is probable that outrage will cease, or sensibly diminish. The racoon in the American story, who, when he saw a sportsman coming to him, said, "Do not shoot, for I will come down," might have claimed, on the same ground, that he had put a stop to the murderous instincts of the American sportsman. I do not think that the pursuit of that mode of pacifying Ireland will conduce much to the restoration of law and order, or to the security of the loyal people whose aspirations and wishes, necessities and conditions, the noble Earl entirely passes by. He tells us that his Government is accused of having failed to govern Ireland. He challenges some independent Peer to say whether we have succeeded in governing Ireland. I think that challenge will come more suitably when Parliament has granted us the powers for which we ask. We do not profess to be able to repress crime with a law that is too feeble for the purpose, or a law which contains so many delays and pitfalls that it is not practically useful for the purpose of repressing offences which did not exist when it was originally enacted. But when the noble Earl goes on to draw from that comparison of the two Governments the inference that no Government that England can furnish is competent to govern Ireland, and that, therefore, as he puts it, the Irish Peers and others should undertake to govern Ireland, he shows a wilful blindness to the social conditions of that country at this moment. Is it the Irish Peers, the Irish proprietors, is it any portion of the classes who have a stake in the country with whom the Government of Ireland will rest if Ireland was abandoned to herself? We have two duties before us; we have the duty of maintaining law and order for the sake, not only of the loyal population, but also for the population which breaks it, and we have the duty of securing the loyal population from such a change in the Constitution of the country as shall place their dearest interests in peril. It is idle to talk of leaving the Irish people to govern themselves. You know very well that they will not govern themselves, but that the majority will govern the minority in a way utterly inconsistent with its rights, and in a manner utterly fatal to all its industrial and commercial hopes. My Lords, I join with the noble Earl in thinking that it is wiser to abstain from discussing the measures which we shall submit to Parliament until those measures are before it; but we earnestly beg you to remember that the enemy we have to meet is not the same enemy that had to be met by the generations that have gone before; that the organization of crime, of outrage, and of dishonesty has reached a pitch which it never reached before; and that you must have law, at all events, more sure and rapid in its process if you wish that the present evils should be suppressed and put down. Until we have obtained those powers, and with those powers have failed to produce that state of society which you have a right to expect—until that has taken place you cannot say that our efforts to fulfil our pledges in respect to Ireland have failed. The noble Earl very rightly abstained from any lengthened remarks on foreign policy at this time. I shall follow his example. But before I sit down I just wish to make a few observations. One is with reference to what the noble Earl said in respect to a speech of mine at the Mansion House. He seemed to infer that some alienation of this country from Germany was the result of that speech. Certainly, as far as my knowledge goes, there is not the slightest foundation for any such apprehension, and I do not think that anything in the speech justifies the construction that the noble Earl has put upon it. The other thing I wish to say is not due to any language used by the noble Earl, but refers to apprehensions that have been recently and publicly expressed both with respect to our policy in the South-East of Europe and to the prospects of European peace being broken. It has been imputed to us that we have been pursuing a policy having for its end the restoration of Prince Alexander to the Throne of Bulgaria. I cannot understand from what circumstance that utterly groundless idea has taken its rise. We regretted his fall, because we saw how well he was fitted to give that cohesion to the Christian communities which they so greatly want; but since his fall we have fully recognized that his re-election is not within the domain of practical politics, and, as far as I know, it has been contemplated by no Foreign Office in Europe, and certainly it has never been contemplated by ours. Our desire in reference to the condition of things in the South-East of Europe is, in the first place, to perform our duties as signatories of the Treaty of Berlin; and, in the second place, we wish—it is the traditional policy of this country—to strengthen and to uphold the freedom of those Christian communities which, in proportion as they maintain their freedom and cohesion, will be the greatest security against any possible overflow of military power into that distracted part of Europe. To them, properly organized and fully developed, we must look for the future guardianship of those countries. We do not desire to establish any special influence of our own; we should have no use to make of it if we possessed it. We do not desire to deny to Russia any legitimate object she may have in view; on the contrary, subject to the conditions which I have already stated, we shall be glad that her legitimate wishes should be fulfilled. But we feel, above all things, that the influence which she may claim in consequence of race, or faith, or history, must not be expanded into domination. Any attempt of that kind will not only destroy that influence, but it will be fatal to the interests of Europe, to whom the independence of those Christian communities is necessarily dear. The other matter, as to which I shall speak with caution, is the apprehension that has been recently felt lest there should be an outbreak of war among the Great Powers of the Continent. It is impossible to be blind to the danger which is caused to the public peace by the vast armaments, growing larger and larger, which threaten each other from opposite sides of a frontier. Those who are near and within reach of those armaments are constantly in the position of men standing in the path of an avalanche which they see above them, and which any accident may detach and bring down upon them. Vigilance is the duty of all men under these circumstances; but vigilance may generate suspicion, and suspicion may end in collision. It is impossible to be blind to these dangers; but, at the same time, I am bound to say that during the last few weeks—certainly during the time I have been at the Foreign Office—nothing whatever has occurred to give us the impression that the danger is more acute than it was; and, in the judgment of the experienced Ambassadors which we have both at Berlin and at Paris, the prospects are not warlike, but peaceful. I earnestly hope that their anticipations may prove correct, and that Europe may be spared the great calamity of a conflict between the most civilized nations in the world.

The EARL OF SELBORNE: My Lords, it has been usual for your Lordships not to have a prolonged debate on ordinary occasions upon the Address, nor should I have broken through this custom on any ordinary occasion. But, my Lords, this is not an ordinary occasion. It is, I venture to think, as serious and as critical a time as has existed within the memory of any of your Lordships, if not in the history of this country; and I believe I may be pardoned if I make some observations which the reference to Ireland in Her Majesty's Speech appears to call for from some independent Member of the House. This is not an occasion for entering into the proposals which the late Government made to Parliament for the future government of Ireland, which the late Parliament rejected, and of which the constituencies of the country have solemnly ratified the rejection. An opportunity will probably come for entering into that large question, and I have no doubt that when it does come there are many of your Lordships who will desire to take part in that discussion. What I desire to address myself to is the matter of the present state of Ireland. Now, the first part of the paragraph relating to Ireland speaks of the improvement with regard to crime and outrage, which cannot but be highly gratifying to your Lordships. It speaks also of the signs of improvement which were exhibited in the early part of the autumn with respect to the relations between the owners and occupiers of land. It speaks of something which has happened to interrupt that prospect. Now, I believe from the bottom of my heart that a very great part—I am willing to believe the greater part—of the people of Ireland are in their own disposition and desires peaceable, would perform their duties, and would honestly abide by their obligations, and would prefer the maintenance of law and order to the maintenance of anarchy and disorder. No one who has seen the people, and is able to judge of them, can fail to be deeply impressed with the many fine and noble qualities of that people. They have many virtues, and they have great natural gifts; and I am firmly persuaded that if there were not a tyranny over them, the honesty and integrity and good faith between man and man in Ireland are such that we should have no need of extraordinary legislation. What, then, is it that has happened to prevent that? It is the establishment of a tyranny in Ireland, of an organized despotism, of a conspiracy against morality and law; and it is that which has interrupted the favourable prospect that offered itself in the autumn. The noble Earl on the Front Opposition Bench (Earl Granville) said that with regard to the diminution of crime and outrage he doubted whether the credit could be claimed by the present Government for the effective measures they had taken —that the diminution which undoubtedly has taken place should rather be ascribed to the offers held out by the late Government. To whom? To those who held the springs of crime and outrage? We have often been told that the National League controls the politics of the majority in Ireland at the present day, and it is to them that it was proposed practically to hand over the government of Ireland. We are told that they are not the persons responsible for crime and outrage; that there are two movements, which are to be separated from each other—the political movement, and something else behind it. If that is so, the argument of the noble Earl is a very remarkable one. Well, I do not pursue that topic. I will now pass on to the next point. What interrupted the improvement in the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland? It was a remarkable renewal, in an altered form, of the old declaration against the payment of rent. We know that the old declaration was that no rent was to be paid unless political Parties permitted it to be done. This was simply to enable them to dictate with regard to the ownership and enjoyment of property and the political relations between Ireland and the United Kingdom, and to dictate their terms to the Government of England. Most people thought that a remarkable departure, not only from the duties of a citizen, but from the fundamental principles of morality, and opposed to all possible government. After the proposals of the late Government, and simultaneously with the effect it is suggested that they had on the frequency of crime in Ireland, you have a new declaration—the Plan of Campaign. The name, in itself, is significant of the nature of the thing. The tenants are now not to pay their landlords; they are to pay one-half, or as much as they please, to other people —to the agitators—to be spent by them in continuing their agitation. That is a remarkable development, coming at a remarkable time. But that is not all. The law is invoked; the law is clear on the subject; and when these proceedings have taken place, and security has been given according to law by the leading men who have instigated them, the moment they are out of Court they go on again in full defiance of the law, and prosecute the same policy of doing all they can by intimidation and influence to prevent the fulfilment of their legal obligations by men who would otherwise be willing to perform them. With regard to what has been said about evictions, no man with a heart in his body can read of evictions, under certain circumstances, without feeling that those who are really answerable for them have upon them a most deep responsibility. Who are those persons? Did we not hear lately of landlords who had so long delayed coming to extremes that the last legal opportunity of claiming their property would have expired if they had abandoned legal remedies? They have acted with the approval of the people on the spot, and with the advice of the priests and clergy—for I am happy to say that there are many signs that the priests wish their flocks to be honest. In cases in which the landlord is most unwilling to evict, in which he is willing, possibly after some pressure, to accept what the tenant can pay, and just as the tenants are on the eve of paying, with the approval of their clergy, certain Members of Parliament step in—I am ashamed to say not Irish Members only—between the landlord and his tenants, between men and their duty, between other men and their rights, and force on these evictions. This is a piece of unscrupulous cruelty which, if committed by landlords, we should hear strongly denounced. These things have been done after the offers of the late Prime Minister and his Government have, we are told, been powerful enough to diminish crime and outrage. These offers have not been able to prevent these things, which are very like crime and outrage. The late Prime Minister has, in 1881 and in 1886, used language which shows how utterly opposed to his ideas of the manner in which political reform should be sought these proceedings are. At Leeds, in 1881, when the No Rent Manifesto came out, he used this language, which I am not aware that he has ever retracted. He said—

> "This is the first time in the history of Christendom that a body of men has arisen who are not ashamed to preach in Ireland the doctrine of public plunder."

Then he named Mr. Parnell as the Representative of the opinions which he denounced; and he continued, after paying a tribute to Mr. Parnell's abilities—

> "But his doctrines are not such as require any very considerable ability to recommend them. If you go forth on a mission to demoralize people by teaching them to make the property of their neighbours the object of their covetous desires, it does not require any superhuman gifts to procure a number of adherents to a doctrine like that."

That is what the late Prime Minister said in 1881; and if it is forgotten, his followers can scarcely have forgotten what he said last August, just before the Plan of Campaign was produced. In his pamphlet he spoke of the Constitutional and peaceful action, and of the purely moral forces with which England and Scotland had secured their political triumphs; and then, recommending the same course to Ireland, he said—

> "It is the potent spell of legality which has done all this, or enabled it to be done. The evil spirit of illegality and violence has thus far—"

and this was in August last—

> "had no part or lot in the political action of Ireland, since by the Act of 1885 she came into that inheritance of adequate representation from which she had before been barred."

Since then the Plan of Campaign — another form of the No Rent Manifesto —has been issued; and yet neither from the late Prime Minister, nor from my noble Friend (Earl Granville) to-night, have we heard any denunciations of it. Why is this? It is not because the right hon. Gentleman and the noble Earl do not detest and abominate this plan. Is it because those who ought to lead have not the courage of their opinions in this matter, and because they find that they cannot maintain their alliances if they denounce public demoralization? There is another Member of the late Government whom I always greatly admired and respected. I am very sorry that his views on this subject should be different from mine; but nothing will make me forget his public services. He (Earl Spencer), in the course of one of his speeches, used these words, which I think did him high honour—

> "We have to see that law and order are maintained, and we cannot allow anarchy in that country;"

And he proceeded to point out how inextricably entwined were English and Irish interests. He was right. Public demoralization is catching and apt to spread. Why, then, have these things not been denounced? Why do not the late Prime Minister and his Colleagues declare—"If these things are done, we will have nothing to do with people who do such things?" This attitude is the more necessary, because some Members of Parliament, who are not, perhaps, entirely without importance as supporters of the late Government's policy, have defended the legitimacy of this Plan of Campaign. I think it is high time we should know where we are. So long as this denunciation is not forthcoming the inference I draw is that your Lordships and everyone in the country who thinks that government is necessary, that there cannot be government without the maintenance of law, nor government if persons can impose their own wills against the law of the land upon their fellow-countrymen — those who think this, whether in this House or in the other House, or in the country, must feel it their duty to support this Government, or any Government who will perform the primary dûty of Government, and oppose any Government that will not. If the choice lay between declaring the Imperial Parliament powerless to enforce the first duties of government in Ireland, powerless to maintain the law against those who avowedly set it at defiance, powerless to protect loyal citizens who wish to pay their debts and do their duty against the intimidation that would prevent them—if the choice lay between this and granting the demands of the Separatists, I, for my part, would far rather not give Ireland what is called Home Rule, handing her over to the domination of those who seek to accomplish their ends by the means which we condemn. I would far rather give her complete independence, when, at least, we should be free from the responsibilities of government. To pretend to maintain the Imperial connection, while renouncing the performance of the first duty of a Government—the protection of the liberty and property of the loyal—and abandoning the loyal to the tender mercies of those who set law at defiance and trample upon liberty, would, in my opinion, be a worse thing than total separation.

EARL SPENCER: My Lords, it was not my intention to take part in this debate; but after what has been said by the noble and learned Earl I feel compelled to make a few remarks. I had considered this question of the Plan of Campaign, and whether it was desirable that it should be made a subject of debate in your Lordships' House, and I had come to the conclusion that this was not the proper time for discussing the matter fully. Several Members of Parliament in Ireland are going to be put upon their trial in connection with this matter; I therefore do not think it proper or decent that it should be gone into fully, lest, while this important trial is pending, the parties should be prejudiced. I shall not shrink at the proper time from giving my opinion on this or any other subject; but at the present moment I will content myself with denying that Mr. Gladstone and his Colleagues are bound to agree with all the views taken by Irish Members who may have supported the late Government. We are not responsible for all the actions and declarations of those who may at different times have supported our policy; and I shall not think it necessary, on every occasion when an Irish Member makes a violent speech or perhaps supports some illegal action, to get up and repudiate that speech or that action, merely because on a former occasion this same Member supported the Government to which I belonged. My noble and learned Friend has referred to something which I once said about anarchy. Well, I maintain still that no Government can be tolerated which allows anarchy to prevail in this country, whether it appears in the form of crime and outrage or in that of illegal conspiracy. I denounce all illegal conspiracies, and I believe that no Government can continue to control the affairs of Ireland for any time which neglects its fundamental duty—that of protecting the property, rights, and liberties of Her Majesty's subjects. This is not the proper time for a defence of the Irish policy of the late Government; but I may perhaps, be permitted to say a word or two with respect to the way in which the present Government have administered Irish affairs. The noble Marquess says—"You must not judge us before we have obtained the powers which we require for the government of Ireland." That is a confession that without extra powers they are unable to maintain the law, and that confession has a special significance when we recollect the important and unusual statement in this House by the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon), who announced that it was the deliberate intention of the Cabinet to which he belonged not to propose exceptional legislation for Ireland. Everyone must have read with great interest and some pain the important judgment delivered some time ago by that distinguished Irish Judge, the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer. Referring to some evictions in Galway, he pointed out that the Sheriff's officers who attended to execute the writs were prevented for some days from fulfilling their duty, although accompanied by several Resident Magistrates and 250 policemen. And he showed how the police stood aside, and did not protect the Sheriff's officers. Now, the police should not interfere actively themselves in the execution of writs; but their business is to prevent breaches of the peace, and it is extraordinary that the law should have been violated in their presence, as it was at these evictions. Whenever the Government are compelled to support the law it is important that they should not allow their officers to be defeated. When such a defeat is permitted it is taken as a sign of weakness, and it leads to outrages in other parts of the country. And another question to which constant reference has been made is the interference of the Irish Government between landlord and tenant. I know nothing which so much tends to crime and outrage as unfriendly relations between landlord and tenant. When the Land Commission was appointed a marked improvement was shown whenever the Sub-Commissioners sat in any district. I therefore fully appreciate the importance of having these disputes between landlord and tenant settled. I have also known it necessary on occasion for the Government to endeavour to bring landlord and tenant to an agreement, though the cases were very rare. Now we are told that the Government have been constantly intervening between landlord and tenant, and have brought pressure to bear on the landlords in order to induce them to come to terms with their tenants. We all know that the Government have the power of bringing an enormous pressure to bear even when acting within the law, but which may be of an improper kind. It may take the form of their saying that they will withdraw police protection, or make the landlords pay for police protection. I want to know how far the Government have gone, and what has been the pressure exercised by the Chief Secretary? We have read the correspondence in *The Times* of yesterday with regard to the Glenbeigh evictions. I confess that I think the general tone of the correspondence between General Buller and the different agents reflects the highest credit upon the humanity and discretion of that distinguished man. I lament immensely that he was not successful. But is it possible for the Government to be carried on if the energy and skill of its officers are to be employed in settling disputes between landlord and tenant? These questions are very grave, and I should like to have some explanation from the Government. They say it is difficult to carry on the Government under the ordinary law. Then recourse is had to exceptional or repressive legislation. Such legislation is not the less exceptional, even if you make it the law of the whole Kingdom. But such legislation will only accentuate the ill-feeling prevalent in Ireland, and until you make the Irish people support the law you are doing no good and gaining no ground in Ireland. My noble and learned Friend referred to the intimidation which exists by large bodies of agitators over the minds of the people, and said that if that were removed all the good qualities of the Irish would come to the front and make government easy in that country. I have had a long experience of Ireland—eight years is a long time—and though I was for a long time misled by that delusion, I have come gradually and sadly to the conclusion that, in many parts of Ireland, the people are not unwilling sufferers under intimidation, but are in thorough sympathy with all the principles of the Nationalists. I fear that this delusion has been going on too long. I despair of effecting an improvement by what is called resolute government, for that will not only exasperate the Irish, but will prevent the removal of those difficulties in the government of Ireland which have so long baffled the statesmen of this country.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND (Lord ASHBOURNE): My Lords, I think the whole House is under a great obligation to the noble and learned Earl opposite (the Earl of Selborne), who has made a last appeal, and given a last chance to the late Advisers of Her Majesty to show whether, even now, they can pluck up their courage to denounce what every honest man in the country has denounced as a scandal. My Lords, there is no responsible public man, outside the narrow class to which I have referred, who has not given a frank and manly opinion upon a state of facts upon which a child could express an unhesitating opinion on the plain difference between right and wrong. The noble Earl opposite (Earl Spencer) says he did not intend to make a speech, but that he had considered the Plan of Campaign, and had deliberately arrived at the conclusion that this was not the proper occasion for entering into the whole merits of the Plan of Campaign; and then he said that he was not bound to denounce it merely because it was illegal. The noble Earl has had the opinion of two most able Judges in Ireland that it is illegal, and also that of one of the greatest legal authorities in this country (the Earl of Selborne); and yet, in face of all that, the noble Earl refrained from making up his mind. The noble and learned Earl described the Plan of Campaign as an organized despotism against morality and law. But the noble Earl opposite said that Ireland should be encouraged to have respect for law. Yet his contribution to the promotion of that respect for law is to deliberately shrink from denouncing what these great authorities have stated to be both illegal and immoral. Lord Hartington, who has had great experience of Ireland, and was one of the most powerful Colleagues of the noble Earl in several Administrations, spoke very plainly last December, and expressed the view of impartial public opinion that this Plan of Campaign was a subversion of every principle upon which hitherto social order has been maintained. Mr. Chamberlain, too, who holds strong and extreme views on some subjects, said that it was the most immoral and dishonest conspiracy which had ever been devised in a civilized country. It has been described in public by my noble Friend the Prime Minister as organized embezzlement and as public robbery; and on a former occasion, as we are reminded by the noble and learned Earl, Mr. Gladstone described a similar organization and similar methods as a policy of public plunder. Yet it has been reserved to the Leader of the Opposition in this House to-night, after making some criticism of a general character, to sit down without expressing a single syllable as to the morality of the Plan of Campaign; and the late Viceroy, who used the word "despair" more than once, did not rise till he was compelled by the speech of the noble and learned Earl (the Earl of Selborne) and the moral pressure of the House, and his only contribution was that he deliberately refrained on the present occasion, which he did not think was a proper one for entering into the whole merits of the Plan of Campaign. The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition said that the smallness of the number of grave crimes and outrages in Ireland were to be ascribed to the sympathy with the people of Ireland shown by their friends in England and Scotland. If the noble Earl thinks that a conviction in the minds of people in Ireland that the sympathy of their English and Scotch allies would not go with them if they commit crime and outrage tends to prevent such crime and outrage, why, then, does not the noble Earl say that he will withhold his sympathy from the Plan of Campaign, and see what will be the effect of that course in Ireland? I have referred to Lord Hartington. Perhaps Mr. Gladstone may speak "elsewhere" for himself and his Colleagues on this subject; but in *The Times* of January 5 in the present year there appeared an extraordinary letter from the late Prime Minister, who was asked by the secretary of a Liberal Association what was his opinion on the Plan of Campaign. What was the answer of the late Prime Minister to that question? He wrote—

> "Sir,—I do not intend to discuss, upon partial or fragmentary evidence, what is now going on in Ireland. It is not my business to govern that country, or to pass judgment upon those who govern it, until I hear in my place what is to be said for and against them."

Well, I think the public opinion of this country has a right to complain of the way in which this question has been left in this discussion. When it goes forth to Ireland that your Lordships have sitting among you those who represent the views of Mr. Gladstone, and that when challenged they refuse to say a solitary syllable in condemnation of the Plan of Campaign, will it not be very easy then to persuade ignorant people in Ireland, who are very credulous and very easy to persuade, that it is because they themselves either indirectly sympathize with the Plan of Campaign, or that they have not the manliness to say that they condemn it? The occurrences at Woodford have been referred to. In that case the house was blockaded; it took a considerable time to get appliances to reach the inside of the house, and then the Resident Magistrate and the police acted with courage, vigour, and success. The noble Earl (Earl Spencer) has alluded to pressure put upon landlords. I suppose your Lordships have, many of you, heard speeches delivered in reference to the conduct of the landlords, and the moral influence which anyone has a right to exercise upon them with a view to advise them to show forbearance. But if it is put as a suggestion, or as an innuendo, that the Government has acted with any unworthy or undue pressure, or has exerted any power of the State to prevent the proper enforcement of the law, I emphatically repudiate and deny any such insinuation. That is a thing to which I, for one, would never be a party, which I entirely disapprove, and which, to my knowledge, has never taken place in any single case in Ireland. All that has been done is to give friendly advice, and, of course, it is open, and in the power of anyone, to give that. Reference has also been made to the Glenbeigh correspondence, which appeared yesterday in *The Times*. I have read the correspondence which appeared in the newspapers yesterday, and I do not find that General Sir Redvers Buller used a single word suggesting that any such unworthy interference or pressure should be exercised to prevent the enforcement of the law. All that was remarked to-night on the subject was that it was wonderful that he should have found time to act as he had done in those matters. The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition referred to the evictions in Ireland, and said they would have been stopped if Mr. Parnell's Bill had been passed.

Earl GRANVILLE: Some of them.

Lord ASHBOURNE: That amounts to a suggestion that if the advice of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell had been taken there would have been a diminution in the number of evictions carried out. Now, what are the facts? Why, the actual figures show that the number of those who were really evicted, and their families—that is to say, who were neither re-admitted as tenants nor as caretakers—was, in 1882, 2,672, and in 1884, 2,205, whereas in 1886 it was 1,535, or about 700 families less than it was two years before. Those facts prove that the Irish landlords as a class and in the mass have shown great consideration and forbearance towards their tenants, and have done their duty wisely and well. Many of them, under very great difficulties as to how to maintain themselves and their families, have to the full met the advice given them to exercise their legal rights with moderation, kindness, and forbearance. The administration of the law in Ireland is always a matter of grave responsibility; but I myself regard the condition of Ireland with no exaggerated hope on the one hand, and with no exaggerated despondency on the other. I have never, either in this or in the other House, used any such language; but I do believe that with firmness, with a steady determination to administer justice and an equally steady determination not to permit injustice, we may expect that the ways of peace will be found again in that country; and I can assure your Lordships' House that the Government are fully alive to their responsibilities, and will endeavour by every possible means to fulfil them so as to bring about that result.

Lord HERSCHELL: My Lords, I entirely agree with my noble and learned Friend (Lord Ashbourne) as to the gravity of the condition of things which exists in Ireland, and I unite with him in feeling that it is impossible for anyone to utter a word in relation to the condition of that country without incurring a very heavy responsibility unless he weighs carefully every word that he uses. But I cannot agree that my noble and learned Friend was following the injunction which he himself laid down, when he tried to induce the belief that those sitting on this—the Front Opposition—Bench entertain sympathy with any sort or kind of illegality. My noble Friend (Earl Spencer) distinctly said—

> "The 'Plan of Campaign' has been pronounced by two distinguished Judges in Ireland to be illegal, and I condemn every form of illegality in Ireland."

What can be clearer or more emphatic than that statement? Surely the greater includes the less. I certainly take a different view as to the proper course to be adopted from the noble and learned Lord. I admit that if there is a condition of things existing in Ireland, or elsewhere, it is perfectly open to persons to express their opinion upon it; but when you have certain individuals waiting their trial for a particular offence, it is entirely out of the ordinary course—it would never be done in regard to England; nobody would ever dream of suggesting it in regard to England—that those who occupy a responsible position should get up and express any opinion with reference to the particular offence with which they are charged, and on which they are entitled to have a fair trial. Therefore, why should such a course be adopted as regards Ireland? The whole question will turn on what is the nature of the acts that have been committed; because all that I know of them is what has appeared in the newspapers; but I understand that it is denied in the strongest possible way that the acts done were really of the kind that has been described. I am afraid of entering into the question, because the inference might be drawn that I justified what they admit they have done. The noble and learned Earl said the Plan of Campaign consisted in bringing intimidation to bear on tenants who were willing and able to pay their rent in order to make them not pay. [The Earl of Selborne made a remark which was inaudible.] That brings us at once to a discussion of the facts which are in dispute. But I understand that the accused entirely deny that this pressure was brought to bear to induce those who were willing and able to pay not to pay. Of course, the noble and learned Lord will not admit that to be the case; but I say that that is stated on behalf of those who are charged with the offence. Now, whatever form of illegality may be committed, whether in this form or in any other, I condemn it; and I am so far from having any sympathy with it, and so far from approving it, that I regard it with abhorrence and reprobation. But I decline to discuss the particular acts of the men about to be tried. It is not a question like murder; but one in which the very acts these men did is the question in dispute, and which is going to be tried in the Courts of Law. The less that is said about this question at this time the better; because it is not only important that the administration of justice should be fair and just, but that it should seem to be just. I think nothing would be more calamitous than that anything should take place in this House which should even give the semblance of a ground for complaint that there had been an attempt to prejudice the cause of men about to take their trial. On this point I am very sensitive, and on that account I desire to deal in generalities, and not with the particulars of the case. Now, I said that I make no limitation, no exception; but I confess, after all, that I doubt very much whether we do much good by denunciations at particular times of crime. It is one of the terrible misfortunes of the social condition of Ireland that men, who in other matters would be honest and would deal fairly, should very often conceal the dishonest nature of the acts they are doing with a cloak of patriotism with which they completely deceive themselves. One has seen it not only in Ireland, but elsewhere; and I fear that, without looking at their situation and position, violent denunciations of the acts the people are doing will not cause these acts to cease, nor alter the opinion of the people with respect to them. They will not think the less of those who give them the advice. I doubt very much the usefulness of denunciation; but, at the same time, I agree that it would be mischievous if it were thought that those who had held responsible positions in this country, whatever their sympathies might be—either with agrarian improvement by legislation or some change in the Government of Ireland—I say it would be a sad thing if it were thought that they had any sympathy with the recourse to any mode of illegality whatever with the view of attaining its ends. I can assure noble Lords, speaking for myself as well as my Colleagues, that we have no such sympathy, and have no desire to shrink from declaring a want of sympathy with any proceedings of this description. We cannot too emphatically repeat that we condemn illegality, whatever form it may assume; and, so far from having any sympathy with it, we regard it with the greatest horror and detestation. I deprecate, however, any attempt now to discuss the action of those being charged with criminal offences which will shortly be coming before the Courts of Law. No useful object whatever can be served by doing so; and we should be careful not to lay ourselves open to the charge of influencing tribunals.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said, they had been told by the Front Opposition Bench that this was not a convenient occasion on which to discuss this question; but he contended that the Plan of Campaign should have been denounced by the Opposition speakers in public long ago. Not only that, but he thought even now that a distinction was attempted to be drawn between the illegality and the immorality of the Plan of Campaign. Seeing that there were certain persons on their trial with respect to the illegality of the movement, he did not think it reasonable to express any opinion on the point. On the other aspect of the question it was different; and what he and others desired to know was—was the Plan a moral one or not? He contended that it was a conspiracy against the main business of Ireland, which chiefly consisted in owning and occupying land. If a witness were needful on this point he should call Mr. Dillon himself, who had told them what the object of the Plan of Campaign was. The hon. Gentleman said that if Mr. Roe wished for occupation of that sort, let him go with him to Mayo, and he would show him men who would not pay, not because they were unable to pay, but because he had told them to accept the Plan of Campaign, and not to pay. That was an immoral doctrine, which it was the duty of everyone to denounce. If the noble Earl or any of his Colleagues had denounced that doctrine on a public platform, and had said that they would have nothing to do with Mr. Dillon or Mr. Parnell if they prosecuted that Plan, he was certain they would have gained a good deal. Indeed, if Mr. Gladstone would denounce it at once some good results might ensue.

LORD HERSCHELL said, that he denounced the conduct of any person who induced tenants not to pay rents who were able to do so.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said, he thought that that was the information which they had been endeavouring to obtain for the last two months, and showed that the debate had done a great deal of good. It had conveyed a great deal of information to the country which had been vainly sought for during the past two months. He was glad to hear noble Lords had denounced the Plan of Campaign; and he hoped they would take opportunities, both in Parliament and on public platforms, to declare that they would have nothing to do with persons who were connected with such immoral doctrines and such immoral practices.

Address *agreed to*, *nemine dissentiente*, and ordered to be presented to Her Majesty by the Lords with White Staves.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

The Duke of BUCKINGHAM and CHANDOS appointed, *nemine dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session.

COMMITTEE FOR PRIVILEGES — Appointed.

SUB-COMMITTEE FOR THE JOURNALS—Appointed.

APPEAL COMMITTEE—Appointed.

House adjourned at Eight o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter past
Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 27*th January*, 1887.

The House met at half after One of the clock.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners;—

The House went;—and having returned;—

Several Members took and subscribed the Oath, and one Member made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

William Tindal Robertson, esquire, *for* Brighton.

James Bigwood, esquire, *for* Middlesex (Brentford Division).

NEW WRITS DURING THE RECESS.

Mr. SPEAKER acquainted the House, —that he had issued, during the Recess, Warrants for *New Writs*, *for* Brighton Borough, *v.* David Smith, esquire, deceased; *for* Middlesex County (Brentford Division), *v.* Octavius Coope, esquire, deceased; *for* Liverpool Borough (Exchange Division), *v.* David Duncan, esquire, deceased; *for* Donegal County (Southern Division), *v.* Bernard Kelly, esquire, deceased.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

BELFAST (WESTERN DIVISION).

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Judges for the time being on the Rota for the trial of Election Petitions in Ireland, a Certificate and Report relating to the Election for the West Belfast Division of the Borough of Belfast, and the same was read.

BELFAST BOROUGH (WESTERN DIVISION) AND SLIGO COUNTY (SOUTHERN DIVISION) ELECTIONS.

Mr. SEXTON, returned for the Western Division of the Borough of Belfast, and the Southern Division of the County of Sligo, stated that he elected to sit for the Western Division of Belfast.

LONDONDERRY CITY.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House, that he had received from the Judges for the time being on the Rota for the Trial of Election Petitions in Ireland, a Certificate and Report relating to the Election for the City and Borough of Londonderry, and the same were read.

YORK, EAST RIDING (BUCKROSE DIVISION).

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House, that he had received from the Judges for the time being on the Rota for the trial of Election Petitions in England the Certificate and Report relative to the Buckrose Division of the East Riding of the County of York, and the same was read.

Ordered, That the Clerk of the Crown do attend this House forthwith with the last Return for the East Riding of the County of York (Buckrose Division), and amend the same by striking out the name of William Alexander M'Arthur, esquire.

The Clerk of the Crown attending, amended the Return accordingly.

LONDONDERRY CITY AND LONGFORD (NORTH).

Mr. SPEAKER acquainted the House that he had received a Letter from Justin M'Carthy, esquire, returned for Londonderry City and for the North Longford Division of the County of Longford, and the said Letter was read as followeth:—

New York,
10*th Jan* '87.

Dear Mr. Speaker,

Having been returned for Derry City and for the North Longford Division of the County of Longford, I beg to inform you that I elect to sit for Derry City.

I have the honour to be, Mr. Speaker,

Very truly yours,
JUSTIN M'CARTHY.

ELECTIONS—SESSIONAL ORDERS.

Ordered, That all Members who are returned for two or more places in any part of the United Kingdom do make their election for which of the places they will serve, within one week after it shall appear that there is no question upon the Return for that place; and if anything shall come in question touching the Return or Election of any Member, he is to withdraw during the time the matter is in debate; and that all Members returned upon double Returns do withdraw till their Returns are determined.

Resolved, That no Peer of the Realm, except such Peers of Ireland as shall for the time being be actually elected, and shall not have declined to serve, for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, hath any right to give his vote in the Election of any Member to serve in Parliament.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to concern himself in the Election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament, except only any Peer of Ireland, at such Elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a Candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament."

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) said, that he did not intend to trouble the House with any remarks, because he understood that the Leader of the House was willing to consent to take a certain course.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster) said, that that was so—the Government would carry out the pledge given by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, and give the hon. Gentleman an opportunity to move for a Committee on the subject.

Motion *agreed to*.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been elected or returned a Member of this House, or endeavoured so to be, by Bribery, or any other corrupt practices, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against all such persons as shall have been wilfully concerned in such Bribery or other corrupt practices.

WITNESSES.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been tampering with any Witness, in respect of his evidence to be given to this House, or any Committee thereof, or directly or indirectly hath endeavoured to deter or hinder any person from appearing or giving evidence, the same is declared to be a high crime and misdemeanor; and this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath given false evidence in any case before this House, or any Committee thereof, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Ordered, That the Commissioners of the Police of the Metropolis do take care that, during the Session of Parliament, the passages through the streets leading to this House be kept free and open, and that no obstruction be permitted to hinder the passage of Members to and from this House, and that no disorder be allowed in

Westminster Hall, or in the passages leading to this House, during the sitting of Parliament, and that there be no annoyance therein or thereabouts; and that the Serjeant at Arms attending this House do communicate this Order to the Commissioners aforesaid.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Ordered, That the Votes and Proceedings of this House be printed, being first perused by Mr. Speaker; and that he do appoint the printing thereof; and that no person but such as he shall appoint do presume to print the same.

PRIVILEGES.

Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed.

OUTLAWRIES BILL.

Bill "for the more effectual preventing Clandestine Outlawries," read the first time; to be read a second time.

NEW WRITS ISSUED.

For—

Kent County (Dartford Division), *v.* The Right honble. Sir William Hart Dyke, baronet, Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education.

Longford (Northern Division), *v.* Justin M'Carthy, esquire, who having been returned as a Member for the said County of Longford (Northern Division), and also for the City of Londonderry, has elected to sit for the City of Londonderry.

Antrim County (Northern Division), *v.* Edward Macnaghten, esquire, Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I beg to give Notice that I shall, at the earliest opportunity, move a Resolution relating to the Procedure of the House, and, as on former occasions, ask the House to give us the necessary facilities to proceed with it from day to day, subject only to such interruptions as may be necessary for the conduct of urgent Public Business.

RESIGNATION OF THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, THE RIGHT HON. LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL (Paddington, South): Mr. Speaker, when a Member of the House who has held Office in the Administration has been compelled to resign that Office, the House of Commons usually permits and expects some explanations of the reasons and causes of that action. If, Sir, it should be the good pleasure of the House to-night to receive such an explanation, I am informed by Lord Salisbury that I am possessed of the gracious permission of the Sovereign to place before the House certain facts and matters bearing upon my resignation of the Office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Mr. Speaker, I resigned that Office on the 20th of December last because I could not—I was altogether unable to become responsible for the Estimates which were presented by the Departments for the support of the Army and Navy in the coming year. Of course, it would be idle to deny what is very well known, that there were other matters of grave importance on which it was my misfortune to hold opinions differing from those of Lord Salisbury. But, Sir, those other matters were matters, in my opinion, perfectly susceptible of accommodation and contraction. This question of the Estimates on which I resigned was incapable of such contraction, for the reason that I was deeply and repeatedly pledged by many speeches I had made in various parts of the country to the policy of retrenchment and economy, because I was convinced by what I had learnt at the Treasury that such a policy was not only necessary, but perfectly feasible, and because, viewing those pledges, it was impossible for me usefully to retain Office as Chancellor of the Exchequer in a Government in whose policy effective retrenchment found no prominent place. Now, Sir, it is not, of course, my intention to analyze in any degree at this moment the Expenditure of this country, and, indeed, it is my desire to make my remarks on this occasion as brief and as concise as they possibly can be; because, in the first instance, the patience of the House has its limits, and, in the second place, if I were to try to make an explanation of a very elaborate character, such an explanation might tend to degenerate into a kind of indictment of the Government, which, I hold, would be neither useful nor becoming. But, Sir, I may state this detail—the amount of the Estimates which were presented to me as Chancellor of the Exchequer by the two Departments exceeded £31,000,000 for the coming year for the support of the Army and Navy; and there is another fact which I must mention, because it operated most seriously upon me. I had also to give a consent, and I did give a consent, though a reluctant one, to unusually large Supplementary Estimates for these two Services. There will be—or, at any rate, when I left the Government there was going to be—I had consented there should be presented to Parliament Supplementary Estimates amounting to the sum of £300,000 for the Navy, close upon £500,000 for the Army, and another £500,000 for expenses connected with the Army in Egypt; and undoubtedly I thought that those enormously large Supplementary Estimates formed an additional and grave reason for a reduction in the Naval and Military Expenditure in the coming year. Well, Sir, I wish briefly to put before the House my view of the position which I endeavoured to take. My view of the position is this—that the Expenditure for this year which is now expiring, and the Expenditure for the preceding year on armaments and on naval and military purposes, was an Expenditure of a distinctly abnormal character, and that it was the duty of the Government to make an effort to commence a return to what I would call a more normal Expenditure. I will just explain to the House by two figures only what I mean by a normal and abnormal Expenditure. Sir, if you take the 10 years from 1874 to 1884 you will find that the average Expenditure on the Army and Navy amounted to £25,000,000 a-year—that that standard of £25,000,000 was very closely adhered to during those 10 years; but if you take the three years 1885-6, 1886-7, together with 1887-8, if I had consented to, and if the House had voted the Estimates which were in question, you will find that the average Expenditure has risen from £25,000,000 to over £31,000,000, an increase perfectly sudden, only the lapse of one year between the two averages, an increase of just about £6,000,000 a-year. Well, Sir, that, the House will see, is no light matter. Even hon. Gentlemen who sit around me, and who naturally enough may have been disposed to take a somewhat unfavourable view of the action which I took, even they will admit that it was no light matter and no small difference which divided me from Her Majesty's Government. The right way, I think, to appreciate the magnitude of the difference is to turn that £6,000,000 into taxation. What does it mean in taxation? Sir, the increase of £6,000,000 on your Military and Naval Expenditure means a sum exceeding by £1,600,000 the entire produce of the Tea Duty; it means a sum equal to two-thirds of the Tobacco Duty; it means a sum equal to three-fourths of the Beer Duty; and it means a sum equal to six-sevenths of the Death Duties. The House must remember that this Beer Duty, and the Tea Duty, and the Tobacco Duty were all in existence before this increase took place, and they will not appreciably produce more than they are doing now. If you like to look at the figures in another way, and if you like to place the increase upon direct taxation, this increase of £6,000,000—this sudden jump, in time of peace, of £6,000,000 on Naval and Military Expenditure—means 3*d.* in the Income Tax. I only mention that point in order to show the House that it was a question of exceedingly large magnitude upon which I resigned, and that it was a question, in my opinion, which went to the very root of government and of policy. Sir, there has been, I think, a good deal of misconception as to the nature of the demand which I thought it was my duty to make upon the two Departments. People have supposed that I expected that that large increase should be immediately reduced upon a stroke of the pen. My right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) and my noble Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) will bear me out in saying that I made no such demand. I never expected—I never was so wild or foolish as to expect—that any very large reduction could be immediately made, nor did I even expect that we should ever be able to get back to the average Expenditure of the 10 years I have named. But my right hon. Friends will confirm me in this—that the only request I made of them was that they should make a sensible and an appreciable effort, which should be expressed in pounds, shillings, and pence, to return, or to come to the commencement of returning, to a more normal Expenditure on military and naval purposes. I named no figure; I carefully avoided naming any figure. The amount I left entirely to the discretion, and judgment, and superior knowledge of my right hon. Friends. In my own mind—and I may have mentioned it casually in conversation without insisting upon it—I thought that a reduction of £1,000,000 in time of peace upon the Military and Naval Expenditure of the country would have been an adequate and satisfactory reduction; but my right hon. Friends know perfectly well—and they will bear me out—that I certainly should not have made any obstinate quarrel about £100,000, or £200,000, or even £300,000—in fact, if the worst had come to the worst, I really believe —I confess it with some reluctance—I really believe I should have been satisfied with a reduction of £500,000. But, Sir, it was only when I found from the view which my right hon. Friends took of the position—it was only when I found from the view they held that they were absolutely unable to make even the commencement of an effort to return to a more normal state of Expenditure that I was forced—forced by a power far greater than Party ties, forced by what I had said in the Autumn, forced by the knowledge which I acquired at the Treasury—to send my resignation to Lord Salisbury. I will mention two details which struck me as most unsatisfactory from my point of view. The Army Estimates show a reduction of £300,000 connected with the expenses of the military occupation of Egypt; but, in spite of that reduction, the whole of the Army Estimates showed an increase of £300,000. That is what I could not understand; and there was a detail in the Admiralty Estimates which weighed with me very much. My noble Friend (Lord George Hamilton), in the statement he placed before me, showed a reduction of £500,000 upon the total Estimates for the Navy; but the whole of that £500,000 was taken off one Vote—the Vote for machinery, and my argument was this—if so large a reduction as £500,000 can be made on so important a Vote as machinery, surely some reductions may be made upon other Votes if they are carefully overhauled. I only mention these details as matters which weighed greatly with me in coming to a decision on the subject. I know it has been said, and it may be said again, that I have made an impossible demand. Well, Sir, I cannot, of course, pronounce upon whether it is possible or impossible. My own belief is that where there is a will there is a way, and the accuracy and efficacy of the maxim may be proved by what took place in 1869, when the Government of the day and the Parliament of the day were under the impression that the Naval and Military Expenditure of the country had reached an abnormal level; and so strong was that impression, and so resolute was the Government of the day, that the Estimates for 1870 for naval and military purposes, as compared with 1868, showed a reduction of no less than £4,500,000. Certainly, Sir, I never asked for and never expected such a reduction as that. I thought I was reasonable. I thought I was entitled to ask some reduction to be made in a time of peace in this largely increased Naval and Military Expenditure. There has been another misconception which I am anxious to clear away. I am supposed to have resigned on the Budget. Sir, my resignation—and my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) will confirm me—had nothing whatever to do with the Budget. I never should have thought of resigning on the Budget. The Budget is the plan of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for providing for the Services of the year; and my idea is that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer produces a plan which is not acceptable to his Colleagues, it is his business and his duty either to modify or alter the plan until it is agreeable to his Colleagues. But, certainly, I had no right or claim to cram any financial scheme of mine down the throats of my Colleagues under the threat of resignation. My resignation had nothing to do with the Budget. I resigned upon the expenditure of a special Department of the Government. My right hon. Friend the present First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Smith) laid down in this House, without much qualification, in 1883, a proposition which I almost entirely agree with. He then laid it down very positively that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was primarily and principally responsible for every shilling in the Estimates. I do not disagree with that proposition. I think the Chancellor of the Exchequer must satisfy himself reasonably in his own mind upon two points—in the first place, that the demands put forward by the Departments do not exceed the necessities of the year; and, in the second place, that the money which is voted by Parliament shall be expended in such a manner that the nation gets full value for its money. These are two points on which, I think, the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to be reasonably satisfied, and it is on these two points that I utterly and hopelessly broke down. I could not satisfy myself that the demands for these two Departments were not excessive. I felt certain that if the foreign policy of this country were a peaceful foreign policy these Estimates were too excessive. I felt equally certain—though I am liable to error—I felt equally certain that our foreign policy at the present moment ought to be a peaceful foreign policy. I do not mean that kind of peace which is a flattering phrase of a platform peroration; but I mean a genuine, effective, peaceful foreign policy, which should be marked by absence of unnecessary initiatives, by an indisposition to interfere too promptly in European affairs; and, Sir, in fact, a policy of that character which should approach very nearly to the domain of non-intervention. Well, Sir, on these two points I held the strongest possible opinions, and I did not see my way to alter those opinions. But in the second point—namely, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to be satisfied that the money which Parliament votes is properly spent—there, again, I could feel no satisfactory assurance. In fact, Sir, I had suspicions which I ought not to call suspicions, because they amounted almost to a conviction, that the reverse was the case. It is not now the time, and this would not be the proper occasion, to examine that matter more minutely; but I may remind the House of this—that we have had since 1883 a series of what I may call Departmental scandals, I believe unprecedented in the history of this country. I only need to run them over on my fingers. There was the exposure—the scandalous exposure—of the defects in the Commissariat Department in Egypt during the first campaign. There was subsequently, during the second Egyptian Campaign, the exposure of the brittle swords, the bending bayonets, and jamming cartridges. You then had in connection with the financial administration of the Admiralty that grave scandal which arose just before the Government left Office in 1885. The Admiralty was discovered to have spent no less a sum than £1,000,000 sterling without the knowledge of the Treasury, and apparently without their own knowledge. Then you had the very serious evidence which was given to the House and the public as to the total failure of three most expensive ships, the *Ajax*, the *Agamemnon*, and the *Impérieuse*—the total failure of these ships to fulfil the expectations of their designers, although they had cost no less than £1,500,000 of money. And then you had the bursting gun; and all these scandals with the charges of inefficiency, and worse than inefficiency, which accompanied them, came pressing one upon another. Sir, I took no part in the discussions in the House on these subjects, because I was not qualified to take any part in such discussions; but I listened, and the series, the rapid series, of these Departmental scandals produced a most unpleasant effect upon my mind. I say it not in the least as imputing blame, but I say it as one of my reasons for taking the action which I did, that I could not feel any assurance whatever that that series of Departmental scandals had made the same deep impression upon the mind of my right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith), and upon my noble Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton); and I do not wish to impute blame, but I say it produced a tremendous impression on my mind, one which I could not shake off. There is only one more question I should like to clear up, if I may do so without trespassing too much upon the time of the House. It has been widely stated, on authority apparently, that I resigned my Office in haste. In fact, I see it stated that I resigned in a temper, and I observe that my resignation is usually designated by a Government organ as an escapade, whatever that may mean. But I should like to tell the House exactly what the facts are, because it is important they should be known. The facts are these — that this controversy about expenditure has been going on between me and my right hon. Friend (Mr. Smith) and my noble Friend the Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury) almost since the commencement of the Government, going on in a perfectly friendly manner; and, indeed, all that occurred has not altered by one jot or iota the friendly feelings which existed between my right hon. Friends and myself. But, as a matter of fact, I brought my views before Lord Salisbury on this question of effective Army and Navy Expenditure as long ago as the month of August last, in a conversation which I had with him in Arlington Street. I then expressed my views, and told him how strongly I felt upon this subject. The House is possibly aware that in a speech I made at Dartford I especially alluded to this subject. I alluded to it briefly but strongly, and I think my right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) and the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) were aware of how strong a meaning I attached to my expressions at Dartford. But before I went down to address the meeting at Bradford in the month of October—the morning before—I had another long conversation with the First Lord of the Treasury, and with Lord Salisbury in Arlington Street, and again I indicated most clearly to them that unless there was an effort at retrenchment it would be impossible for me to retain the Exchequer. Then, Sir, in the middle of the month of October, I wrote to the present First Lord of the Treasury, and to the First Lord of the Admiralty, requesting them, as a particular favour, to get the Army and Navy Estimates prepared, so that they might be considered by the Cabinet before Christmas. Not only was I anxious that these matters should be considered by the Cabinet while there was yet time and ample leisure, but I was also determined that if the decision as to the amount of those Estimates should be against me I should not continue in my Office, but would resign at such a moment as to give to Lord Salisbury the most ample margin of time to make any arrangement that was necessary before Parliament met. Well, Sir, on the 13th of December I wrote to Lord Salisbury to say that from what I heard I feared he would have before long to choose between the heads of his great spending Departments and his Chancellor of the Exchequer. On Thursday, the 16th of December, I had another protracted conversation with Lord Salisbury on the whole question, in which I indicated to him that the matter was approaching a crisis. On Monday, the 20th of December, the Estimates were communicated to me, the Navy Estimates by my noble Friend (Lord George Hamilton) in the morning, and the Army Estimates by my right hon. Friend (Mr. Smith) in the afternoon; and it was clear to me that the position that they took up was one which admitted of no modification and no alteration, and I also was aware of what the Prime Minister's mind was on the subject, and on Monday, the 20th, I was put in that corner that I had absolutely no option but to write to Lord Salisbury to resign my Office. I have only wearied the House with these facts because I wanted to show the House that the suggestion that my action has been taken in a hurry is entirely wrong. I greatly doubt whether any Member ever took action on any grave question more deliberately, more long thought of, and more considerately. Now, Sir, I think that those who suppose I would be capable of resigning the Office of Chancellor of the Exchequer in a hurry or in a temper hardly do justice to their charge. There is no position open to a private individual in this country prouder and more honourable than that of Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House of Commons. It is not a position which is lightly or hastily resigned. I can assure my hon. Friends who sit around me that it was a very hard and bitter thing for me to have to do—to sever my connection with the Government, and to resign a position so honourable, although so anxious and responsible. But I could not help it. I was pledged by speeches which I had made to the people. Sir, I may make this remark. The relations which exist between a Minister and the people are nowadays so direct and very close, and owing to the practice of great and large mass meetings, which have become so usual and so common, a Minister or the Leader of the Opposition is brought into close contact with the people. He discourses with the utmost freedom, without much qualification, on public affairs. The practice may have its advantages and its disadvantages, but the practice exists; and I can conceive nothing more disastrous or ruinous, or more fatal to the healthy tone of our English political life, than that the people should take it into their heads that a Minister or Leader of the Opposition, whoever he be, when he comes down to address them, thinks of nothing but exciting a momentary and passing cheer, and leaves the meeting straightway without remembering what manner of man he is. I hope it will never be imputed with accuracy or justice to me that I knowingly or intentionally contributed to such a belief. Sir, I have placed before the House as rapidly as I can the various reasons which forced me, on the 20th of December, to write to Lord Salisbury the letter which I am permitted to read. The House will understand that further opportunities will arise for a more exhaustive and analytical examination of the Expenditure of the Government. The House will not wish me, and I am not anxious to anticipate those opportunities. All I have to do is to place as briefly as possible before the House the reasons which caused me to leave the Government. I wrote on the 20th of December to Lord Salisbury—

"Dear Lord SALISBURY,

"The approximate Estimates for the Army and Navy for the next year have been to-day communicated to me by Lord George Hamilton and Mr. Smith. They amount to £31,000,000; £12,500,000 for the Navy, and £18,500,000 for the Army. The Navy Votes show a decrease of nearly £500,000, but this is to a great extent illusory, as there is a large increase in the demand made by the Admiralty upon the War Office for guns and ammunition. The Army Estimates, thus swollen, show an increase of about £300,000. The total of £31,000,000 for the two Services, which will in all probability be exceeded, is very greatly in excess of what I can consent to. I knew that on this subject I cannot look for any sympathy or effective support from you, and I am certain that I shall find no supporters in the Cabinet. I do not wish to be wrangling and quarrelling in the Cabinet, and therefore I must request to be allowed to give up my Office, and retire from the Government. I am pledged up to the eyes to large reductions of expenditure, and I cannot change my mind on this matter. If the foreign policy of the country is conducted with skill and judgment, our present large and increasing armaments are quite unnecessary, and the taxation which they involve perfectly unjustifiable. The War Estimates might be very considerably reduced, if the policy of expenditure on the fortifications and guns and garrisons of military ports, mercantile ports, and coaling stations was abandoned or modified; but of this I see no chance, and under the circumstances I cannot continue to be responsible for the finances. I am sure you will agree that I am right in being perfectly frank and straightforward on this question, to which I attach the very utmost importance; and, after all, what I have written is only a repetition of what I endeavoured to convey to you in conversation the other day.

"Believe me to be,
"Yours most sincerely,
"RANDOLPH S. CHURCHILL."

I wrote that letter on the 20th of December, and I received, late in the evening of the 22nd of December, the following reply from Lord Salisbury, which I am permitted to read. Lord Salisbury wrote:—

"Hatfield House, Hatfield, Herts,
December 22, 1886.

My dear Randolph,—I have your letter of the 20th from Windsor. You tell me, as you told me orally on Thursday, that £31,000,000 for the two Services is very greatly in excess of what you can consent to; that you are pledged up to the eyes to large reductions of Expenditure, and cannot change your mind in the matter; and that, as you feel certain of receiving no support from me or from the Cabinet in this view, you must resign your Office and withdraw from the Government. On the other hand, I have a letter from Smith telling me that he feels bound to adhere to the Estimates which he showed you on Monday; and that he declines to postpone, as you had wished him to do, the expenditure which he thinks necessary for the fortification of coaling stations, military ports, and mercantile ports. In this unfortunate state of things I have no choice but to express my full concurrence with the views of Hamilton and Smith and my dissent from yours—though I say it both on personal and public grounds with very deep regret. The outlook on the Continent is very black. It is not too much to say that the chances are in favour of war at an early date; and when war has once broken out we cannot be secure from the danger of being involved in it. The undefended state of many of our ports and coaling stations is notorious; and the necessity of protecting them has been urged by a strong Commission, and has been admitted on both sides in debate. To refuse to take measures for their protection would be to incur the gravest possible responsibility. Speaking more generally, I should hesitate to refuse at this time any Supplies which men so moderate in their demands as Smith and Hamilton declare to be necessary for the safety of the country. The issue is so serious that it thrusts aside all personal and Party considerations. But I regret more than I can say the view you take of it; for no one knows better than you how injurious to the public interests at this juncture your withdrawal from the Government may be. In the presence of your very strong and decisive language I can only again express my very profound regret. Believe me, yours very sincerely, SALISBURY."

The House will observe, Sir, that that letter is absolutely final and conclusive. Lord Salisbury did not demur to my suggestion that there was no use in discussing the question in the Cabinet.

Lord Salisbury did not request that the whole matter should be laid before him, as the First Lord of the Treasury, in order that it might receive personal examination. On the contrary, he expressed his total concurrence with the Heads of the Departments, and his total dissent from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He added that he had nothing to do but to express his deep regret. The House will see that that was a letter which brought things to a conclusion. Therefore, on the 22nd of December I wrote the following letter to Lord Salisbury:—

"Carlton Club,
December 22, 1886.

Dear Lord Salisbury,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of to-day's date accepting my resignation of the Chancellorship of the Exchequer. I feel sure you will believe me when I express my deep and abiding appreciation of the unvarying kindness which you have shown me, and of the patience and indulgence with which you have always listened to the views on various public matters which I have from time to time submitted to you. The great question of public expenditure is not so technical or departmental as might be supposed by a superficial critic. Foreign policy and free expenditure upon armaments act and re-act upon one another. I believe myself to be well informed on the present state of Europe; nor am I aware that I am blind or careless to the probabilities of a great conflict between European Powers in the coming year. A wise foreign policy will extricate England from Continental struggles, and keep her outside of German, Russian, French, or Austrian disputes. I have for some time observed a tendency in the Government attitude to pursue a different line of action, which I have not been able to modify or check. This tendency is certain to be accentuated if large Estimates are presented to and voted by Parliament. The possession of a very sharp sword offers a temptation which becomes irresistible to demonstrate the efficiency of the weapon in a practical manner. I remember the vulnerable and scattered character of the Empire, the universality of our commerce, the peaceful tendencies of our democratic electorate, the hard times, the pressure of competition, and the high taxation now imposed, and with these factors vividly before me I decline to be a party to encouraging the military and militant circle of the War Office and Admiralty to join in the high and desperate stakes which other nations seem to be forced to risk. Believe me, I pray you, that it is not niggardly cheeseparing or Treasury crabbedness, but only considerations of high State policy which compel me to sever ties in many ways most binding and pleasant. A careful and continuous examination and study of national finance, of the startling growth of expenditure, of national taxation, resources, and endurance has brought me to the conclusion, from which nothing can turn me, that it is only the sacrifice of a Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the altar of thrift and economy which can rouse the people to take stock of their Leaders, their position, and their future. The character of the domestic legislation which the Government contemplate, in my opinion, falls sadly short of what Parliament and the country expect and require. The foreign policy which is being adopted appears to me at once dangerous and methodless, but I take my stand on expenditure and finance, which involve and determine all other matters; and reviewing my former public declarations on this question, and having no reason to doubt their soundness, I take leave of your Government, and especially of yourself, with profound regret, but without doubt or hesitation. Yours most sincerely,

"RANDOLPH S. CHURCHILL."

I have now laid before the House the causes of my resignation, and I have sincerely to thank the House for the indulgence which it has accorded to me.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I have, Sir, on rising, to make an appeal to the House. Placed in the position in which I am, I desire to appeal to hon. Members for the indulgence and for that favourable interpretation of all my actions which are necessary to one who feels deeply his own deficiencies in following in the steps of the many great men who have held the important position which I now fill. I appeal to them in the hope that by the cordial support of my hon. Friends on this side of the House, and by the generous interpretation of my acts by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite, I may be enabled, to the best of my ability, to maintain the order and decorum of the proceedings of this House and the decencies of debate. Now, Sir, I have risen to make a few observations on the statement that has been made by my noble Friend; and I hope I may be allowed to express on my own part, and also on the part of my Colleagues, the profound regret with which we part from him as a Colleague. We are aware of his great ability; we have derived immense advantage from his counsel and advice; and I may say, for myself, that any sacrifice which I could have made personally would have been gladly made in order that he might have retained his position. He is perfectly well aware that I offered, unreservedly, to place my resignation in the hands of the Government if a Minister could have been found who would have met his views in the matter of public Expenditure, and I also assured him that I would cordially support the Minister who would take my place in the Government in the effort to conduct the affairs of the Department over which I then presided with the economy which he desired. My noble Friend has stated to the House the circumstances which led up to the event which culminated on the 20th of December. My noble Friend was good enough to come to the War Office, and to discuss with me the draft Estimates which had been prepared, and he asked me to cut off the provision for the coaling stations.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL (Paddington, S.): I did not ask for that; I suggested it.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Well, the noble Lord suggested that the provision for the coaling stations should be reduced, or, I think, cut off altogether, and that other considerable reductions should be made. My noble Friend has stated that he hoped we might have made a reduction of £1,000,000 in the Estimates of this year about to be presented to the House, as compared with the Estimates of last year as they were presented to the House. He has said that he would have been satisfied with £500,000, but that as we could not reduce the Estimates even by £500,000 he felt it to be his duty, looking at the tendency and the spirit in which the Departments were administered, to tender his resignation. Sir, I understand that it is not desirable that I should enter into details that might provoke debate. You have ruled, Sir, that debate under the present circumstances is not admissible, and that nothing beyond a personal explanation can be allowed. Under those circumstances, I refrain from entering into the details which would justify, in my judgment, the expenditure which I thought it necessary to propose to the Government. But the opportunity will be afforded, and I hope most earnestly that my noble Friend will then give his assistance to the House and to the Government in the effort to make those reductions which he believes to be possible and advisable. My noble Friend has spoken of himself as pledged to effective retrenchments, which, he said, found no permanent place in the policy of Her Majesty's Government. Well, I hold that I am individually—that I was, and that I continue to be, completely bound and held by retrenchment, and effective retrenchment is part of the policy of Her Majesty's Government, of the House of Commons, and is certainly part of the duty of the House of Commons. But the question arises, what is "effective retrenchment," and how is it to be carried out? I could not see, with my noble Friend, that it was possible to carry out effective retrenchment under present circumstances—under the circumstances alluded to in the letter of Lord Salisbury, referred to by my noble Friend—in the way in which he desired. My noble Friend spoke of the amount as abnormal. Undoubtedly there are abnormal charges in the present Estimates, for which the present Government are not in any way responsible. We are carrying out an expenditure of which, personally, we do not approve; but we could not immediately refuse an expenditure commenced by previous Governments, and which, in the opinion of the House of Commons itself, was found to be necessary and essential, and which was forced upon the Successors of the Government. My noble Friend has spoken of the circumstances and conditions which have brought about the demand which is now made. He has suggested that the policy of the Government is one which tends to an excessive initiation. He has suggested that if there had been a less disposition on the part of the Government to mix itself up in the affairs of Europe, there would be less necessity for the expenditure which has been contemplated. Now, I venture to declare, on the part of the Government, that there has been no excessive initiation, and that there is, in the very bottom of our hearts, a desire to keep England out of any unnecessary complications, and a determination not to enter into any engagements which may compel us to take part in those controversies to which my noble Friend has referred. My noble Friend, in the earlier part of his speech, made the remark that, although there were differences at first, they were susceptible of accommodation. Well, I am quite sure of this—that the differences in the Cabinet were not differences of a character that were susceptible of accommodation, or differences in which my noble Friend could possibly consent to be swayed by the majority of his Colleagues. There is one matter in his letter to which I would wish to draw attention, and that is where he remarks upon the attitude of the Government and their disposition to pursue a line of action which it would be impossible to modify or check. My own belief is, that on further reflection he will find that such is not the case; that his own statement this evening is the more correct statement; and that any matters on which there might be differences of opinion were matters which were susceptible of accommodation between himself and his Colleagues. But I do not think I ought to occupy the attention or time of the House, under present circumstances, at greater length. I not only desire to defend the policy of the Government in regard to those matters of which my noble Friend complains, but I will go further, and say that I desire his assistance, and I will give him all the help in my power; and if he can put his finger on any single blot, if he can give evidence of any extravagance or of any unnecessary expenditure, all the assistance which either a Committee of this House or a Committee of Supply can render him will, I am sure, be cordially afforded to him by the House and the Government, and there will be no disposition to withdraw or keep back information, nor any wish to shrink from obtaining the opinion and the verdict of the House of Commons, both as to our policy and as to the reasonableness of all its conditions. Sir, I am deeply conscious of the distress and suffering which the taxpayer has endured during the last two or three years. I hope a better time is coming, and if it be possible to effect a reduction in the public burdens I shall be the first to welcome assistance in that direction, from whatever quarter of the House it may proceed.

THE RIGHT HON. THE LATE EARL OF IDDESLEIGH.—OBSERVATIONS.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Sir, I may, perhaps, be allowed to solicit the indulgence of the House for one single moment. I believe that in doing so I am acting almost without precedent; but the circumstance—the occurrence itself—is almost without precedent, if not altogether unprecedented. I refer, Sir, to the death of the late Earl of Iddesleigh, who was far better known in this House as Sir Stafford Northcote, and whose long tenure of a seat in this House entitled and obtained for him the affection and respect of all of those who had the honour of sitting with him. I think I may be permitted to express the feeling, not alone of personal sorrow at the personal loss I have sustained, but also of the sorrow which my Friends and Colleagues also feel at the loss they have sustained in the death of one of the best and noblest public servants who ever held Office under the Crown. But I prefer rather to base these remarks upon the services which he rendered to his country and to his Queen—those conscientious, devoted, and painstaking services, which extended over a long period of time. He parted from us scarcely a year ago, and about a fortnight ago he fell, while still in the possession of intellect, in the possession of all the powers of his mind, and devoted, up to the last moment, to the discharge of the public duties in which he was engaged. I venture to think, Sir, that no one who has sat with him in this House, as I have had the honour of doing for 17 years, ever failed to remark the vast stores of information which he possessed, the readiness with which they were reproduced, and the admirable use to which a most retentive memory enabled him to put them, and still more the gentleness and kindliness which were exercised in the discharge of duties which required sudden determination, and very frequently a decision which must be painful or disagreeable to the persons whom they concerned. But there is no one in this House who can say that, at any period, an unguarded, hasty, or unkind word ever passed his lips. He did his duty by his Queen and by his country, and I think I may say with perfect truth that his widow and family are solaced in their deep affliction by the consciousness that the Sovereign and the people enter into their sorrow, and deeply feel with them the heavy loss they have sustained.

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Mid Lothian): I do not intend, Sir, to offer a single word upon the subject which has been treated between the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House; because I believe that an opportunity will be legitimately afforded for that purpose in the debate which may arise on the Speech from the

Throne. But I think that the House will, perhaps, consider it to be becoming on my part to say a few words upon the subject of the death of the late Earl of Iddesleigh, seeing that I had the privilege of a very long and very early friendship with that noble Earl. My knowledge of him commenced in 1843. I had the honour—and it was a great honour—of introducing him into public life, and I had the advantage of profiting largely by his personal services and aid, and of observing that rich and abundant promise of his early life which was so well fulfilled in the after years of his career. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken with excellent feeling, and with admirable propriety, of the character and services of Lord Iddesleigh. We must all, I think, have observed—and I wish to bear my testimony upon it, as in some sense it will be the completion of the testimony of the right hon. Gentleman — that the sentiment upon the death of Lord Iddesleigh which was expressed by the country was not partial, but universal. It was universal, and it was uniform. No distinction could be traced between Party and Party in the feelings that were expressed upon that lamentable event. There were, Sir, no doubt, tragic circumstances; so sudden and appalling a removal would do something to stir, in an unusual manner, the sympathies of the nation. But there was more in the character and the expression of those sympathies than could be accounted for by a mere reference to those momentary and incidental circumstances. As has been said by the right hon. Gentleman, it was known and felt that the country had lost a man of very large experience, of great accumulative knowledge, of remarkable power in instituting and applying that knowledge, and of admirable capacity to render public service to the country. But even that, I think, and the sense of the loss of such a man as I have described, by no means account for the depth of the feeling that has been excited in regard to Lord Iddesleigh. I think there was a sentiment that we had lost, not only that knowledge and that experience and that ability which, thank God, are not rare in this country, but that we had lost a man of qualities not easily to be replaced. The courtesy of Lord Iddesleigh was not only an unvarying courtesy, but it was a courtesy immediately connected with the foundation of his character. And the same remark may be made with respect to his admirable temper. There is no school of temper like the House of Commons. A man, not happily gifted in that respect by nature, may acquire by self-discipline that self-control which is necessary in the transaction of the Business of the House. And so with respect to the courtesy which flowed out from Lord Iddesleigh. On all hands there is the courtesy—and the delightful courtesy—of the man of the world, founded upon his knowledge of society, and upon his knowledge of what is necessary to social intercourse. But the temper and the courtesy of Lord Iddesleigh were based upon a gentleness which was at the very foundation of his character. He seemed to be a man incapable of resenting an injury; a man in whom it was the fixed habit of his life to put himself wholly out of view when he had before him what he deemed to be the attainment of great public objects. And these qualities, Sir, permit me to say, are qualities which are even more valuable than any of the signal intellectual gifts which he expended so freely in the service of his native land. Sir, I join with the right hon. Gentleman in hoping that his widow and his family may both have access to those sources of consolation which are higher than any we can offer; and I trust that they may likewise be greatly aided in enduring the bereavement which they have been called upon to suffer by the assurance of that sympathy which the right hon. Gentleman has so well expressed, and which, if I may presume to do so on the part of many who sit on this side of the House, I may say we entirely share and re-echo —by the assurance that in this Assembly, where, far beyond all other spheres, Lord Iddesleigh was well and thoroughly known—that here it is that the sympathy felt universally for him throughout the country is even more lively and more profound. Sir, it is not for me to speak of Lord Iddesleigh in relation to the political Party to which he belonged. Yet one thing I may venture to say—that, as far as an external observer may feel entitled to speak, I may venture to judge that as that Party has but rarely in its history had in its service a man of greater intellectual gifts, so it has never had one who was more entirely loyal and devoted to its aims. This unanimity of feeling prevails among us, I believe, without distinction or difference of any kind, for, happily, we are not so far gone in the extremes of our great contentions that we cannot, upon occasions such as these, lay aside the recollection of them, and fall back upon that which is broadly human between us; and I trust that the right hon. Gentleman will believe in my perfect sincerity, when I express my conviction with him that the distinguished man whom we have lost will long retain an honoured place in the respect and affection of the nation.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

MR. SPEAKER *reported* Her Majesty's Speech, made by Her Chancellor, and read it to the House.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

[FIRST NIGHT.]

VISCOUNT WEYMOUTH (Somerset, Frome) (who wore the uniform of a Yeomanry officer) said: Mr. Speaker, I trust that the House will credit me with the feeling which I sincerely entertain of my inability adequately to do justice to the variety of topics which are mentioned in Her Majesty's Speech which has just been read from the Chair. In craving the indulgence which this House has always so generously extended to those who have occupied a position similar to that which I have the honour to fill to-day, I beg to assure the House that I do so with all earnestness, impressed as I am alike with the responsibility of my position, and with the consciousness that, both in years and experience, I have the good or ill fortune to be numbered among the youngest Members of this honourable Assembly.

Sir, I have the honour to move that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty in answer to the Speech from the Throne; and in doing so I desire, in the first place, to acknowledge the high compliment which has been paid to the constituency by whose favour I enjoy a seat in this House through the selection of its Representative for the performance of this distinguished and loyal duty.

In the first place, Sir, I crave the special permission of the House to refer for a moment to the sad subject which has already been treated in such eloquent terms by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. Before I obtained a seat in this House, and since I have had that honour, it was my privilege—and I shall ever esteem it a high privilege—to have been closely associated with the distinguished statesman who has so recently passed away. I trust I am not offending against the Rules of the House, or against the feelings of any hon. Member, if I ask for permission to pay a personal tribute of sincere respect and admiration to the memory of the high-souled, patriotic, and generous-hearted Englishman with whom my first acquaintance with political life was so closely connected, and whose remains only the other day were borne to their last resting-place, to the deep regret of the Sovereign he loyally served and the people he passionately loved.

Her Majesty's Gracious Speech gives us the gratifying announcement that her relations with Foreign Powers continue to be on a friendly footing; and that, with regard to the affairs of South-Eastern Europe which are still in an unsettled condition, Her Majesty entertains no apprehension that the peace of Europe is likely to be disturbed. I know, Sir, that the House will re-echo the wish that Her Majesty's anticipations may be altogether fulfilled, and that, especially in this year, which marks the Jubilee of her great and glorious reign, not even the shadow of a cloud of war may throw dark its reflection over any portion of the world which owns the sway of our beloved Queen. It is greatly to be desired that the difficulties to which Her Majesty alludes may ere long be solved—the difficulties which led to the retirement from Bulgaria, under circumstances highly to be regretted, of a Prince who had endeared himself to the people of that country by his military achievements on their behalf, and by his personal qualities. Sir, the House will receive with cordial approval the assurance that this country will not interfere in the election of Prince Alexander's Successor, but that strict regard will be had to those provisions of the Treaty of Berlin which dictate the position to be assumed by the Powers of Europe in the event of any vacancy occurring in the Bulgarian Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I venture to congratulate Her Majesty's Government upon the welcome intelligence which is conveyed to this House in regard to the condition of Egypt. Our troops are being withdrawn from Egyptian territory because they are no longer needed, and in consequence of the state of external and internal tranquillity which their exertions have so happily brought about.

Then, Sir, I would venture to suggest that no more acceptable intimation is conveyed in the Royal Message than is contained in the announcement with reference to the affairs of Burmah. The brilliant genius of the hero of the march from Cabul to Candahar has found yet another field for its exercise in the service of his Queen and country; the valour and devotion of our brave troops have added fresh laurels to their previous records. The wisdom of the statesmanship of the Earl of Dufferin has already exacted an approving acknowledgment; and while a new and vast area has been opened out to British trade and commerce, we have the satisfaction of knowing that the Native population are already reaping the fruits of the civilized Government which replaced a barbarous and besotted despotism, and that a country of rich resources has been reclaimed to honest industry and secure cultivation. In addition, we have the satisfaction of knowing that most of those who were at first leaders of rebellion are now laying down their arms and becoming willing subjects of the Queen. It is with justifiable pride, I think, that we may reflect that once again in the history of this country the planting of the British Flag on foreign soil is synonymous with the institution of the blessings of civilization and order.

I turn now to the declaration that the Estimates which are to be presented to the House for the service of the coming financial year have been framed with a strict regard to economy, and to the efficiency of the Public Service. The House and the country demand of the keepers of the national purse that there shall be no waste of the resources of the nation. At the same time, the House and the country demand, with equal insistance, that every Department of the State shall be efficiently administered. The English people have ever been generous taskmasters to those who have served them well; but to no fault would so little indulgence be shown as to those who have charge of the defences of the nation, and who fail to fulfil their trust with scrupulous exactitude. The greatest of English interests is the maintenance of peace consistently with the national honour; and the surest way to maintain that peace is by creating an unmistakable impression of your ability to render the position of the peace-breakers one absolutely unsatisfactory so far as their own future comfort is concerned. A free and independent commerce, which belongs to a nation like ours, can only be secured by the possession of the means to defend it in the event of attack; and I would humbly submit that those means are mainly, if not entirely, to be found in the maintenance of the naval superiority of our country. I feel sure, Sir, that in their honest and earnest efforts to combine economy with efficient administration Her Majesty's Government will not be forgetful of the spirit breathed by the poet's lines—

"The Fleet of England is her all-in-all;
Her Fleet is in your hands;
And in her Fleet her fate."

Turning now to that portion of the Royal Speech which refers to home affairs and domestic legislation, I would venture to suggest that the prudence which has induced Her Majesty's Government to determine upon dealing first with the problem of the Reform of Local Government in England and Scotland before proceeding to legislate in the same direction with regard to Ireland will commend itself to the common sense and business-like faculties of hon. Members. A modicum of good work achieved is far preferable to ambitious projects which cannot be carried out; and I would venture to suggest that a comprehensive scheme for the improvement of Local Government in England and Scotland, which commanded the support of a majority of this House, would pave the way for the introduction of a similar measure in Ireland, due regard being had to the difference of locality, and the conditions of those for whom it is sought to legislate.

The next measure to which reference is made is one, Sir, which, under a modest guise, will, perhaps, raise high hopes in the breasts of those who are anxious to improve the legislative machinery of the House of Commons. This is a matter which, undoubtedly, underlies the success of all future legislative projects. The Business of this House is retarded by two evils—one the unwieldiness of its own machinery, and the other the growth of what is called wilful or designed obstruction. It is with the former of these evils that Her Majesty's Government propose to deal. Now, Sir, I believe that there is a general agreement that the Business which this House is called upon to transact is far too great for the capacity of the machinery with which it essays to do its work. To improve the process of Private Bill legislation will go far towards improving the legislative path which has so long been seriously blocked. Should these evils assert themselves in the future, as, unfortunately, they have done in the past, the House will look to its natural Leaders for protection. So far as freedom of speech within proper bounds is preserved, and so long as the rights of honest minorities acting within Constitutional limits are respected, those Leaders will not call upon hon. Members in vain for their support in re-establishing this ancient House in its proud position of Mother of Parliaments and a pattern for all Legislative Assemblies.

The Royal Speech conveys an intimation that the House will be asked to consider measures having for their object the removal of hindrances which exist as to the cheap and rapid Transfer of Land. I do not think that this measure, so desirable in itself, will be based on certain principles—or, rather, on certain no principles—which in some places have been advocated. I do not suppose that the transfer of land will be made so cheap as to cost nothing, or so easy of passage that the mere exercise of will will put one man in the possession of the property of another; but I venture to hope that by rendering the description of parcels of land more simple—perhaps by some system of registration of title—the cost of transfer may be so diminished, and the law's delays so removed, that the Crown may be set on legislation in this direction which is for ever connected with the name of Earl Cairns. In the same paragraph of the Speech we are promised a measure to provide greater facilities for the acquisition of Allotments by Small Householders, and to encourage the Sale of Glebe Lands. The latter measure, while conferring an undoubted advantage upon the present owners of glebe lands, will, in itself, tend to assist in the achievement of the former measure. Representing, as I do, a constituency situated in a district which is closely identified with agricultural pursuits, the House will, perhaps, permit me to express my belief that these measures will be welcomed by the rural population, equally with the dwellers in the neighbourhood of small towns, as legislative benefits for some time promised on their behalf.

The question of the levying of tithes has also attracted the attention of Her Majesty's Government. Upon this question, which affects some parts of England and Wales, I can only venture to express the hope that the grievance, which is limited in its area, but which is exceedingly irritating in its circumstances, will be removed by the legislation which is proposed.

The proposals which are contained in Her Majesty's Speech with regard to Railway Rates will be received with no inconsiderable hope of relief by a large portion of the community, who are now labouring under the intolerable pressure of rates levied with undue preference. Those who are connected with the agricultural interest will hail with satisfaction a measure which will afford to them some prospect of assistance in the carriage of their produce to market; and the great mining industries of the country will receive a fresh impetus from the acquisition of greater facilities of transit for their outputs, owing to a fairer method of imposing the rates with which they are charged.

Sir, in approaching the last subject in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, on which I feel bound to say a few words, I know that I shall carry the general consent of the House with me, at all events, in recording the satisfaction and the pleasure with which the House receives the assurance that crimes of a grave character have been rare during the last three months in the Sister Isle. I wish I could think that every reference which will be made to Ireland in the ensuing debate would be equally free from controversy. It is very sad to think that every ray of sunshine which seems about to burst through the clouds of Ireland's trouble is destined to be obscured by the baneful conduct of evil conspirators and pernicious agitators. Class hostility, dishonesty in social relations, and treason to the Constitution are the stock-in-trade of those who fatten upon an impulsive and misguided people. There have been, Sir, we are authoritatively told, in some parts of Ireland organized attempts to incite the occupiers of land against the fulfilment of their legal obligations. Behind that conspiracy is another for the repeal of the Union between Great Britain and Ireland. The men who are engaged in these conspiracies are both active and mischievous; and, to quote the words of Mr. Pitt—

> "It is enough to make them hate the Union; that it has a tendency to preserve order, for order is the extinction of their hopes."

Her Majesty's Ministers declare that these evils have gained way, owing to defects in the machinery of the law, but not owing to the law itself, and they have expressed their intention to ask for powers to remedy those defects. The country will consider that, in making this declaration, Her Majesty's Ministers are doing their duty. The evils which, unhappily, they are called upon to encounter are not too great for the genius of the people of this country to overcome, or for the majesty of those laws to counteract which prevail in every other well-ordered and civilized community. But, Sir, with the suppression of crime Her Majesty's Government have not lost sight of remedial measures for real grievances; and in the Report of the Commission which has recently been engaged upon an inquiry into the causes of the failure of the recent land legislation for Ireland, and into the best means of developing the resources of that country, we look for wise measures to promote the comfort and welfare of the law-abiding population.

It only remains for me now, Sir, to thank the House for the kind manner in which it has acceded to my original request for its indulgence. I cordially acknowledge the generous forbearance with which it has received my first effort to elicit its sympathy and engage its attention. If, Sir, I have omitted to mention any matter of interest in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, it is because I feel that I should be unduly trespassing on the time of this House, and because I knew that I could leave those subjects to be fully dealt with by the hon. Member who will immediately follow me.

In conclusion, may I venture to express a hope that ere long, in every quarter of Her Majesty's Dominions, all Her Majesty's subjects, without distinction of race or creed, may be united in a common devotion to Her Royal Person, in attachment to the fundamental principles of the Constitution, in affectionate regard the one to the other, knowing no rivalry, save that in which each strives to excel the other in promoting the well-being of a common country and a united State.

Sir, I have the honour to move that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, in reply to Her Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne—the terms of which it is now my privilege to read:—

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, to thank Her Majesty for the Most Gracious Speech which Her Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament:
>
> "Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that Her Majesty's relations with all Foreign Powers continue to be friendly:
>
> "To thank Her Majesty for informing us that the affairs of South Eastern Europe are still in an unsettled condition; but that Her Majesty does not apprehend that any disturbance of European peace will result from the unadjusted controversies which have arisen in that region. Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that while Her Majesty deplores the events which compelled Prince Alexander of Bulgaria to retire from the Government of that Principality, Her Majesty has not judged it expedient to interfere in the proceedings for the election of his successor until they arrive at that stage at which Her Majesty's Assent is required by the Stipulations of the Treaty of Berlin:
>
> "To thank Her Majesty for informing us that the task which has been undertaken by Her Majesty's Government in Egypt is not yet accomplished; but that substantial advance has been made towards the assurance of external and internal tranquillity:
>
> "To assure Her Majesty that we learn with satisfaction that the operations in Burmah have been conducted by Her Majesty's Troops with bravery and skill, for the purpose of extirpating the brigandage which has grown up during recent years of misgovernment. Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that the bands of

marauders by whom Upper Burmah has been long infested have been dispersed, that many of the leaders have laid down their arms, and that Her Majesty entertains a confident hope that the general pacification of the Country will be effected during the present season:

"To thank Her Majesty for informing us that Commercial Treaties have been concluded with the Kingdoms of Greece and Roumania, and that Papers on these subjects will be laid before us:

"Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that the Estimates for the Expenditure of the ensuing year, which have been framed with a careful regard to economy and to the efficiency of the Public Service, will be submitted to us:

"To thank Her Majesty for informing us that the condition of Ireland still requires our anxious attention; that grave crimes have happily been rarer during the last few months than during a similar period in the preceding year, but that the relations between the owners and occupiers of land, which in the early part of the autumn exhibited signs of improvement, have since been seriously disturbed in some districts by organised attempts to incite the latter class to combine against the fulfilment of their legal obligations. Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that the efforts of Her Majesty's Government to cope with this evil have been seriously impeded by difficulties incident to the method at present prescribed by Statute for dealing with such offences, and that our early attention will be called to proposals for reforms in Legal Procedure, which seem necessary to secure the prompt and efficient administration of the Criminal Law:

"To thank Her Majesty for informing us that since Her Majesty last addressed us, the Commissioners directed to inquire into certain subjects of great importance to the material welfare of Ireland have been actively prosecuting their labours, and that the Report of the Commission on the operation of the recent Acts dealing with the Tenure and Purchase of Land will shortly be laid before us, which will doubtless receive from us the careful attention which the serious importance of the subject demands:

"Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that Bills for the improvement of Local Government in England and Scotland will be laid before us, and that, should circumstances render it possible, they will be followed by a measure dealing with the same subject in Ireland; that a Bill for improving and cheapening the process of Private Bill Legislation in England, Scotland, and Ireland, will be submitted to us, and that we shall be asked to consider measures having for their object to remove hindrances which exist to the cheap and rapid Transfer of Land, to facilitate the provision of Allotments for Small Householders, and to provide for the readier Sale of Glebe Lands:

"To thank Her Majesty for informing us that the Commission which Her Majesty issued in 1885, to inquire into the lamentable depression under which Trade and Agriculture have been suffering for many years, has presented a valuable Report, which, together with the important evidence collected by them, will be laid before us:

"Humbly to thank Her Majesty for informing us that a Bill for altering the mode of levying Tithes in England and Wales will be submitted to us; that, in regard to Scotland, we shall be asked to consider Measures for the reform of the Universities, for completing recent Legislation as to the powers of the Secretary for Scotland, and for amending the Procedure of Criminal Courts; and that Measures dealing with the Regulation of Railway Rates, and for preventing the fraudulent use of Merchandise Marks, will also be brought under our consideration:

"To assure Her Majesty that our careful consideration shall be given to the subjects which Her Majesty has recommended to our attention, and to the Measures which may be submitted to us; and we earnestly trust that, with regard to these and all other matters pertaining to our functions, the keeping and guidance of Almighty God may be vouchsafed to us."

MR. G. W. BALFOUR (Leeds, Central) (who wore a Court dress) said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the Address in reply to Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, which has been moved by my noble Friend, although I cannot, like him, plead that this is absolutely my first experience in addressing the House, I, nevertheless, venture to express the hope that I may receive an equal measure of consideration in the discharge of the difficult duty which has been laid upon me.

My noble Friend, as well as the Representatives of both the Front Benches, have spoken in feeling terms of the loss which the country has sustained in the sudden and lamented death of Lord Iddesleigh. I desire to add my voice to theirs in the expression of the deep sorrow which has been caused by that melancholy event throughout the length and breadth of the land, alike in friend and foe. And yet I doubt whether Lord Iddesleigh had a foe, and whether this word is appropriate in the case of one who was so blameless as a man, and so selfless as a statesman. Of Lord Iddesleigh it may be truly said that he died in harness; for I am assured, Sir, that Lord Iddesleigh left no arrears in his Office—that he finished the whole of the work up to the very day on which he was taken from us. The nation will cherish his memory with respectful affection; and the absence of his sage and moderate counsels will be a loss to his Party which they can ill afford at the present critical stage of affairs.

For I think, Sir, that no one will deny that Parliament meets on the present occasion at a moment of grave anxiety, and in circumstances calculated to put to a severe test the statesmanship of our leading men, and the political sagacity and steadiness of the nation at large. Whether we look at home or abroad the prospect is serious, and even menacing. It is certainly satisfactory to learn, from Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, that her relations with Foreign Powers continue friendly. But Governments, as we know, are always at peace until they are at war; and I think if we look for solid comfort we shall find less in this general assurance than in the more explicit declaration which immediately follows it, that Her Majesty has no reason to apprehend that any disturbance of peace will result from the condition of affairs in the South-East of Europe.

Undoubtedly there had arisen in the public mind a not unreasonable apprehension that a spark might be lit in Bulgaria which would set all Europe in a blaze, and, perhaps, involve this country in the universal conflagration. Allusion has been made in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech to the events which led to the abdication and retirement of Prince Alexander. The midnight plot, the kidnapping of a brave and gallant Prince in his own Palace in the capital of a country which he had just led to victory; his deportation beyond the frontier; his triumphant return; his second retirement, under open pressure from a Power which could not brook the defeat of its secret machinations; the bullying mission of General Kaulbars, and the steady courage and quiet dignity of the Bulgarian people and rulers under circumstances of the greatest provocation—all this is too fresh in our memory to need recalling in detail. Sir, the circumstances which led to Prince Alexander's abdication excited, and justly excited, in this country the greatest indignation; but there is a long step between sympathy and active interference. It would be ridiculous in us to assume the office of knight-errant to the whole world. To adopt a line of action that would be likely to lead to conflict would not only be Quixotic, but wholly unjustifiable, unless our own interests were attacked, or unless a duty were imposed upon us by Treaty obligations.

Sir, I rejoice that Her Majesty believes that a settlement of this perplexing question is likely to be effected by the peaceable methods of diplomacy. For that this country has got interests in the East, and that, in certain contingencies, these interests might be seriously jeopardized, I hold to be undoubted. It is true that Austria stands sentinel on the ramparts, and that she has nearer and dearer interests in any changes that may take place in the Balkan Peninsula than we have. Austria's is the house next to the house on fire; ours is only the next but one. But we cannot expect that Austria will do our business, any more than Austria can expect that we shall do hers; and if we approach the question with that expectation, we shall be apt to find that what is everybody's business is nobody's business. We have joint interests in the East, and, therefore, joint responsibilities, and in those joint responsibilities Austria's share is the largest.

The censure implied in the speech of the noble Lord the Member for Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) on the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government is testimony, at least, to this—that the duty of maintaining the interests and honour of this country in foreign parts is not one the obligation of which they are likely to minimize. If the noble Lord is right, the foreign policy of the Government is likely to be too spirited, rather than too tame. I yield to no one in my admiration of the brilliant talents of the noble Lord, and in my regret that he should have found it necessary to leave the ranks of a Unionist Ministry; but I do not believe the country will be ready, without further evidence, to take his view of the imprudence of the foreign policy of Her Majesty's present Advisers. We know that his view is not shared by any one of his late Colleagues; and, at least, they may claim that their policy shall be judged by results. However this may be, of one thing we may be sure—that no matter to what Party a Minister of this country may belong, the foundation of his policy must be an earnest striving for peace. As my noble Friend has said, peace itself is one of the greatest of British interests, and no Minister could be so guilty or foolish as to choose the alternative of war, if he thought it possible to escape that alternative consistently with the honour and welfare of the nation. What possible reason could we have for a policy of aggression? We have no war of revenge to make—no war of revenge to anticipate. We have no tottering dynasty to support; nor have we any temptation to silence complaints at home by dazzling achievements abroad. The life of this country is commerce, and the interests of commerce require peace—peace, if possible, between our neighbours in Europe one with another; but, above all things, peace between our neighbours and ourselves.

But, Sir, there is an old saying, and, as I believe, a wise one, that those who desire peace must be prepared, if need be, for war. That saying does not appear to commend itself to the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington. If I understand him rightly, his view is that those who desire peace ought to take care that they shall not be strong enough for war; that we should continue weak lest we be led into temptation. Sir, the noble Lord, in one of the letters which he read to the House, spoke of the danger of having a sharp sword, the possession of which, he said, was almost sure to lead to the desire of using it. Metaphors are somewhat misleading; but if I were to use a metaphor at the present moment, I should say that the Government, in insisting that our coaling stations and ports should be defended, is not asking for a sword, but for a shield. If the question is one of temptation, and if strength is likely to tempt us into war, we ought to remember that weakness would be no less a temptation to our enemies to attack us. If the War Minister had asked for gigantic armaments and a vast increase of expenditure, then I could understand the position taken up by the noble Lord; but, unless I am mistaken, the Estimates for the coming year will actually show a reduction. And what is the item which the noble Lord has singled out for attack? Why, it is the most defensive item in the whole Military Budget.

No doubt, the view taken by the noble Lord is a very convenient one for the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but I think, in the long run, it would prove a very inconvenient view for the nation. We learn from Her Majesty's Speech that the Estimates have been framed with a due regard to economy and the efficiency of the Public Service. I trust that the first part of this formula is not a mere formula, and that the noble Lord has not sacrificed himself in vain on the altar of thrift and economy. But in every question of Expenditure we have two things to look at; the money spent and the value received. Zeal for economy ought not to blind us to the paramount necessity of efficiency in the Public Service. No doubt, the burden of taxation is heavy and grievous to be borne, and I fear it is also beyond question that much of the large sums raised by taxation is unprofitably spent. It is the business of those who are entrusted with the management of the national finances to discover the particular points where waste or leakage occurs, and to do their utmost to stop it. But, Sir, if a private individual wishes to set about curtailing expenditure he does not commence by cutting off the sums annually paid for insurance. I hope that we, as a nation, will not be guilty of a folly which we should shun in our private capacity. A great nation like ours, with Possessions in every quarter of the globe, whose commerce extends to all parts of the habitable world, cannot carry out the requirements of its Public Service for nothing. I trust the day will never come when the British nation will be afraid of its own greatness, and will shrink from those sacrifices which may be found necessary to maintain not only its greatness, but even its safety.

Sir, I now pass to the question in which, as the Representative of a great industrial centre, I am peculiarly interested—I mean the question of trade. Attention has been called in Her Majesty's Speech to the Report of the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade. The Report of the Commission is, indeed, of a most interesting character, and it bears throughout signs of that calm sobriety and genial wisdom which was characteristic of its lamented Chairman (the Earl of Iddesleigh). The fears expressed at the time of its appointment by over-jealous Free Traders have, I think, not been justified; for the Report may be studied from beginning to end by the most orthodox without the slightest fear of having their faith perverted. Its general character may be fairly described as optimistic, and the revival which has lately taken place goes some way to confirm the view which the Commissioners have taken. In their view the depression resolves itself, on inquiry, into lowness of profits, and, in many cases, even an absence of profits. But although, if that state of things were to continue indefinitely, it could not fail sooner or later to affect the wage-earning classes, it does not appear that, so far at least, there has been any great fall in the rate of wages. It is a satisfaction to learn from the Report of the Commissioners that the condition of the working classes appears, on the whole, to be one of prosperity. The recommendations which the Commissioners have made are comparatively few in number, and apply, I think, to two questions only—to the question of railway transport, and to that of the fraudulent working of merchandize. Measures dealing with both of these subjects are announced in Her Majesty's Speech from the Throne. With regard to the latter, I do not think it is a matter on which much difference of opinion is likely to arise; but the question of railway rates is certainly one which involves difficult and delicate considerations. I have, however, a confident hope that when Her Majesty's Government produce their measure they will be able to reconcile the legitimate interests of the public with the established rights of the Railway Companies, which it would be unjust, and therefore unwise, to infringe.

As being myself a Scotchman, I see with pleasure that, in addition to the Local Government Bill referred to by my noble Friend, several measures are in contemplation dealing with the wants of Scotland; and, in particular, a measure for the reform of the Universities. The Scottish Universities are institutions of which the Scottish people are justly proud. They are national and democratic in the best and worthiest sense, and it is high time that those changes should be introduced into their constitution which are confessedly necessary to maintain them in healthy growth, and enable them to continue in the future that work which they have so successfully carried out in the past.

I must not omit to notice the prospect which is held out to us of a Bill for cheapening and improving the process of private legislation in the Three Kingdoms. This measure is intended to meet what I believe to be a very genuine grievance, and will, at the same time, relieve the Imperial Parliament of a portion of the work with which it is at present overburdened. I trust, too, that it will go far to satisfy whatever there is genuine and reasonable in the demand of the Sister Kingdoms for greater control over their own local affairs.

I think, Sir, that I have now adverted to most of the points mentioned in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech which my noble Friend has omitted to touch upon. There remains the question of Ireland, which, following his example, I have reserved to the last, although, in point of importance, it will be generally allowed that it ranks first of all. Sir, I entirely agree with the view of those who believe that if a settlement of the agrarian question in Ireland could be effected, the agitation in favour of Home Rule would cease to be formidable. I also think that any real settlement of that question must be in the direction of converting the smaller tenants into peasant proprietors. We are informed in Her Majesty's Speech that the Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the causes which have hampered the operation of the Acts dealing with the purchase of land will shortly be presented to us. But we hardly require to wait for the Report of the Commissioners to be convinced that the principal causes are the opposition of the National League, the agitation carried on under its auspices, and the hopes which it has excited in the breasts of the peasantry of Ireland that they have only to hold on and they will get their land at a mere nominal price, or even for nothing at all. The agitation fomented by the National League has always been unscrupulous in its character; but for open defiance of the law it has reached a culminating point in the scheme known as "the Plan of Campaign."

Her Majesty informs us in Her Gracious Speech that the Government, having found the existing legal procedure too cumbrous and dilatory effectively to cope with the organized attempt to incite the tenants of Ireland to combine against the fulfilment of their legal obligations, proposals will be laid before the House for such reforms of legal procedure as are necessary to secure the prompt and efficient administration of the existing Criminal Law. If the Government deem it necessary to make such a demand, certainly the greatest responsibility will rest upon this House if it withholds its assent. To maintain law and order, and to secure to every class of the community its just rights, is the object for which Governments principally exist. If a Government considers that the present methods of procedure are inadequate to the effective vindication of the law, it is their absolute duty—a duty from which nothing can absolve them—to make good the defect. In the absence of that habit of obedience to law which is necessary for the stability of the social structure, no remedial measure and no concession of power to Local Bodies in Ireland is given a fair chance of working successfully. It is useless to build additional storeys to your house when its foundations are crumbling away. [*Irish Cheers.*] Sir, I appeal not to those hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side who are so ready with their ironical cheers; but I appeal to the followers of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), and I desire to address to them one question. They are resolved to secure, if they can, Home Rule for Ireland. We, on this side of the House, are determined to resist the demand for Home Rule to the utmost extent of our power. But are they prepared to connive at the warfare which is being carried on by their allies in Ireland with unlawful weapons? Are they prepared to sit quietly by while the attempt is being made to wrest the concession of Home Rule by reducing the deliberations of this ancient Assembly to impotence, and by making all government in Ireland impossible? To poison the wells has always been held to be a base and barbarous method of carrying on war. This method has its counterpart in political warfare also. To spread the deadly germs of anarchy and lawlessness, with a view to gaining some particular political end, what is this but to poison the wells, and to taint at its very source that which is a necessity of life to every civilized community? I hope the followers of the right hon. Gentleman will pause before they enter upon so reckless a course. Sir, I beg to second the Motion of my noble Friend.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, &c."—[See page 23.]

MR. W. E. GLADSTONE (Edinburgh, Mid Lothian): Sir, I rise at this somewhat inconvenient hour (8.10) on account of the value which I attach to the old traditions of this House, and on account, perhaps, of my own inclination to adhere to those traditions, hoping against hope, even when they have become somewhat superannuated. It has been almost uniformly the anxiety of Governments to limit the debate on the Address; and the person occupying the place of Leader of the Opposition has usually—indeed I think invariably—been found willing to promote that purpose by rising immediately after the Mover and Seconder of the Address. But I am bound to say that that arrangement has always proceeded upon the assumption that the speeches of the Mover and Seconder of the Address were not to be polemical speeches. I shall do nothing to notice any polemical portions of those speeches upon the present occasion; but I will content myself by discharging a much more agreeable duty in making the statement that, in my opinion, both of them have shown abundant ability in the course of those speeches, and shown faculties which may enable them to take an important and valuable part in the discussions in this House. Therefore, while I congratulate these Gentlemen, I waive entering upon certain portions of their speeches, which, however, I anticipate will draw forth answers from others. I shall notice first the declaration of the Gracious

Speech from the Throne that the Estimates which are to be laid before us have been prepared with due regard to economy. Of course, it will be easily anticipated that I commence with that portion of the subject in consequence of the speech which we have just heard from the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill). My own opinion is that that speech, which has already provoked an animated rejoinder—partly, I think, delivered while the noble Lord was out of the House—from the Seconder of the Address, has laid the foundation of very many future discussions. I shall observe all the care and caution I can in referring to it on the present occasion, because my anxiety is not to turn that speech to any Party advantage, but to regard it as affording hopeful opportunities for bringing about a recurrence to the older methods of public administration, and to principles of public expenditure, which have undoubtedly, of late years, lost much of their efficiency and power. The noble Lord has read a Correspondence of great importance, and has explained to us, in terms the most distinct, the nature of the reasons which compelled him to resign his Office. There was no portion of the speech of the noble Lord which I thought more directly commended itself to the general acceptance of the House than that in which he indicated his own sense of the greatness of the sacrifice he was making. The noble Lord has made a great sacrifice. He was entitled to the presumption that such a sacrifice could only have been made under the influence of deep conviction. I have known nothing of the noble Lord in regard to questions of finance and of public Expenditure until to-night, except that he had undoubtedly, as he told us in his speech, pledged himself largely on the subject of economy. To-night, in my opinion, he has shown he has formed a firm resolve to act upon and to redeem those pledges, if it be in his power. He has stated principles which have great breadth and comprehensiveness. He has also explained to us in very clear language the manner and the degree in which he proposed to apply those principles on the present occasion. I am bound to say, as far as my judgment goes, the principles he propounded were safe, and not only so, but the manner in which he proposed to apply them. I do not mean as to this or that item of reduction; but the scale upon which he had proposed to apply them was judicious and was moderate. The noble Lord referred to a subject of great importance in touching upon the connection between foreign policy and the scale of our Expenditure; and I think it was the late Lord Beaconsfield who, standing in the position I now occupy, expressed an opinion of great force and weight as to the existence of that connection. The noble Lord appeared to indicate to us that there are reasons why we should recognize a tendency towards increasing Expenditure, or a hindrance to the reduction of our Expenditure, in certain tendencies in our foreign policy. I do not mean to make any broad assertion upon that subject, and the general purpose of what I have to say on several points will rather be to invite re-assuring explanations from the Government, than to state propositions in the nature of charges or accusations against them. On the question of foreign policy I am bound to say that, as far as I know, the Prime Minister and now the Foreign Secretary, and the late Lord Iddesleigh as Foreign Secretary, have taken just views of the position of the recently emancipated races in the Balkan Peninsula, and of the reciprocal obligations between them and the Porte. Yet there was a speech delivered by Lord Salisbury, at the Guildhall, which raised in many minds some apprehension, and appeared to lay a foundation for the question whether it was true that we, in our negotiations upon the politics of the Balkan Peninsula, had indicated to one particular Foreign Power that if she were disposed to take a particular course, and that course led to a conflict with any Power, we should be prepared to range ourselves on her side. I shall not enter into any discussion of that matter. I make no assertion beyond the fact that such was the idea conveyed to many minds, and I simply express the hope that upon that subject we shall receive assurances from Her Majesty's Government in the course of this debate which will entirely remove any such impression. With regard to the general bearing of the speech of the noble Lord, I consider it is a speech which is not delivered by way of appeal to the Party who sit on this side of the House; I consider it is a most important declaration, addressing itself mainly to Gentlemen who sit opposite. If the question of economy be taken up largely on this side of the House it becomes a Party question. What I desire from the bottom of my heart is to see the question of economy once more what it was for the first 20 years of my political life—a question in which there was no distinction of Party, in which each vied with the other in real and energetic attempts to keep down the public Expenditure. On this question of economy I am bound to say I am only too familiar with the stereotyped official apologies which always proceed from the Representatives of Departments when they feel themselves unable to comply with demands like those of the noble Lord to derive the smallest satisfaction from those apologies. The challenge to the noble Lord to put his finger on this or that item appeared to me to be a challenge to fight a battle upon very unequal terms. The noble Lord cannot have the technical, professional, and official knowledge, armed with which every Representative of the spending Departments comes into the field. I will not pursue the question further than to say I trust that Gentlemen opposite, especially those who represent the large towns of the country, will deeply and profoundly weigh the declarations made by the noble Lord to-night, and that they will, while the question is still within the precincts of their own Party, consider what they can do to impress economical views upon Her Majesty's Government. Economical proposals made by us naturally come to them with prejudice ; there is a flavour, there is a colour of Party, and the possibility of Party collision about them. When they come from those who sit on that side of the House there can be nothing of the kind. Let me tell them that the speech of the noble Lord and the effort of the noble Lord will be much considered and weighed in the country. They lie under a great and a special responsibility, because they can take up the views of the noble Lord as friends of Her Majesty's Government, and they can impress the mind of the Government, before it is finally committed to a given scale of expenditure, with the necessity of doing something to indicate, at all events, even if it be only as a symbol, yet as something in the nature of a real symbol, an intention of endeavouring to reverse that incessant tendency towards the augmentation of Expenditure in the great Departments under which we have so long laboured. The favourable course of affairs in Egypt has, I think, afforded a great opening for encouragement. The heavy duties with which we were charged in that country added largely to the Expenditure of this country ; and, unless such opportunities are made use of, I feel it is idle to indulge in mere generalities. There has been no period at which these generalities have not been thrown broadcast over the country; no period in which the Ministry of the day have not given constant assurances of their desire for economy. I remember the day when the Army, Navy, and Ordnance Estimates—for there were then three Departments—amounted in all to £11,000,000 ; and these Estimates were proposed on the responsibility of Sir Robert Peel as the head of a Conservative Government, having for his leading and most important Colleague the Duke of Wellington, then in the full vigour of his age and the full maturity of his experience. These days are gone by, and cannot be revived. But between £11,000,000 and £30,000,000 there is a very wide space indeed. It is not a question upon which there need be the smallest distinction between Party and Party. If the day comes when it is—and it need not come as yet—it will be because Gentlemen opposite have lost their opportunity. I am making my appeal to Gentlemen opposite, who have the opportunity, if they think fit to use it, of distinguishing themselves and serving their country by endeavouring to press upon the Government the necessity of some spontaneous effort, not to do great things, not to make flourishing statements, but to make some spontaneous effort of a real though moderate character, which may indicate a fixed determination now in time of peace to work the public Expenditure into the direction of economy. There is a question in connection with the retirement of the noble Lord on which I think it necessary to speak some words of criticism. That question is in reference to the changes in the construction of the Government which have followed upon the retirement of the noble Lord. Those changes, though they are not numerous, are of the most important character. They are open, it appears to me, to very grave objections, and I will state my objections under three heads. To the first objection I do not attach the same importance as to the second and the third; at the same time, it is one which I think ought to be stated. My first objection is to the severance of the Office of First Lord of the Treasury from the Leadership of the Government. I do not know why it is that a Government which avows itself to be Conservative should, upon some temporary consideration of convenience, depart from an important tradition of 170 years' standing. For 170 years, with two exceptions, there has been an unbroken union between the Office of First Lord of the Treasury and the headship of the Government; and I should detain the House too long were I now to explain all the consequences of that union. But I will refer to one of the consequences of that union which at this moment is directly applicable to the case of the noble Lord. When the First Lord of the Treasury is the Prime Minister of this country, as by fixed tradition he has been for many years and ought to be, his position in regard to the Chancellor of the Exchequer is this—that he never interferes with him, at least he never legitimately interferes with him, in regard to the ordinary public Expenditure. But, on the great annual occasion when the scale of that Expenditure and the mode in which it is to be met are determined, the position of the First Minister as First Lord of the Treasury is of great importance. It is for him then to determine whether he should support the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I may say, Sir, from an experience of 12 years in the Office of Chancellor of the Exchequer and nearly 11 years as Prime Minister, that there is no Minister who requires the support of the head of the Government like the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, one may say, is, in the public interest, the standing enemy of all the Departments. It is no slight matter to carry on that warfare. I rejoice that a man of the noble Lord's age and energy has set about it. No man, except one in the fullest possession of hopeful courage and energy, would undertake it; and that he should have at his back the First Lord of the Treasury, who is responsible for disowning or supporting him, is a matter of the greatest consequence. I need not remark that it is no reproach to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, when I say that if the First Lord of the Treasury is not the head of the Government he has no power whatever. What is the position of the right hon. Gentleman as First Lord of the Treasury, not being the head of the Government? He has the Leadership of the House of Commons, and in respect of that he will have to perform extremely laborious duties for six months, through which I heartily wish him well; but for the other six months of the year the right hon. Gentleman will be in possession of an excellent sinecure—a sinecure substantially in the same sense as that held by the Lord Privy Seal, whose duties consist of affixing that important instrument from time to time. Apart from the headship of the Government, any man of business much inferior to the right hon. Gentleman—whom I believe to be an excellent man of business—could perform the whole of the duties of the First Lord of the Treasury in the space of less than three days. That is an arrangement, then, which, I am bound to say, does not commend itself either to my antiquated or my utilitarian notions. I come now to the two other points; and, first, I ask how is the Foreign Secretary, being also the First Minister, to exercise concurrent action with the heads of Departments in all the important affairs of those Departments? I say confidently that, according to the scale of the human faculties as they have been known in this country during the present century, the thing cannot be done. The Foreign Office requires the continuous attention of the Foreign Minister, who has the most exacting, unsleeping Office in the whole Government. It is impossible that a Prime Minister also holding that Office can watch and keep an eye upon the important proceedings of other Departments of his Government as he should do; and, so far as the action of the various Departments is concerned, I affirm that where the Foreign Secretary is also the Prime Minister the Government must be a Government without a head. In my opinion, the Cabinet, which has grown almost unobserved, passing on from step to step in the development of its existence and its powers, is at once the most delicate and also, perhaps, the most important part of the whole of our Constitution, and serious public and political evil must follow any derangement of that machinery. It might be said that this is not the first time that Lord Salisbury has been Foreign Minister and Prime Minister, and that no objection has been taken to it. That is perfectly true. It is true that I objected very strongly at that time, as I do now, though it is also true that I did not lay my objections before the House. Why? Because when in January last we met the first Government of Lord Salisbury, I looked upon that Government as having a purely transitory existence. It was supported by only 250 Gentlemen out of 670, and it required no Zadkiel, no prophetic almanack or instrument of that kind, to predict, or at least to be conscious, that its days were numbered. I think it was not unknown before the present Government was formed what my sentiments were. I will now deal with the third objection, which is this—that this arrangement introduces a fundamental change into the machinery for working the foreign policy of the country. For the whole period of my political life—and I am pretty confident for many years before—the foreign policy of this country—I do not mean in mere Departmental concerns, but in everything of an important and delicate character—has been worked by the joint action of the Foreign Secretary and the Prime Minister. One incidental consequence of that arrangement has been that in almost all cases, though I admit there have been exceptions to this, there has been in each House of Parliament one person specially responsible for Foreign Affairs. I may refer to the time of Lord Palmerston, Lord Grey, and Lord Melbourne. It is of the greatest importance that that dual action should be maintained, because it was in the nature of a security to the Sovereign, to the Cabinet, and to the country. I do not wish to convey to the minds of the House that the Prime Minister stood in the same relation to the Department as the Foreign Minister did; because, although it was the duty of the Foreign Minister to call the Prime Minister's attention to foreign matters, the decision would rest with him, and not with the Premier. That was the process in constant operation; but the system has now been swept away. Few are the days, especially in the Session of Parliament, in which close communication with Foreign Affairs must not go on between the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister; but now one man will be the sole judge, will be the judge of the diction of the despatches, and those niceties even of expression upon which our foreign relations, and even the peace of the world, so much depend. I am not going to speak, as I saw it stated in a newspaper the other day, of this arrangement as an "unconstitutional one." If I have avoided the use of that epithet, it is because it is an epithet which is the foundation of infinite disputation. But I will say this—that it is a wanton rupture of an old-established and invariable practice of the greatest importance, in my opinion, to the good conduct of the public affairs of this country. Nor am I aware of any compensating advantages which can be shown in the face of the formidable objections to which I am now alluding. Before quitting the subject, I will explain what I meant when I spoke of 170 years without a break. It is commonly considered that about 120 years ago—perhaps not quite so much—Lord Chatham was Prime Minister of this country. What I believe to be true is that Lord Chatham did perform a particular function ordinarily performed by the Prime Minister. He was the maker of the Cabinet, which afterwards became so well known as the Cabinet, first of the Duke of Grafton, and afterwards of Lord North. But I am totally unaware that Lord Chatham, after the making of the Cabinet, ever managed it as its Chief; on the contrary, it is well known, on the surface of history, that he substantially retired from public life, and from the Metropolis, and hardly took any part in public affairs, except to vindicate principles of his own. Well, these are principles of very great consequence and importance, upon which, entertaining a very decided opinion, I have thought it my duty to lay them before the House, because I think it should have an opportunity of forming a practical judgment on the matters with which I am now concerned. Now, there are certain points in the Speech to which I should like to call attention. I am very glad to see that Her Majesty's Government do not anticipate any rupture of the peace of

Europe. But what I wish to know is, whether it is intended to lay before us at an early date Papers relating to affairs in the South-East of Europe? With respect to the condition of the people of Bulgaria, I feel—and I think it is generally felt—that after Bulgaria had been liberated by the arms of Russia, and at the cost of Russia, it would have been a perfectly natural and legitimate consequence that Russia should enjoy a large moral influence in Bulgarian concerns. The effect of gratitude would, in the natural working of the human breast, lead to that result. If Russia be content with that moral influence, I, for one, cannot grudge it her. But recent events have not tended to convince the whole world that she has been content with that moral influence. I believe it to be an error on her part, both with respect to her dignity and her power, if, instead of being content to reap the fruits of her former exertions in the spontaneous gratitude of the Bulgarian people, she should attempt to lay her yoke upon the necks of that people. With respect to Egypt, I rejoice to see reference made to the reduction of the force in that country. Indeed, I should be glad if we could be informed, in the course of the debate, to what point it is likely to be reduced. In November, 1882, we were so happy as to give instructions for its reduction merely to a single brigade. I think 4,000 men would have been the number, when the news came of the disaster to General Hicks' column, which entirely upset our plans, and entailed an enormous additional charge on this country. One thing I shall always be glad to state, whoever may be in Office. I said it when in Office myself, and I restate it now when the benefit is to be reaped by others—that although our position in Egypt has been on many grounds a very difficult, slippery, and perilous undertaking, and although it is open to question from many points of view, one thing I think no rational and candid man can doubt—and perhaps it would not be admitted in some foreign countries—but I do not think any rational and candid man among us can doubt that the administration of affairs in that country, largely under British influence, has been eminently beneficial in many vital and primary matters to the population of that country. There is a question not mentioned in this portion of the Speech on which I wish to address an inquiry, and that is the question of the Canadian fisheries. Undoubtedly, what we have heard and seen through secondary authorities does not leave our minds in a state of entire immobility. I should be glad if the Government would assure us of one of two things. What we should like best of all to hear is that the question of the fisheries does not at this moment present inconvenient complications; but, if that assurance cannot be given, then that there is a likelihood that we shall be speedily put in possession of information which will enable Parliament to form a judgment. The noble Viscount, in the able speech in which he moved the Address, said in substance that it was the object of the Government to achieve a modicum of Business rather than to make vast professions likely to be followed by small performance. Happily for himself, the noble Viscount is very young, and, therefore, very sanguine, and so he regards as a modicum the Business which is proposed in the present Speech. There is one subject coming off which cannot be included in the Speech; I mean the Procedure of Parliament. But, as I make out, there are 13 important subjects, all of them likely to make considerable demand upon the time of Parliament, which go to make up this modicum which the noble Viscount was so sanguine in hoping would be passed. He has my best wishes in the matter. I will not now dwell upon this question further than to say that, looking at the great bulk of them, they appear to be subjects upon which legislation may be very rational and beneficial. But we must recur to that which is the standing question on every debate on the Address under present circumstances—I mean the question of Ireland. We see how little there is to satisfy, as we now stand, the aspirations of those, and they are very numerous—the aspirations are not less numerous than they are rational—of those who say that it is a very hard case upon England and Scotland that they have so very little of the time of Parliament. Sir, I entirely agree with them. It is a very hard case, and, in my opinion, it is a case which is likely to be harder still. I draw the indications of it from many sources, and, among others, from the Speech which is now before us. For, no doubt, the object of Her Majesty's Government, as far as they can properly pursue it, would be to reduce within limited and moderate bounds the share of attention to be given to Ireland; and yet I find, omitting the minor reference to Private Bill legislation, there are five references to Ireland, each of great and cardinal importance. The first of these references is an announcement which we must all receive with satisfaction. But perhaps I had better first take the legislative references. There are three references to Ireland with regard to legislation—one with respect to Criminal Procedure, one with respect to the Tenure and Purchase of Land, and one with respect to Local Government. With regard to Local Government, I am very sorry to find that we are losing ground instead of gaining it. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington did not acquaint us that the subject of Local Government for Ireland had formed one of the differences between himself and his Colleagues. But the noble Lord certainly announced, in an important speech, that Local Government for Ireland should be dealt with, "in simultaneity"—the peculiarity of the phrase assisted to stamp it upon the memory—"in simultaneity" with England and Scotland. How does that stand now? There is to be a postponement of Local Government for Ireland until England and Scotland be dealt with, and that not accompanied by a pledge of immediate sequence, but a postponement qualified by the expression that Local Government for Ireland is then to come, provided that circumstances should render it possible. I venture to say that Local Government for Ireland with reference to this Speech, which only relates to a particular Session, must be regarded as a shadow, a delusion. It cannot be regarded as a promise at all. If it were a question of betting only, I would venture to bet at least 10 to 1 with any Gentleman on those Benches that there will be no Local Government for Ireland during 1887, and I do not believe that there is a man of them who would not have shrewdness enough to refuse my offer. With regard to any measure relating to the tenure and purchase of land in Ireland which Her Majesty's Government intend to introduce, I should not, under the circumstances, wish the right hon. Gentleman to say a word as to its nature and character—and, indeed, were I to ask him to do so, he would be justified in refusing—and I will, therefore, content myself with expressing my satisfaction that it is coming at all, and that it is coming early. Then, we have another promise which is still more proximate—that is, a measure in relation to the Criminal Laws of the country. I observe that the Mover and Seconder of the Address have drawn a distinction between law and procedure. There is, it seems to me, no idea of altering the law, but only of altering the procedure; but procedure is a very elastic word, and may cover a great deal. I apprehend that if a Bill were to be introduced into this House for the abolition of trial by jury in the Three Kingdoms, it might be argued that it was not an alteration of the law, but only an alteration of procedure. We must not be too sure about the limited character of this apparently very modest proposal. This subject is not entirely new to me. We were in Office in 1885, when we had determined to drop what we considered to be the coercive portions of the Crimes Act. I believe I may probably have used the very words—the very phrase—undoubtedly I did state to the House that all we intended to do was to make one or two proposals tending to the sort of improvement which is now called the improvement of procedure. Our attempt to make our rose smell sweeter by calling it by another name did not succeed. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) declared that he believed we were going to re-enact the worst portion of the Crimes Act, and that opinion was taken up by those who are now in the Government who broadly distinguished between their conduct and ours, because their conduct was the abandonment and ours the retention of repressive legislation. I will not ask what this amendment of procedure is to be. The words are very ambiguous, but I will be content to wait to learn the meaning of them when the proper time comes. The measure may be of small and limited scope, or it may be of very great scope and importance. I shall not enter into the subject of repressive or coercive legislation for Ireland at this time. My opinions upon it have been placed in the very fullest manner upon record, when I proposed the Irish Government

Bill on the part of the late Administration, and to those opinions I entirely adhere. But there are two other statements with regard to the condition of Ireland. One of them is an announcement which we must all receive with great satisfaction—namely, that grave crimes have become more rare in Ireland. I am bound to say that this announcement in the Speech of the Queen reminds me of the words which fell from the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington when, towards the close of the proceedings of 1886, he was acting as Leader of the House. I then said that it was exceedingly to be desired that Her Majesty's Government should, at an early period, announce their intentions with respect to the government of Ireland, because in Ireland the administration of government was intimately allied to social order, and the noble Lord replied that I had forgotten the great change that had taken place. He said—

> "You have associated yourselves with a movement of local and domestic government in Ireland; since you have done that, the country has put on a new face with respect to legality."

[Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH dissented.] Not the right hon. Baronet opposite, who, if I remember rightly, contradicted the noble Lord. I am quoting the noble Lord to show that while he stated that, in his opinion, they had a right to expect a greater regard for legality in Ireland on account of the course we had taken, he is borne out in this respect—that the Queen, in the Speech from the Throne, thinks it right to announce that grave crimes have been more rare in Ireland during the last few months than was the case in a similar period last year. Then there comes another passage, upon which I must say a few words, regarding the organized attempts to incite occupiers to combine against the fulfilment of their legal obligations. I do not find fault with the Government for putting a reference like that in the Queen's Speech. But I think, if a reference were to be made, it is defective in one important if not essential point. I think that from the nature and incidence of the evictions which have taken place in Ireland, which have produced a profound sensation in this country—I do not enter into the question of blaming anyone connected with them—which has, as a matter of fact, struck with horror multitudes of men, I might almost say the general public of this country—it would have been well to have referred to them, and to have expressed some regret on the part of the Sovereign and the Government that it had been necessary to proceed in the depth of winter to eject people by force from their houses and to consume the houses by fire, when there was no evidence, as far as I am able to judge, that they were really able to pay their rents. I do not wish to enlarge the scope of my present observations further than the terms in which I have couched them. The hon. Member who has just sat down asked me what I thought of the "Plan of Campaign." I will tell him what I think of it. It is the consequence of the policy which he and his Friends have pursued. How does the matter stand? If it be necessary to remind the House of what took place at the opening of the Second Session of Parliament in 1886, the whole of those whom I am permitted to call my political Friends, as well as the whole of those who are known as Irish Nationalists, contended and urged on the Government in the strongest manner the absolute necessity for some legislation for Ireland with a view to the difficulties of the winter. We urged that it was absolutely necessary that there should be some legislation to enable persons who were unable to pay their rent, on proof of their inability before a Judicial Tribunal, to obtain relief in point of time. There was some difference in the arguments by which we supported our proposition; but our proposition was one and the same. I contended that Her Majesty's Government were bound to do it by their own declarations and by their own acts. I contended—and I contend now—that Lord Salisbury's speeches admitted that there were cases of the kind. I was not able to quote his words at the time. But I have referred to them since, and I have them now in my pocket. Lord Salisbury's words were that representations had been made that the people were unable to pay the judicial rents, but that he did not credit that declaration to any great extent; and yet he issued a Commission which was to inquire, among other matters, into the ability of the Irish tenants to pay the judicial rents. I argued on those grounds that it was an absolute duty to save the people who were by presumption unable to pay their rents from the pains and penalties of eviction during the winter, by provisional legislation of that character which would enable them to obtain relief in point of time. What was said by the Government? In the first place, they said that I had misquoted Lord Salisbury—that he had never expressed any such opinion. They said the Commission did not imply that; and they went a great deal further; because when some of my hon. Friends near me contended from what they knew that the rents absolutely required reduction, and supported their statement by what was going on in England and Ireland, the general tone of the debate on the part of the Government was to contend that the rents did not require reduction, and that on that account they met the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork, not by another proposal of their own providing temporary relief upon proof of inability to pay before a judicial tribunal, but with an outright opposition on principle, and they refused to make any provision whatever to meet the difficulties of the winter. We thought, and we said, that great public evils must arise in consequence of that refusal on the part of Her Majesty's Government. I said—"Can there be anything more monstrous than to appoint a Commission to inquire whether people can pay their rents or not, and, in the meanwhile, while the Commission is inquiring, to allow the people to be turned out?" That was answered by declarations that there were necessary steps in the process of law, and that before the people could be turned out we should know what the Commission recommended. That has been completely falsified. The evictions have taken place, and a great deal besides has taken place. A great deal has been said about there being no occasion for a reduction of rents. I am now going to speak of a matter of which I have no original knowledge, but which, I believe, rests on good authority. We are given to believe that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant—far be it from me to censure him for it—has been, what we call, exercising pressure on the landlords. The right hon. Gentleman has been exercising pressure in one direction, because he thought there was a case of necessity; and some of the Nationalist Members, feeling it was no use for them to go to the landlords and enter upon a course of reasoning and argument, it appears that some few of them have been exercising pressure in another way. I am rather jealous of the exercise of pressure by the Executive Government upon landlords, and I think it would have been far wiser and fairer that they should come to the House and say—"Pending this inquiry, we must make temporary provision for those persons who are unable to pay their rents. We will not be put off by professions of inability to pay; we will require judicial proof, and upon judicial proof time shall be given." Instead of that the extreme course was taken of putting pressure on the landlords; and it was said there was no necessity for the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork, of which, I confess, I have no knowledge, except as to its fundamental principles. Then have come these proceedings tending to compromise the dignity of the law, and which have given rise to the deplorable scenes which have caused such a thrill of horror throughout the country. In that state of circumstances, the hon. Gentleman the Seconder of the Address thinks he is in a position to ask me, who three months ago pointed out what ought to be done, what I think about the Plan of Campaign. I will detain the House no longer. I sincerely hope that the performances of the Session may justify more than I anticipate the sanguine expectations with which it is quite evident the Queen's Speech has been framed.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), but who is of necessity not in his place at the present moment, referred to the old traditions of Parliament. He spoke of the necessity of limiting debate. I think, Sir, that I may, even in his absence, remark upon the fact that the speech which he has delivered is one which is not likely to limit the debate on the Address to be presented in answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech, for he opened questions of great width and magnitude, and with a force and a vigour which belongs to any statement that proceeds from the right hon. Gentleman when he throws his whole heart into the subject with which he has to deal. He congratulated my noble Friend behind me

(Lord Randolph Churchill) upon the step which he had thought it right to take conscientiously in the interests of economy, and in the interests of the country itself. He spoke of it as a great sacrifice. Well, Sir, I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman does my noble Friend only justice in making the remark of him that it was a sacrifice which a man in the position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was very rarely called upon to make. I have already, Sir, referred to the observations which fell from my noble Friend in justification of the course which he took. I should be the very last person in the slightest degree to derogate from the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the position in which my noble Friend found himself. On the other hand, I will say for myself that there is also a duty on the part of those who are the heads of the great public Departments; and that duty is to maintain, from their own point of view and of their own responsibility, the efficiency of the Services for which they are responsible. It may happen that they may take an exaggerated or a mistaken view of their duties. I was myself perfectly prepared to take the full consequences of the acts for which I was then personally responsible. I believe that in the circumstances of the present day, looking at the condition of affairs abroad, looking at the vast interests of this country, looking at the great trade which we have to protect, looking to the multitude in this country who depend for their livelihood upon the security of their daily wage and their daily labour, that I should not have been justified in reducing the defensive forces of the country below the standard at which they existed and at which I proposed to place them. Nor should I have been justified in refusing to provide for the continuous defence of our coaling stations, which had been undertaken. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of the necessity of economy. He spoke of the judicious and moderate views which were advocated by my noble Friend. I believe that my noble Friend, in advocating those views, was convinced in his own mind that they were both judicious and moderate. But I had also a duty to discharge, and I may say for myself that I believe no economy can be more short-sighted or more extravagant than to enter, under the pressure it may be of Parliament or of public opinion out-of-doors, upon an expenditure which may be one-third, one-half, or two-thirds incurred, and then to abandon that expenditure before the object which was sought to be obtained and which was recognized as a necessity for the security of the country had been accomplished. My view of the duties and obligations of Parliament is that we ought not to commit ourselves to expenditure rashly, heedlessly, or thoughtlessly, but that we ought to examine carefully the necessity for such an expenditure, and that if we have begun an undertaking we ought to complete it. If we have entered upon an undertaking to fortify, it may be, our coaling stations, to provide defences for our commercial ports, to make secure our military forts, we ought to carry it through with economy, and in such a way that the expenditure already incurred shall conduce to the security and safety of the nation. For my part, as long as I have any responsibility for the conduct of Business in this House I shall invite it to realize for itself the importance of a particular work on which it embarks, and to commit itself to the completion of that work, or not to enter upon it. The right hon. Gentleman referred at some length to the remarks which were attributed—and which were attributed, I believe, with perfect accuracy—to Mr. Disraeli, that foreign policy and financial policy go closely together. They do. From what I know of the foreign policy of this country I claim that it is economical, and that it is directed to secure the peace of this country, the continuity and security of the industry of this country, spread, as its interests are, throughout the world. No, Sir; we are not aggressive; we are not disposed to interfere in the disputes of other countries or of other peoples; but we are bound to maintain the honour and the obligations of this country, and we are bound to fulfil the engagements to which Treaties bind us. The right hon. Gentleman referred to some observations which fell, I think, from my noble Friend as to the disposition which is supposed to exist that we should range ourselves on the side of one Continental Power or of another. I again, Sir, repeat that our disposition is bounded by the duties and interests of this country and by its obligations under Treaties, and that we shall never interfere, unless we are bound to do so, either in the interests of the commerce and industries of this country, or on account of those obligations which we have undertaken. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of my challenge to my noble Friend to put his finger on any expenditure which he believed to be unwise as a challenge to fight a battle on unequal terms. Now, Sir, I have been most anxious to avoid anything which appears, in the slightest degree, to suggest a difference of feeling between my noble Friend and myself. It was natural that the right hon. Gentleman should avail himself of the opportunity to point out circumstances which would bring to pass a difference of opinion between Gentlemen sitting on this side of the House and the Government which they support. I believe there is no real difference of opinion between my right hon. Friend and myself on a single point. We desire economy, but we desire practical economy. Having invited my noble Friend to put his finger upon a single blot, upon any single excess or extravagance, I do not ask him to fight a battle on unequal terms; I ask him to assist his Friends on this side of the House in the endeavour to enforce that economy which is in our interests, as completely as it can be in his, or of the country itself. No, Sir; Parliament itself must be taken into council in matters of this kind; it must, by its own effort, aid the Government in the detection and correction of extravagances which may exist—extravagances, however, which, from the point of view I take, I believe do not exist. But in the conduct of the great Departments—and I see right hon. Gentlemen opposite who have been associated with them—there no doubt always exist opportunities for retrenchment and improvement. In that direction, and in the direction of the maintenance of the armaments which exist, I ask the House to assume the responsibility to discharge its duty, and to acquaint itself with the system which exists. There appears to be an impression that the Estimates which have been presented and the armaments which are proposed are in excess of those which existed and were proposed by the late Government of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). There is no foundation for that impression. They are really less in magnitude and less in amount than those which were proposed last March by the right hon. Gentleman, who then sat upon this side of the House. I admit that they are not reduced in effective strength, and that the reduction which has been effected is due to the economy and supervision which has been exercised in the various Departments, and which, I hope, may conduce to still better results for the public benefit. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the proportion which exists between the Expenditure of the present day and the Expenditure of many years ago. I am afraid that there is no hope that these proportions will be very largely altered. The right hon. Gentleman knows perfectly well that the circumstances under which we are acting are entirely different—that the ships and the guns of the present day are as distinct and different from those of 10, 15, or 20 years ago as it is possible to conceive. We might as well almost go back to the days of bows and arrows for comparison as to compare the ships and guns of to-day with those in use 20 years ago, and the cost relatively is almost as much greater. But this is not the opportunity for entering into a discussion of this kind. Such a question can only be minutely investigated either by a Committee of this House, or by the discussion in Committee of the Whole House when the Estimates are produced, which will either justify or change the policy of Her Majesty's Government. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the changes in the structure of the Government—to the position of my noble Friend the Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury), and to my own position in this House. Well, Sir, I feel some hesitation in remarking on my own position. I am sure that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen will feel that I am at a disadvantage which almost shuts my mouth in the attempt to speak of the position which I myself occupy in this House. I had no desire to fill that position, and I occupy it merely in the discharge of what I believe to be, under the circumstances, a public duty. I would only say this—that I have never yet, even for a limited portion of the year, had the enjoyment of a sinecure. It is absolutely inconsistent with the life I have led, and I cannot imagine that I shall at any period of my public and active life arrive at that happy position. But the right hon. Gentleman insisted, with great force apparently, upon the impropriety—at least, that appeared to be his argument—of my noble Friend who is at the head of the Government being also the Foreign Secretary. He admitted, I think, that the circumstances of the present day were grave, and that the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government was not, on the whole, unsatisfactory even to him; but he did not indicate that there was any one man at the present day better fitted to discharge the duties and the responsibilities of Foreign Secretary than my noble Friend. I believe, speaking with great deference, and with full regard to the great qualities which exist in public men at the present day—I believe that the country is prepared to say that there is no man, on the whole, better fitted to discharge the duties of Foreign Secretary than the Marquess of Salisbury. The question then arises whether the practical object which we ought to aim at of having the best man for the position, which has to be filled under circumstances of great difficulty, anxiety, and danger, not, perhaps, to the interests of England, but to the peace and the interests of the world—whether, under those circumstances, it was not wise and right that my noble Friend should assume the responsibilities and the duties of Foreign Secretary as well as those of Prime Minister. I will not presume to judge upon a question of this character. I only say for myself that I occupy the position which has been assigned to me from a simple sense of duty; and I believe I and my Colleagues will be fully informed—as if, indeed, we were Prime Ministers ourselves—of the views, of the mind, and of the policy of my noble Friend, and that we shall have all the influence which we ought to exercise, and all the power which we ought to possess, in the decision of any question which affects the interests of this great Empire and concerns the honour of Great Britain. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Government, under present circumstances, was without a head; that it was a Government of Departments. Sir, I deny that altogether. I say that in Council we meet together under circumstances which give to the Prime Minister, and to those who exercise influence one with the other, that complete interchange of responsibility and duty which enables us to act as one Government, responsible to the country, responsible to Her Majesty, and in complete accord with the Prime Minister himself. Reference was made to the advantages of dual action. The right hon. Gentleman insisted that there always had been dual action in this country—that there had been a Foreign Secretary and a Prime Minister—the Prime Minister reading the despatches, and the Foreign Minister sending them. I do not think we can say that the results of that dual action have been always entirely successful. Looking back upon the past, it must be confessed that we were involved in liabilities and responsibilities in Egypt as the result of dual action, which, had there been single individual responsibility on the part of a vigorous and capable man, might possibly have been avoided; and very much of the expenditure now objected to has arisen from that dual action in Egypt. I will pass now to other passages of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He asked me whether Papers with regard to the Balkan Peninsula would shortly be produced to the House. Yes, Sir; they will be produced immediately. But I think it would, perhaps, re-assure the House if I venture to state more precisely what the views of Her Majesty's Government are with regard to the Balkan Peninsula, and I will say that—

> "An invitation has been conveyed to Her Majesty's Government to give Instructions to the Ambassador at Constantinople to associate himself with the Representatives of the other Powers in the hope of arriving at an acceptable solution of the difficulty, and he has been informed that Her Majesty's Government are very anxious for the adjustment of the controversy which exists with regard to the future government of Bulgaria; that we should act, in the first instance, under a sense of our responsibility as signatory of the Treaty of Berlin; secondly, that we desire to give effect to our wish for the independence and the freedom of the Bulgarian people, in accordance with our traditional policy; and, thirdly, that subject to those considerations, we desire to give all legitimate satisfaction to the wishes of the Russian Government."

Sir, I do not think I could give any more clear statement of the views and policy of Her Majesty's Government with regard to Bulgaria than I have read out to the House, and I have read out substantially the Instructions which have been conveyed to Her Majesty's Minister at Constantinople. I was then asked with regard to Egypt. I was asked to state to what number the British troops in Egypt were to be reduced. We found them at a very large number when we assumed Office. They were in excess of the provision which had been made in the Estimates for the year; and, thanks greatly to the skill, the moderation, and the good feeling exhibited by the Representatives of the English Government in Egypt, especially to General Stephenson, we have been, or shall be, able to reduce the number of the Army of Occupation to about 5,000 men before the 1st of April next, and, at the same time, there will be a considerable reduction in the Egyptian Army, probably to about 10,000 men. I need not say the effect of these reductions has been beneficial both to the Egyptian and to the English Exchequer; but, at the same time, there appears an excess of expenditure for which Estimates will have to be produced in this House. I concur entirely with the observations which fell from the right hon. Gentleman as to the beneficial effect upon the people of Egypt of the administration of the country by the English Government. I believe it has been most beneficial to them in every sense of the word. I believe they have been relieved from trouble and difficulty which oppressed them before, and they have the advantage of orderly and settled government. With regard to the question of the Canadian fishermen, I need not say that Her Majesty's Government are most anxious to do anything in their power to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the question at issue between the United States Government and this country with regard to those fisheries. The Canadian Government itself has assumed a most moderate attitude in the affair. It has been the policy of the English Government in the past, under all Administrations, to maintain Colonial rights, and we are bound to do so so far as we can; but there are two kindred peoples who honestly desire, I believe, to arrive at a settlement of the questions in dispute, and no efforts will be spared on the part of Her Majesty's Government to bring those questions to a fair and equitable and amicable settlement. Now, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman referred to the question of Ireland, and spoke of the hard case of England and Scotland in the past, and of the probably still harder case of England and Scotland in the future. I can only say that if the right hon. Gentleman will give his assistance, with a view to bringing about peace and order in Ireland, and a termination of those interruptions to the conduct of Business in this House, we shall be most glad to accept that assistance; and he will thus contribute largely, I believe, to the happiness of Ireland, and to the advantage of England and Scotland. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the fact that there were five references to Ireland in the Queen's Speech; that there were three with regard to legislation, and others to the condition of crime and outrage. The right hon. Gentleman has said, with regard to Local Government, that it was losing ground; that it would have to be postponed; that we have qualified our intention to introduce a Bill for the Local Government of Ireland, provided circumstances rendered it possible. I think myself it is always better, in dealing with questions of this kind, to be perfectly frank and open with the House and the country; and we say, as my noble Friend behind me said, that if the condition of a country is such that it is incapable of receiving any large measure of self-government, then it would be absurd and impossible to force such a measure upon it. The right hon. Gentleman offered, indeed, to bet me 10 to 1 that the Bill would not be introduced. Well, he has it in his own hands, as the head of the National Party of Ireland, to exercise that influence which will bring about a condition of order and obedience to the law in that country which would justify Her Majesty's Government in proposing measures for the increase of local self-government. If the right hon. Gentleman will, as the head of the National Party, in conjunction with the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), exercise that control over those combinations and those agitations which disturb and distress and unsettle that country, then there will be no question that the measure for the local self-government of Ireland will be brought forward. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the fact that great crimes are becoming more rare, and he spoke of the allusion in the Queen's Speech to the organized attempts at agitation and resistance to the law which had been made.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.): A nice law.

MR. W. H. SMITH: I did not catch the hon. Member's observation.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I said it was a nice law that allowed a house to be burned.

MR. W. H. SMITH: Well, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), among other things, referred to the fact that there was no allusion to the evictions that have occurred in Ireland, and gave it as his own belief that if a certain Bill, introduced before the Session closed only four months ago, had been passed, these evictions might have been prevented. Well, Sir, there is no one in this House, or in this country, who has a greater sympathy for the suffering poor of Ireland than I have individually. I pity them from the very bottom of my heart; but there is nothing more deplorable than the fact that their sufferings have been made the instruments for agitation by men who have no regard whatever for the real interests of those people, but who only use them as ammunition for the attainment of their own particular views and objects. What are the facts of the case? I cannot believe that the right hon. Gentleman really understood them. The particular case of eviction to which he referred was the Glenbeigh eviction. It is notorious that if the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) had been passed, no single eviction at Glenbeigh would or could have been avoided. No, Sir; put it how you like, the Plan of Campaign which the right hon. Gentleman appeared to justify, and which has been solemnly condemned by one of the Judges of the land, is a campaign directed against the interests of the poor suffering tenants of Ireland, because it compels a landlord, if he will not accept the terms offered by people who have no concern whatever in the question, to assert his rights in the manner in which he has done in the past. The right hon. Gentleman chose to refer to my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) as having given colour and sanction to the Plan of Campaign. Why, Sir, what has my right hon. Friend done at the most and at the worst? He has, perhaps, on one, or two, or more occasions exercised his personal influence with gentlemen to endeavour to induce them not to press their legal rights to the last extremity—from information which he has received, and believing that in doing so he was benefiting alike the owner and the occupier of the land. But what is this Plan of Campaign? It is the interference of other persons, who have no local concern in the place at all, to compel individual tenants not to pay the rent which they are able and capable of paying, and which they are willing to pay, to pledge them not to pay them, and to compel the landlords to accept that which they offer them, whether or not it is just or right. In the one case we have the influence—not the influence, but the suggestion—of a gentleman who feels deeply for the country, and for the interests of the people over whom he is called to govern; and in the other we have an organized attempt to bring the owner of the land and the tenant of the land into hostile relations, so that if the owner is not content to forego all his rights he must proceed to extremities against the tenants by having recourse to legal remedies. I have no sympathy whatever with the hard-hearted landlord. I do not believe that there are 10 men in this House who have any sympathy with him. But you are putting the good landlord into a position from which it is impossible to extricate himself, except by the assistance of the law, and the miserable tenant into a position in which he is forced to accept the dreaded alternative of eviction. Let hon. Gentlemen be reasonable, considerate, humane to the tenants of Ireland. Let the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) exercise his influence, and let him take care to inform himself of the facts of the case. Let him act with the facts as his judgment, knowledge, and conscience direct, and then we may have some hope of peace and prosperity in Ireland. I do not propose to occupy the time of the House at any further length. I may venture to express the hope that the debate may partake of that character which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian himself desired—that it may be a short debate—that it may permit us as speedily as possible to proceed to the real Business of the Session, and that we may endeavour to devote some portion of the time of Parliament to the amelioration of the condition of the people of Ireland.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.) said, that the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. W. H. Smith) had made an appeal to the late Prime Minister (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) to do something to promote order in Ireland; and he said it would be a good thing if the Members of the late Government exerted their influence to put an end to those things which were interrupting the exercise of the law in Ireland that day. To put an end to the obstructions which the law had received in Ireland, or what was considered to be law in Ireland recently, was first of all to put an end to scenes like those which occurred at Glenbeigh, when, at that time of the 19th century, under the flag of England, and with the forces of England, unfortunate people, who were unable to pay what the landlords demanded, were not only hounded from their homes in the depth of winter, but, to the disgrace of the Government and of England, had the roofs burned above their heads, and were smoked from their houses as if they had been rats, and not human beings. The right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had said that the Plan of Campaign was the cause of the bad relations which now existed between the landlords and tenants of Ireland. What was the fact? In Glenbeigh, where these unheard-of atrocities had taken place, the Plan of Campaign was never heard of; and if it had been exercised in the district of Glenbeigh, instead of the people being hunted through the fields, while their houses smouldered in ruins, they would now be at home under their own roofs, and would be receiving overtures of peace and settlement from the landlords, and would have got what reductions the landlords had given on other estates where the Plan of Campaign was in operation. The right which Irish Members had to interfere in such cases was this—that they were the elected Representatives of these people; and one of the chief duties which these people had delegated to them was that they should spare no exertion in order to keep them safe in their homes. He would remind the House that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), when in the witness-box in Dublin, had not denied that he had used pressure on the landlords to abstain from enforcing their technical rights; and the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had at last admitted, as Leader of the Government, that there were harsh landlords, and that it was the duty of the Government to discountenance them. That was to say, the Irish Nationalists were reviled in England because they persistently preached what the First Lord of the Treasury had now admitted in the House to be necessary. That right hon. Gentleman had confessed—and he (Mr. Redmond) felt bound to say that he received the admission with great satisfaction—that there were harsh landlords whom it was absolutely necessary to appeal to, to prevent them from exacting from their tenants more than the tenants could pay. He (Mr. Redmond) and his Friends hoped the Government would exercise pressure, and so fall in with their efforts to put a stop to evictions in Ireland. The Government had acknowledged to-night that it was necessary to interfere between landlords and tenants, and endeavour by personal influence to stay evictions. That admission altogether demolished the argument sometimes used—that the landlords were a class of men who might be left to the kindness of their own hearts in dealing with their tenantry. If Her Majesty's Government thought it their duty to interfere to prevent the harshness of landlords, how much more strongly must the Representatives of the poor tenants feel it would be their duty to interfere for the same purpose? It looked very much as if it was because the Government failed by their method of personal pressure, that they were so jealous and bitter against the Plan of Campaign. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House described the Plan of Campaign as an engine brought to bear on landlords who refused to surrender all their rights. But that showed a complete ignorance of facts. The Plan of Campaign was only adopted upon a few estates; and in these cases the landlords were only asked to give a fair reduction, and it was always promised that when that reduction was made the rent would be paid. It was also said that the Plan of Campaign was not fair, because the tenants themselves fixed the reduction that they asked; but there was every desire to meet the landlords in a fair arbitration. This, however, they would not do, and the answer they usually gave was a shower of writs. It was under circumstances such as these that the Plan of Campaign was adopted. The right hon. Gentleman spoke contemptuously of the "persons" who were returned for trial for their connection with the Plan of Campaign. He (Mr. Redmond) was proud to say that he was one of those persons. The estate he had been connected with was that of Lord Dillon, in the county Mayo, from which Lord Dillon, though he had never put his foot in Ireland, drew £25,000 a-year. The tenants had themselves reclaimed the barren rocks and hills of the estate, and, owing to the severe depression, they asked for a reduction. Lord Dillon refused, and a quantity of writs were served. Then the Plan of Campaign was adopted, and Lord Dillon, after some time, consented to grant a reduction of 20 per cent. Then the entire rents, less this reduction, were paid over to him. Under such circumstances as these, the Plan of Campaign was fully justified; and if he and his Colleagues were found guilty of the mythical criminal offence with which they were charged—if by packing of juries and changing of venues that was possible—they would nevertheless rejoice in their action, which had saved many hundred people from the horrors of unjust eviction.

Sir GEORGE RUSSELL (Berks, Wokingham) said, that it was melancholy to find once again in the Queen's Speech a phrase drawing attention to the fact that, although grave crime had become rarer in Ireland, violence of a more insidious nature prevailed. It was, he believed, attributable to the defeated measure of the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister, which was still being dangled before the eyes of the people of Ireland, who were led to believe that, by resorting to this system of violence, they would at last attain their ends. He often wondered that the late Prime Minister should be so anxious to deny that separation would result from his proposed legislation; because, if there was any merit in his scheme, it was that its adoption would result in our being no longer troubled with the Irish Question. Now, there had been enough of surrender by instalments. It was supposed by its author that the measure for the Disestablishment of the Irish Church would bring content to Ireland; but the change was only received as an instalment, and the same was the case with the two successive Land Bills of the late Prime Minister. The Conservative Party had been asked to disclose an alternative policy. Their policy was "no surrender," as opposed to "surrender;" they had been sent to Parliament to maintain the Union at all hazards, and they were determined to do it. It was greatly to be regretted that there existed statesmen who were prepared to throw over to-day the principles which they advocated yesterday. For example, it seemed but yesterday that the late Prime Minister threw into gaol the very men who were now his close allies. Then it was not very long ago when the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) declared that all minor considerations must yield to the maintenance of the cardinal principle of Party union; and yet that very night they had heard from the noble Lord that the small question of a difference in the Estimates of £500,000 had been sufficient to induce him to discard that cardinal principle. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) appeared now to be anxious to arrive at a *modus vivendi* with the late Prime Minister, and half-inclined to offer Home Rule with safeguards. In the present temper of the Irish people it would, he believed, be very dangerous to make any such offer. The only policy that had been tried and failed was that of "shilly-shally." There must be firm and resolute government, and it would be useless to offer Ireland any further legislation of a remedial nature until the people were prepared to accept such legislation as a final measure. The present Government were, he trusted, resolved to carry out a firm policy in Ireland, and in that resolution they would be supported by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington). It was only by following a policy of that kind that they could insure the ultimate welfare of a distracted country.

Mr. LANE (Cork Co., E.): I believe the English and Irish people will prefer to take their ideas of honesty and morality from the opinions expressed by the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland and the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister, rather than from the hon. Gentleman who has just addressed the

House. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, in the speech which he delivered a short time ago, said that the late Prime Minister, in the views which he has expressed this evening as to the Plan of Campaign, showed that he knew very little of the facts of the case. Now, I think that any person from Ireland who listened to the remarks of the Leader of the House must have been satisfied that the right hon. Gentleman himself knows much less of the facts of which he has attempted to speak than the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister, because the Leader of the House said that the Plan of Campaign was an uncalled-for interference in the relations between landlord and tenant by persons who had no interest whatever in the payment of rent in Ireland, and that it was, to a certain extent, an act of coercion or intimidation on the part of the Nationalist Members, in order to prevent the tenants of the property where the plan has been put into operation from paying their just and legal liabilities to their landlords. That sentence alone convinces me that the right hon. Gentleman must have made a very superficial inquiry indeed into the meaning and working of the Plan of Campaign. If he had asked right hon. Gentlemen who sit at his right and left for information I think he would have obtained much better information than he seems to possess at present. Now, it was my privilege to be the first Irish Nationalist Member who co-operated with any body of tenants in Ireland for putting this Plan of Campaign into operation. I need not inform the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland of that, because it is on public record that when the fact was brought under the notice of the right hon. and learned Gentleman he gave an opinion upon the Plan of Campaign, the genuineness of which has been much debated ever since. Well, Sir, having been the first to co-operate with the tenants in putting the Plan of Campaign into operation, I think I may claim a more intimate acquaintance with it than the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House; and it is only right that the Members of this House should hear from one or two Irish Representatives who have been connected with the Plan of Campaign something more about it than they have heard up to the present before they begin to discuss it, or even to speak about it. I do not know a single case in Ireland where the initiative in this matter has been taken by a Member of Parliament, or by any other individual than the body of tenants who were interested, on the estate where the Plan was put into operation. It is well that hon. Members should clearly understand how this Plan of Campaign works in Ireland. The first step which is taken by the tenants is to meet together to discuss the rents on their holdings—the excess of rents over the valuations, and then the particular depression of prices in their various departments of agriculture, because, owing to the distance from markets, and a great many other local causes, the prices got for the same sort of produce in different parts of Ireland vary to a very large extent. These tenants, having fully discussed their affairs, came to an agreement among themselves as to what was a fair all-round reduction of rent to ask from their landlords for their mutual protection. Having done that, they go to the agent or landlord and make the offer which they say is the best they are able to make. If the landlord or his agent on the spot agrees to accept that offer, in every case the rent is paid without the slightest hesitation on the part of the tenants; but if the landlord or his agent refuses to make the reduction, then the tenants adjourn to some place in the district in order to determine what is to be the next course they ought to pursue. The general result of that action is that these men, not being able, to a certain extent, to manage their own affairs, ask their Representative, or some other Member of Parliament whom they happen to know, to go down and consult with them, and help them as to the best mode of procedure. I am stating now the course which has been adopted in reference to various properties from my own experience. I was asked by 400 tenants to assist them in this matter, and having met them I found that the largest number of them were inclined to ask for a reduction of 50 per cent; but, having gone thoroughly into the particulars of each case, I came to the conclusion that a demand of that kind was excessive. I was assisted in the matter by my hon. Friend the Member for Mid

Cork (Dr. Tanner), and after a great deal of persuasion we induced the tenants, who were determined in the first instance not to pay more than 50 per cent, to abate their demand to 35 per cent as the maximum reduction. In regard to that estate, I can vouch for the fact that when the tenants came in to pay the rent they had agreed to pay into the common fund a very large number of them stated to myself personally, and to the clergymen who were co-operating with me, that they had in many instances been compelled to sell articles of household furniture, not to speak of cattle and other portions of their stock, which might be considered legitimate things to dispose of for such a purpose. They had had, actually, to dispose of their household furniture in order to obtain the amount, which they were perfectly ready to hand over to their landlord or his agent if it was agreed to accept it. On properties immediately adjoining this of which I am speaking, and on land running into it, other landlords—and there are hon. Gentlemen opposite who know the fact—other landlords who are Members of the Tory Party in the County of Cork made much larger reductions than these tenants asked for, and I know that they tried to use their influence with the particular landlord I was dealing with on that occasion in order to induce him to accede to what was considered to be a fair and legitimate arrangement in regard to his estates; but he refused to do so. On that particular property there are more than 400 tenants. Under ordinary circumstances I know, for a positive fact, that a good many of them could not have made an offer to pay the rent this year at all; but, owing to the fact that they were called upon to adopt some united course of action, the agreement they arrived at was that which I have stated. I believe that their conduct will stand the test of the closest investigation, and that it will be found that these men scraped the money together from sources of which I and their neighbours had no idea, for the purpose of paying the last farthing it was possible to pay to their landlord. That, Sir, I think is clear proof that there is no such thing as wholesale dishonesty on the part of those tenants of Ireland who have adopted the Plan of Campaign. I believe that every Member from Ireland who will follow me in the course of this debate will be able to give similar testimony as to the great sacrifices which have been made by the tenants of Ireland in order to meet every fair, just, and reasonable demand their landlords can possibly make upon them. As a proof that there is no dishonesty on the part of the tenants of Ireland, and no general combinations to refuse to pay rents, I may mention the fact that there have not been more than 50 or 60 instances, up to the present moment, in which the Plan of Campaign has been adopted. In all other cases the landlords, with a few exceptions, have met their tenants in a fair and reasonable spirit; and I am myself acquainted with a great many properties and estates where the Plan of Campaign would not have been adopted if the landlords had shown the slightest disposition to treat with their tenants, or to meet them fairly. It was only resorted to where the landlords displayed no inclination whatever to abandon the pound of flesh they demanded in the nature of rack-rents. If there had been any conciliatory attempt to meet the tenants on the part of these harsh landlords, there would have been a desire on the part of the tenants to meet them half-way. As an invariable rule, wherever the Plan of Campaign has been adopted, it will be found that the landlords are inexorable in their claims. They will not acknowledge that there has been any depression of prices; that their tenants are suffering any hardship whatever; or that there is any fair ground for making a reduction. I think I have given proof to the House that we have not been trying to prevent the tenants from paying the rent. In every case where the Plan of Campaign has been adopted, and the money put into the common fund, the landlord has been told plainly and distinctly that the money is there ready for him to take if he is willing. There is no hesitation in paying it over to him; and in every case where the landlord has come to terms the whole of his half-year's rent, less the reduction which the tenants have asked him to make, has been paid to him, without the slightest deduction on account of any expenses which may have been incurred in reference to legal proceedings. One proof of the actual necessity of putting this Plan of Campaign into operation, and particularly in the South of Ireland, with which I am personally connected, is contained in a fact which I will mention to the House. The hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald), who led the opposition last Session to the Tenants' Relief Bill of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), called a meeting of the landlords of the county of Cork, and of the South of Ireland, immediately after he returned to Ireland from Parliament. Speeches were made at that meeting by the hon. Member for Cambridge and the hon. Member for South Huntingdon (Mr. Smith-Barry), calling on the landlords of Cork and the South of Ireland generally to acknowledge the badness of the times and the depreciation of prices, and to make fair and reasonable allowances to their tenants upon the half-year's rent. It is only right that, in speaking from these Benches, I should acknowledge that many of the landlords, in answer to that appeal, did make large reductions, and among the foremost of them was the hon. Member for South Huntingdon himself, who made a larger reduction than we have asked for under the Plan of Campaign upon property immediately adjoining that upon which the Plan of Campaign was put into operation. Surely this fact affords strong justification for the proceedings which the tenants have been compelled to resort to. The hon. Member for Cambridge led the opposition to the Bill of my hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) last autumn. But when he went home and inquired into the circumstances, he saw at once the absolute necessity of making a wholesale and sweeping reduction of rents to the tenants. One very curious thing connected with the Plan of Campaign is this. It has almost invariably been in connection with properties where the landlords are absentees that this Plan of Campaign has been put into operation, for the simple reason that, unlike those gentlemen who live among their tenantry, and who are able to inquire into their affairs, these absentee landlords know nothing of the circumstances of their tenantry, and are altogether guided by the reports which they receive from parties who are interested in making no settlement. It is a very well known fact in Ireland, if it is not known to Members in this House, that almost invariably the land agent in Ireland, or some one of his relatives, is a member of the Legal Profession. Of course, the more law there is on these properties the better it is for the land agent, or for his brother or son, or whatever relative happens to be solicitor to the estate. If the landlord came to terms with his tenant, and gave a proper reduction, there would be no law costs find their way into the estate office. I believe that in a large number of cases where this unfortunate strife prevails between landlord and tenant, if they could be thoroughly investigated, it would be distinctly found that this is one of the primary causes which prevents the landlord and tenant from coming to an amicable settlement. Upon one particular property in which the Plan of Campaign has been adopted, the entire reduction, if allowed, would not have come to more than a few hundred pounds, and yet I am informed that the landlord has already incurred costs which amount to £600 or £700 without having received a single farthing of rent, or being likely to do so. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House seems to have gone somewhat out of his way in order to show how little he knows of this Plan of Campaign and its operations in Ireland. He referred to it as one of the causes of the Glenbeigh evictions. My hon. Friend who spoke from these Benches has already referred to that matter, and has told the House that in Glenbeigh, where those unfortunate cottiers live who have been hunted out of their homes by the agents of the Hon. Rowland Winn, and left without a roof to cover them for some weeks, the Plan was never heard of. It is an extraordinary fact that on all the properties in Ireland where the tenants have adopted the Plan of Campaign, up to the present moment there has not been a single case of eviction. If the Government have been, as has been stated, doing their best to prevent evictions in Ireland, and if these evictions are, in the eyes of the British people and of the Government, a source of shame and degradation, how is it that the law does not prevent them, and why is it that the forces of the Crown are used in order to assist in carrying them out? It is a source of congratulation to us who have been connected with the Plan of Campaign that not a single unfortunate family has been put out on the road-side in this inclement winter on any property where the Plan of Campaign has been adopted. Whatever may have been thought of our action here in England—and I believe that very different views are held of the morality and the justice and the necessity of the Plan of Campaign in England generally from those which have fallen from the Tory Benches opposite—we shall always look back with pride to the fact that we were, in this winter of abnormal agricultural depression, able to maintain upon their farms, in many localities, persons who would otherwise have been driven out upon the road-side or compelled to emigrate. There is one other circumstance in connection with this Plan of Campaign which I would ask English Members and others to give their attention to, as a justification and reason why a different view may be taken from that which has been persistently adopted by the Members of the Government; and that is that while this great persecution of the tenants is going on all over Ireland, and while these grossly harsh evictions are taking place which are arousing the indignation of the whole civilized world, Her Majesty, in the Speech which she has addressed to the Houses of Parliament, has announced the fact that there has been less of grave crime committed in Ireland in the present winter than for a long time past. What is the cause of it? Why is it that we have not this winter, as we have invariably had in other winters, long records of agrarian outrage and crimes following directly in the wake of evictions and as the direct consequence of evictions? It has been acknowledged by Captain Plunkett, the representative of the Government in the South of Ireland, that the reason why we have not had these crimes is this—that the Plan of Campaign has obviated the necessity for the tenants of Ireland to have recourse to those acts of violence which they have adopted in former years, when they were handed over unprotected to be persecuted and exterminated by rack-renting landlords. That is an additional reason why we who have taken part in this Plan of Campaign in Ireland, instead of feeling intimidated by the State prosecutions which have been initiated in Dublin, or by the threats which have been thrown out from the Treasury Bench this evening in regard to the adoption of the Plan of Campaign being a violation of the law, are able to stand up here as fearlessly as we do in Ireland to acknowledge with pride and pleasure that we have taken part in the Plan of Campaign, and that we have done so knowing intimately the circumstances of the tenantry with whom we have co-operated. We know that the tenants have been making a fair and honest demand, and that if they had paid more than they have offered they would have been doing great injustice to themselves and families. If they had made any effort to meet the unjust claims of the landlords at the present moment, they would have been merely staving off, for a very short time, the same drastic course of persecution on the part of the landlords, because it would be sure to be repeated when the March rents came round again, and when they would be less able to meet the claims made upon them. I must apologise for detaining the House at such great length, but I thought it was necessary that some of us who have taken part in the Plan of Campaign should deny the deliberately false reports which have been made in regard to our proceedings in Ireland, and endeavour to place before the House the real circumstances and conditions under which we have put this Plan of Campaign into operation. We challenge a verdict on our conduct from all fair-minded and impartial Englishmen as fearlessly as we do from any fairly constituted Jury of our fellow-countrymen in Ireland.

Mr. SHIRLEY (Yorkshire, W. R., Doncaster): Any measure for the reform of county government which is likely to meet with the approval of Members on this side of the House must be of a distinctly democratic character. I confess that I have little faith in the reforming pretensions of the present Government; and we have already heard, in Ministerial speeches made within these walls, that the new County Boards are to be composed largely of *ex officio* members. Now, I venture to say that any scheme of that nature which may be brought forward will not meet with acceptance. The desire of the country is to have Councils elected on a purely democratic basis; that the members should be the direct representatives of the ratepayers of the locality; that the electors should have the protection of the Ballot; and that the principle should be adopted of one man one vote. Under these circumstances, I should like to have some information given to the House by some Member of the Government as to what their plan is. It has been suggested by some that the parish should be the area, and by others that it ought to be the Union; but my opinion is that, while on the one hand the parish would be too small, on the other the Union would be too large. I would suggest myself that the Boundary Commissioners who were sent round the country in connection with the Redistribution Bill should be sent round again in connection with the system of local government, so that districts might be mapped out with populations averaging 6,000 or 7,000—in some cases by giving a Charter of Incorporation to a large village or a small town, and in other cases by the grouping together of a number of villages; and to the Councils representing these districts ought to be transferred all those powers which are now exercised by the Court of Quarter Sessions. I sincerely hope that the scheme to be introduced by the Government will be on lines of that kind. As the Representative of rural electors, I know what it is they want. They do not want a sham Bill; they have no desire to find out, when the new system is brought into operation, that they are to continue to be governed by the parson and the squire, and that they have only got Quarter Sessions over again under a new name. That is certainly not what they want; but their desire is to have the full power of local self-government exercised by the persons who pay the rates. At the time the Municipal Corporations Act was passed, in 1835, the people who lived in the towns were given the full right of managing their own local affairs; and that system has answered so well in the case of the towns during the last 50 years that it ought now to be applied to the rural districts as well. My opinion is that Her Majesty's Government are only making a pretence of legislating in the matter, and that they will not put into the hands of the electors the real power which they ought to have. Then, again, there is another branch of the question of local self-government which is very inadequately referred to in the Speech from the Throne—namely, local self-government as it relates to Ireland. I am glad to be able to believe that the cause of Home Rule has been making considerable progress during the last few months; and nothing, I think, indicates that more clearly than the Liverpool Election. There we saw the spectacle of a Tory statesman of the first rank, holding a high official position, and with every kind of advantage in his favour, not only enjoying the powerful support of the Press, but also the assistance of a large number of influential persons calling themselves Liberals, and the fight was on the one question of Home Rule. And yet in that great constituency of Liverpool, where the commercial ability of Mr. Goschen must have been so thoroughly understood and appreciated, the Home Rule candidate was returned. All that I have observed of late shows that the cause of Home Rule is making rapid progress. We have been told by hon. Members opposite, not only in this House, but throughout the country, that we who advocate Home Rule are Separatists. We deny the accusation, and hurl it back with scorn and indignation at the men who make it. We say that it is you who are the real Separatists, and that it is we who are the real Unionists; and that it is foolish for you to keep up that condition of separation which has now existed for the last 86 years. Have you had any solid union during those years? You have had a paper union; but no union of heart or affection. You have had the union of Parliaments; but you have never had a union of people; and, therefore, I say that it is we who advocate Home Rule—we, who are willing, under proper safeguards, for the protection of minorities, for the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, and for the unity and integrity of the Empire, to intrust the Irish people with the power of managing their own local affairs, who are the true Unionists. I believe that the people are getting more clearly to understand that the concession of a statutory and subordinate, not a co-equal and co-ordinate Parliament, does not mean separation. We are not Separatists, because we desire, and intend, that Ireland shall always remain an integral portion of the Queen's Dominions. We do not intend that Ireland shall ever be separated from Great Britain; and the people of this country are rapidly beginning to understand that to intrust the Irish people with the management of their own local affairs would be a perfectly safe experiment.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I have noticed that the present debate is very similar to others which have taken place upon the Address in answer to the Queen's Speech. Debates on the Address generally turn upon the question of Ireland and of coercion. I think it is somewhat strange that on the present occasion we do not find the many embryo statesmen in this House prepared to descant upon the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government. We have not heard anything of Prince Alexander in the course of this discussion, or of the Eastern Question, or of Austrian sentiment, or anything like that. The debates which usually follow Her Majesty's Gracious Speech generally hang upon Ireland, and in most cases on the propriety of coercing Ireland. No matter how the ideal may be put, no matter what may be the language used, there is always found in the Queen's Speech some hint of coercion for Ireland. We have that very mildly put in the Speech of Her Majesty to-day, for I find that Parliament is invited to consider that question in these terms—

> "Your early attention will be called to proposals for reforms in legal procedure, which seem necessary to secure the prompt and efficient administration of the Criminal Law."

Now, Sir, I am somewhat curious to know whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Law Advisers to introduce into that Bill some means by which Her Majesty's Crown Prosecutors in Ireland may be prevented from packing juries. We, in our capacity of Representatives of the Irish people, have often strongly to protest against the efforts made by the Crown Prosecutors in Ireland to pack juries. We were successful in one case this year in smashing up a jury panel in Sligo, and we were also successful in securing for the prisoners sent to Cork for trial the benefit of the doubt. For the first time the unfortunate prisoners brought to Cork for trial got fair play, and it was only because my hon. Friend the Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner) and myself demanded fair play in such a remarkable fashion that the juries of Cork and the Crown Prosecutor himself dare not deny fair play. I trust that in any legal procedure that may be introduced by Her Majesty's Advisers they will take good care to put it beyond the power of the officials in Ireland to pack juries and deny the rights and privileges of citizens and the British Constitution itself. But I am inclined to think that the language of the Royal Speech, although very mild, does convey to those who are able to read between the lines that something more is intended to be done. For my part I believe it is intended to coerce Ireland again, and I have only to point out to Her Majesty's Government, as I have often pointed out before, that in proportion as you coerce the people of Ireland, in proportion as you oppress them and deny them their rights, will be the crime that exists in Ireland. I remember—I think it was in 1881 or 1882—reading a speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), in which he clearly proved that as the local leaders of opinion in Ireland were put in prison so did the number of outrages increase in the localities in which the arrests had taken place, and that when these men were restored to their homes and the influence which they had always exercised over their neighbours was again exerted, crime was throttled and suppressed. I believe that if the same course is pursued by Her Majesty's Government now a like result will follow. As I have said already, it is very strange that in all the debates which occur after the reading of Her Majesty's Gracious Speech, the principal topic of discussion is Ireland. On this occasion the speakers who have already occupied the time of the House have fortunately the much-abused Plan of Campaign to fall back upon. We have seen the Plan of Campaign abused by the Press; we have heard it abused on the platform; and we now invite discussion upon it. We are satisfied that after a full discussion of the matter the Government will sing very small indeed. I have very little to say as to the Plan of Campaign. That Plan of Campaign has only been put into operation in order to effect that which the Government themselves desired to bring about. Why, Sir, the landlords of Ireland have entered upon a Plan of Campaign of their own. Hon. Members of this House as well as the Irish Members have witnessed the operations which have been carried out under the Plan of Campaign. I myself had not the opportunity of witnessing the terrible evictions which have been taking place in the district of Glenbeigh; but although I was not in the South of Ireland I was in a district in the North in which evictions were attempted to be carried out—namely, in the district of Gweedore, in the County of Donegal. A more miserable country I have never put my foot in. The inhabitants of the district live amidst rocks and stones. The whole surface of the land is white with granite—great granite boulders weighing five or 10 cwt.—scattered all over the surface of the land. The people descend to the shore and bring up on their backs huge piles of seaweed, which they lay down between the crevices in the rocks and over the surface of the stones. On the land thus formed they sow potatoes, but I am sorry to say that a very small crop indeed is produced. I myself examined the crop produced upon the land of one of the tenants who was evicted, and this (holding up a small potato) was the largest I could find. Nor is it very inviting. But no sooner have the peasants made this land than the landlord comes down upon them for the rent. They have in this district of Gweedore patiently paid rent for years, but owing to the pressure of the times they have now found themselves unable to do so. But because these people are unable to meet the landlords' demands, by virtue of necessity they have been obliged, if not to adopt the Plan of Campaign, at least to strike against the payment of the exorbitant rents that were demanded from them. The landlord put the law into operation, and last week he proceeded in this terribly bleak and barren district to evict some 13 families. With the aid of 200 policemen he succeeded in evicting one man, but no sooner was he evicted than the people, in their resentment, put him back again into the house from which he had been expelled. Now I maintain that it was a worthy act. That, Sir, is the state of things at Gweedore. If the people in other localities have adopted the Plan of Campaign they have done so by virtue of stern necessity, and not with any intention to defeat or evade the law, or to refuse to fulfil their legal obligations. I am acquainted with another estate in the South of Ireland on which I have witnessed on one or two occasions the collection of money from the tenants, and I know that many of the farmers in that district have been compelled to encroach upon their domestic resources in order to contribute their portion to the common fund. Many of them have gone to the meetings of their friends, assembled to take council, and have professed their inability to pay anything, either to the landlord in the shape of rent, or into the Tenants' Defence Fund. They have said that it would be necessary to go to some fair and dispose of their last cow, or sheep, or pig, as the case might be, and they have appealed to their friends, as they would appeal to the agent or landlord himself, for time to enable them to pay in the money to the Tenants' Defence Fund. This is, I believe, the state of things which exists on all the estates where the Plan of Campaign has been adopted. Yet because the Plan of Campaign has been adopted, by virtue of stern necessity, the advisers of Her Majesty make her say in the Gracious Speech from the Throne that—

> "The relations between the owners and occupiers of land, which in the early part of the autumn exhibited signs of improvement, have since been seriously disturbed in some districts by organized attempts to incite the latter class to combine against the fulfilment of their legal obligations."

What has been stated here by my Colleagues who have preceded me is a fact —namely, that the Nationalist Members of Parliament in Ireland have not identified themselves with the initiatory steps which have been taken by the tenants in adopting the Plan of Campaign. Never until they had themselves decided upon adopting that plan have the Nationalist Members interfered, and very often they have only intervened for the purpose of cutting down what might otherwise have been an exorbitant reduction. A case came under my observation last Sunday. A body of tenants waited upon me, and, having made a statement, I advised them not to demand the reduction which they thought they ought to get in order to enable them to live and thrive. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe Her Majesty has been very badly advised in regard to her Speech so far as Ireland is concerned. I believe that there is no foundation for the assertion that there have been organized attempts to incite the tenants to combine against the fulfilment of their legal obligations to the landlords. I believe that there has been no combination among the Irish Members, or on the part of any organization in Ireland, to incite the tenants to refuse to fulfil their legal obligations. I believe, also, that Her Majesty has been badly advised in stating that she wishes this House of Parliament to introduce any measure of coercion in Ireland. The coercion, if any is to be applied, should be applied to the officials of Dublin Castle, and those officials under British rule who tyrannize over the subjects of Her Majesty in Ireland, who pack juries, and send subjects into penal servitude who are innocent of the crimes laid to their charge. Not only am I of opinion that Her Majesty has been badly advised, but I believe that the Government will know it before long. It is not the first time that a Tory Government has advised Her Majesty wrongly in relation to Ireland. They are out of sympathy with the majority of the people of Ireland, and they are in sympathy and harmony with the oppressors of the Irish people. They are trying to get for the landlords the best bargain they can possibly make, and at the present moment they are using the forces of Her Majesty to keep up the land at a fictitious value in order that they may enable their friends, the Irish landlords, to retire with flying colours and full pockets. But they are counting without their host. The Irish people to-day have friends; they have advisers and counsellors who will not allow the Government to play into the hands of their enemies in the manner in which, perhaps, Her Majesty's Government desire. No doubt before long we shall have some grand scheme of land purchase in Ireland. I think it is foreshadowed in Her Majesty's Speech. When the Government find that they are unable to maintain the rents in Ireland at a fictitious value by other means, they resort to the old methods of coercion. They prosecute the advisers of the Irish people, put them in prison under a Peace Preservation Act, and prosecute them under some special Statute which provides some hasty and obsolete means of dealing with them. We are asked now to furnish Her Majesty's Government with means for removing the advisers of the Irish people, who now stand between them and the landlords, in order, as I have said, to sustain the rents at a fictitious value, so that they may retire the old garrison before they create a new one, with flying colours and full pockets. The Irish landlords have been for a long time in the occupation of the country, and now, like a retiring army, they are endeavouring to lay waste the land as they retire. They are seeking to devastate the country, but we will not allow them if we can prevent it. On the contrary, we desire to hasten their retirement, so that they shall have no time to carry out their work of devastation. I have felt it my duty to point out to the Government the mistakes they have made in the advice they have given to Her Majesty in the Royal Speech which was made to-day from the Throne. I believe that a grave mistake has been committed; and whatever course is before us, whether it be coercion or conciliation, we are prepared for any fate in store for us, and are resolved to stand by the people, no matter what the consequences may be.

Mr. BLANE (Armagh, S.): Some hon. Members on this side of the House have touched upon what is called the Plan of Campaign. Now, I maintain that the Government have had at their disposal a devastating army, and that that devastating army has not confined its operations to what are called the rebel and disaffected portion of the Irish people. I know of my own knowledge that what has been termed the English garrison in Ulster has suffered as much, and perhaps more, from the ruffianism of landlordism as any other Province. I know something of Ulster. I remember when, in North Armagh, Lord Lurgan cleared out 100 families in one locality, and for what purpose?—in order to make a run for dogs. And yet this arbitrary course of procedure was resorted to in the case of the men who, whenever the Empire is in danger, are to rush to the front and defend the integrity of the Empire. They were supposed to be Loyalists in the true sense of the word, and yet Lord Lurgan swept them off in droves like cattle. That is the estimate in which the Loyalists of Ulster are held by one of the Irish landlords. They have not been treated in any degree better than the rebels and disaffected, as they are called. I know, of my own knowledge, that during last winter, in that part of the county of Armagh which I have the honour to represent, the tenants in what are called the Nationalist districts got a reduction of rent from 25 to 30 per cent, but no such reduction was made in the Loyalist districts. I commend this fact to the notice of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), who must often have heard of the Protestant garrison of Ulster for the defence of the unity of the Empire and of the Crown. It would be much more proper to speak of it as the defence of the landlords' half-crowns. We are not told much of the loyalty of the landlords; and in a time of emergency, judging from the past, the landlords, as a class, are not the men who would be prepared to stand in the breach. Indeed, we have been told by *The Times* that in the time of the Crimean War 2,000 aristocratic cowards laid down their arms; and I, for one, certainly do not regard such men as the defenders of their country. I have thought it right to intervene in this debate because I have heard so often, both in and out of Parliament, that the Irish garrison of Ulster is to maintain the country for England. My belief is that the Loyalist garrison of the North would be the worst enemies of the country, and that it would fill it with combustible materials. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) has, to a large extent, bridged over the differences between England and the Irish people. He has endeavoured to create a real union between the two peoples; and it must not be forgotten by the men who now call themselves Unionists, on the other side of the House, that more than 100 years ago, at the time when the Americans wanted to rule themselves, Lord North and his Party said they would not tolerate any disruption of the Union. What was the result of their refusal to concede right and justice to the American people? I have myself seen, on the Chesapeake and Potomac, the Stars and Stripes waving where the British Flag might have been floating to the present day. The right hon. Member for Mid Lothian and the Liberals who follow him have no intention, certainly, of adopting a policy which, in the case of America, threw away a Colony of the Crown. At the present moment you have a difficulty with the American people. You have the Canadian Fishery Question at issue with the very people from whom you separated, and whom, if you had not separated from them, you might have had some share in ruling. Taking the advice of the Unionists of those days you threw away all your chance. You may possibly have a war now, for the United States are not likely to submit tamely to the piratical acts of Canada. If you were not able to contend with them 100 years ago, or in 1812 or 1814, you may not fare much better in these days. Surely the sympathy of the Irish people in any European or American complication is worth consideration, and it may be far more worth your while to have the goodwill of the Irish people by allowing them to rule themselves than to have them ruled by bad landlords, and disaffected towards your rule when a time of difficulty arises. The landlord class may collect their rents, because they are Justices of the Peace and judges in their own cause; they have control of the Sheriffs and bailiffs who execute the law; they empanel the Grand Juries, and form the Visiting Committees of the gaols. In addition, they are *ex officio* Poor Law Guardians, equal in number to the whole of the elected Guardians. They can sit on more than one Board; and in the county of Armagh, although you may find different Boards, they are always the same men. The law as it now exists enables them to oppress the people, and it is put in force by such men as Judge Lawson and Prince Edward of Saxe-Weimar, a German. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary himself has such contempt for the law in Ireland that he anticipates the judgment of the Courts and sends down his emissaries to seize the money of the people on the ground that they have incurred legal liabilities to the landlords, notwithstanding the fact that no writ has been issued or judgment delivered. Before any judgment is got at all the Chief Secretary directs a number of policemen to go down and throttle one of my hon. Colleagues, so that they may wrest the tenant's money out of his hands. The magistrates themselves have so much contempt for the Judges that they do not wait for the ordinary operations of the law, but direct the seizure of money which never belonged to them. I can understand the Chief Secretary sending down to seize this money if a writ or judgment had been previously obtained; but he has waited for no authority whatever. Well, a pickpocket could not do more than that, and I believe there is a Statute in existence which inflicts the penalty of flogging upon any man who takes money out of the pocket of another. Small as my knowledge of law is, I must confess that under these circumstances my respect for it is still less, and for this reason—that the responsible Officers of the Crown in Ireland do not respect it themselves. You must respect the law yourselves if you desire to make it respected. And the law must be in accordance, not only with the Divine law, but the natural law. But how can you look upon any proceeding as being in accordance with either Divine or natural law by which men are thrust out upon the roadside and their houses pulled down or set on fire? In a military campaign a victorious army would do far less than you have been doing in Ireland by means of the Sheriffs and the bayonets and rifles of the police. And this, too, in the year of Her Majesty's Jubilee. What a monument it is to Her Majesty upon her Jubilee! 4,000,000 of Irish people have been done to death since the accession of Her Majesty in 1837, and 270,000 houses were levelled in the years 1846 and 1847. These are the monuments of the reign of Queen Victoria. We are asked to be loyal, and we do the best we can; but you will not allow us to be loyal. I would ask how loyal you would be under the same circumstances? What have not Englishmen ventured in the past for the preservation of their rights and liberties? But if we dare to murmur a complaint against the harsh and cruel laws which are imposed upon us, our mouths are immediately closed and we are put in prison. The police in this country do not carry rifles and bayonets; but in Ireland they have them, and charge them with buckshot. The Government do not care what happens, although I believe that Englishmen generally are ashamed of the transactions which take place in connection with Ireland. I have heard Englishmen say that they are ashamed of the accounts they have read in regard to the conduct of the troops and police in Ireland. Surely the Irish people have a natural right to the soil of their own country. I have no right to the soil of this country because I am not an Englishman, but I venture to submit that, as an Irishman, I have some right to the soil of Ireland. Therefore I maintain that the law which you support in Ireland is not the natural law. It is a law which gives the lives and bodies of other men into the custody of third parties. It does not make much difference whether a man owns a slave or whether he owns the land on which that slave is kept; he is a slave all the same. We deny that there is any power on the part of this country to put an end to the natural rights of Irishmen to the soil of their own country. Certainly the Irish Representatives refuse to admit your power to legislate for their country in that spirit, and if they took any other course the Irish people would very soon send another class of Representatives to this House, who would probably not treat you as respectfully as we do. We do our best to respect your procedure and your stupid laws, but we endeavour to induce you to alter them. You, on the other hand, manifest no disposition to alter them, and you are slow indeed in taking any steps that will be for the benefit of the people. On behalf of our constituents, we protest against the violation of their natural rights and law of which you have been guilty. The course you have pursued in the past has not tended to produce tranquillity in Ireland, but it has made the Irish people the enemies of your Empire. You talk about the American Irish. How is it possible that they can have any feeling of loyalty towards this country? No doubt the action of the National Representatives, of the National League, and of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), has done very much to soften the asperities which exist in other parts of the world. I would therefore ask who are the greater friends of the Empire—we, or those who increase the number of the enemies of Great Britain and bring the law into contempt? Not only that, but they bring the Sovereign of this Realm into hostility with the people, for every writ that is issued against the people runs in this way, "Victoria, by the Grace of God." I ask fearlessly whether we or the landlords are the best friends of the Empire? These are the remarks I have to make on this subject, and I have to thank the House for the attention paid to them. I could not allow the debate to close without saying a few words, more particularly with regard to the events which have occurred in the North Armagh Division.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Colonel Saunderson.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury give the House any information with regard to the circulation of the proposed new Rules of Procedure?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Yes, Sir. I will give attention to the subject, and I trust they will be in the hands of hon. Members to-morrow.

House adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 28*th January*, 1887.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—Committee of Selection, *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *First Reading* — Probation of First Offenders * (3); Christchurch (Southampton) Charter (Correction of Error) * (4); Women's Suffrage) * (5).

COMMITTEE OF SELECTION.

The Lords following; viz.,

E. Morley. L. Boyle.
E. Lathom. L. Colville of Culross.

with the Chairman of Committees, were appointed a Committee to select and propose to the House the names of the five Lords to form a Select Committee for the consideration of each opposed Private Bill.

MILITARY ARMAMENTS AND ORGANIZATION.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS, on rising to ask the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether Her Majesty's Government are taking steps, and, if so, what steps to improve our military armaments and organization? said, he must apologize to their Lordships for bringing on the question that evening. He was glad to notice that, from the contents of the Speech from the Throne, Her Majesty was on friendly terms with all the Foreign Powers. But, at the same time, they also knew that nothing tended to the maintenance of peace so much as a state of preparation for war. He would go further, and say that he believed a strong England, strong not only at home, but strong in her coaling stations, in her harbours, and in her Colonies, was a material element in a question which affected the peace of Europe. Mention was made of other questions in the Speech, no doubt, of great importance—the questions of Ireland and local government, for example. Ireland at the present moment unquestionably presented a spectacle which could not be paralleled in any other part of the civilized world, because in that country law and order were apparently suspended in a great degree. Important as these matters were, however, there was no reference whatever in the Speech from the Throne to the question of our armaments, on which all Europe at the present time was agitated, nor as to anything which the Government proposed to do for the defence of the country. It was true that their Lordships had heard, and they had read statements in the newspapers that morning made in "another place" by the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) and the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton), and he (the Earl of Wemyss) believed that the Government were keenly alive to what it was necessary to do in one direction, at any rate, for the safety of the Empire. They saw that the resignation of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) turned on the question of Military and Naval Expenditure, as to which a Royal Commission and those most cognizant with the question agreed that there should be an adequate outlay on coaling stations and harbours. They, no doubt, had also read that the reasoning which led to this resignation on the part of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer had been described as "safe and judicious," but he was greatly mistaken if public opinion, without respect to Party, would not on this question declare that safety and sound judgment—aye, and public spirit and patriotism, rested with those who maintained the necessity of having sufficient and efficient defences. This was, perhaps, the first occasion when a Secretary of State for War and a First Lord of the Admiralty, backed by their Colleagues and a Prime Minister, had successfully resisted the curtailment suggested in the Estimates by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. This was an indication that Her Majesty's Government were keenly and patriotically alive to the wants of the nation as regarded defence, but he should like to know whether Her Majesty's Government were also turning their attention, in the first instance, to the question of armaments; and, in the next place, to matters affecting military organization at home? It had been his duty on several occasions to call the attention of their Lordships to what he considered to be the defects in our armament, and also the grave deficiency in the matter of military organization. About six weeks ago, he read a statement in a newspaper to the effect that the War Office were about to adopt what was called the Schulhoff new repeating arm. If this was the case, all he could say was, better late than never. He had seen this arm about five years ago, and to his knowledge it was submitted to the authorities. It was the simplest possible form of repeater. There were no springs or other complications about it, and for the small sum of 8*s.* the repeating action could have been applied and could now be applied to the existing arms of the Service.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Lord HARRIS): To the Martini-Henry?

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: Yes, to the Martini-Henry, by cutting away a portion of the stock. He believed that this question of a good repeating rifle was of greater importance than a lower projectile, and many other things to which attention had been directed. If that were the case, he hoped that, looking to what was going on in Europe with regard to armaments and to the way in which other nations were arming their forces with repeaters, this country would not be left in a position of inferiority. If our troops were sent abroad armed only with a breech-loading rifle and met troops armed with a repeater, the authorities at the War Office would be guilty of a grave dereliction of duty. He hoped no time would be lost in giving such an arm to our troops. The other point he was anxious to obtain some information upon was whether any action was being taken with reference to the Militia and its organization. He hoped the rumour was well founded that the Government had been moving heaven and earth to do all they possibly could to establish two Army Corps, thoroughly equipped in every way. This step had also been too long delayed; but he was very glad to hear such a rumour. In the interest of the nation and the efficiency of its defences he trusted that these preparations would be promptly carried out. As to the Militia, he should like to know whether anything was being done to fill the Militia up to its proper establishment, and also whether the Government intended to do anything to give effect to the original intention that the Militia Army Reserve should be borne in excess of the Militia Establishment? There were other questions, mainly affecting the Reserve Forces, the question of artillery, of commissariat, transport, and the equipment of Volunteers. On the last mentioned subject, it was known that without equipment the Volunteer Force could not keep the field for a day. They were men with muskets, and nothing else. There was an impression, too, that although the sum granted to the Volunteers was sufficient to cover equipment, yet there were some corps which, from the circumstances in which they were placed, found the grant insufficient to enable them to equip themselves. He hoped the Government would look into the question and see that the Volunteer Force was made effective, which at present it was not. He had read with interest and some surprise the speech of the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) at a recent distribution of prizes to Volunteers. He was bound to say that that speech had caused a good deal of alarm through the Force, as was shown by the fact that one Service newspaper headed its article "Startling Announcement." The announcement was to the effect that only a certain sum of money was voted for military purposes, and that, therefore, only a small sum might remain for the Volunteers. He ventured to think that the House of Commons never had refused, and never would refuse, whatever sum the Ministers responsible for the safety of the country and the efficiency of the protective Services came and asked for, backed by the Government and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The interpretation put upon that speech was that it was for the Military Authorities, under a proper system of organization, to declare what is the proper number of Volunteers; that if there were too many Volunteers in one locality they should either be allowed to die off or be compelled to diminish their companies; and that if there were not too many—[Lord HARRIS dissented.] He (the Earl of Wemyss) was glad to see his noble Friend shake his head, because that was the impression his speech had made, and he was pleased to find it was a wrong impression. The Volunteer Army was a very sensitive Army; it had existed now for nearly 30 years, having sprung from the public spirit of the people, and been allowed to grow freely in what direction it could; and if any Minister were to be unwise enough to endeavour to deal with the Volunteer Force as he would the pieces on a chess-board, the whole thing would disappear. It was a Force that was full of vigour and growth, and he begged the War Office Authorities to consider what would be the position of the country if we were to lose this Army, consisting of some 200,000 men, which had done so much for the strength of the country, and done so much also to raise the character of Englishmen for patriotism, public spirit, and self-denial. The noble Earl concluded by putting the Question of which he had given Notice.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH said he would intervene for a few moments between the reply of the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for War to say that, since the question of economy had been publicly raised elsewhere in reference to the War Department, that there might be a considerable saving in the Civilian element of this Military Department, and at the same time business expedited between Regiments, the units of the Army, by a reduction in the number of clerks, for whenever an increase in the Army took place a small army of clerks was added to the Department out of proportion to the addition made in the combatant portion of the Service. He did not think the public were desirous of such cheese-paring as taking away the Military Secretary from the Governor of Gibraltar, who was also the General Officer at that important place, or taking away the Aide-de-Camp from the Brigadiers at Aldershot. He generally concurred in what had fallen from the noble Earl on the Cross Benches (the Earl of Wemyss), but would desire, before any more money was spent upon the Volunteers, that they should be organized, and that old force, the Militia, should receive more attention both in respect to equipment, and by being raised or recruited to its proper strength. The present state of things made us appear more American than the Americans, caused by the number of honorary Colonels to be met with wherever you went. It would be evidence of great ingratitude in the case of any Commanding Officer of a Regiment at the period of the Crimean War, who did not acknowledge the advantage of the Militia, as the means of filling the ranks of their Regiments with both old and young Soldiers. He maintained that, unorganized, the Volunteers might become a source of danger rather than strength. Of course, the Volunteers were popular because every one nearly had some relative in them, and from the circumstance that they originally cost little, which being less the case now, was an additional reason for their not being made more efficient, at the expense, and to the detriment of, the older Force, the Militia; but of all short-sighted cheese-paring, neglect of the Coaling Stations would be the most objectionable, they being inadequate for the purposes of the Mercantile Marine, irrespectively of those of vessels of war. The cost for the Services of the Military Secretary at Gibraltar and the Staff at Aldershot, lately reduced, would not be more than £1,200 per annum altogether, and several £1,200 could be saved out of the Civilian element of this Military Department. From the large number of Officers who were placed out of the Service against their will, at a great cost to the country, although of an age when perfectly competent to serve, many might be very advantageously employed both in the Militia and the Volunteers.

THE EARL OF NORTHBROOK: I am not going to dilate on the speech of my noble Friend; but as reference has been made to the subject of the defence of our coaling stations, I should be glad if the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for War could give your Lordships some general information as to the progress which has been made in that most important branch of the defences of the country. My Lords, we have just read in the papers a correspondence between the noble Marquess the Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury) and Lord Randolph Churchill on the subject of the resignation by Lord Randolph Churchill of the Office of Chancellor of the Exchequer—and as that correspondence bears mainly upon the continuance or otherwise of the expenditure upon the defences for the coaling stations, I cannot think it would be right for anyone who has had some responsibility in the matter to avoid taking the earliest opportunity of saying a few words upon the subject. The subject of the defence of the coaling stations is by no means a new one. A Royal Commission, which was appointed when the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) was Prime Minister, sat some time ago, presided over by my noble Friend (the Earl of Carnarvon), and upon it were men of the highest distinction, both military and civil, including my noble Friend behind me (the Earl of Camperdown), and an hon. Friend of mine, a Member of the other House, Mr. Whitehead, both men of sound judgment and experience. They made a Report, proposing certain defences of coaling stations which they considered necessary. That Report was very carefully considered by Mr. Gladstone's Government, and at the time I was at the head of the Navy—in the winter of 1884—I explained to the House the expenditure which the Government had determined on with respect to the coaling defences. The Estimates came to between £800,000 and £900,000, and were included in the programme which Mr. Gladstone's Government recommended to Parliament, and which I had the honour to explain to your Lordships. That programme formed the basis of the Naval and Military Estimates for the year 1885-6, which were Estimates proposed on the responsibility of the Administration over which Mr. Gladstone presided. The Government which succeeded it did not remain sufficiently long in Office to propose any Estimates to Parliament. The Naval and Military Estimates for the year 1886-7 were proposed to Parliament upon the responsibility of Mr. Gladstone's last Administration, while my noble Friend (Lord Ripon) was First Lord of the Admiralty. The Estimates proposed to Parliament, including the defences of the coaling stations, have been Estimates proposed to Parliament by two Liberal Administrations, over both of which Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister. Therefore, the scale of expenditure with respect to the fortification of the coaling stations was a scale deliberately adopted by two Liberal Governments after full inquiry, and accepted, I may say without any hesitation, by both Houses of Parliament as being necessary for the defences of the country. Those being the circumstances of the case, I feel bound to express my humble opinion, after having read the correspondence I have referred to, that the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) would not have been doing his duty to the country if he had taken the responsibility of following the advice of Lord Randolph Churchill to abandon or to postpone the completion of those defences. The programme of 1884 has formed the basis of the Naval, and, to a very considerable extent, of the Army Estimates of succeeding years, because a large portion of the expenditure upon ships—namely, the supply of ordnance—is included in the Army and not in the Navy Estimates. The programme which Mr. Gladstone's Government of 1884 decided to recommend to the country, embraced an expenditure of £5,250,000 in excess of the normal expenditure, spread over a period of about four years. The Estimates thus framed were accepted by the other House of Parliament for 1885-6; and I am bound to say that, so far as I am acquainted with the facts of the case, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, for the present First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) to have conscientiously advised any large reduction in the expenses of the Navy. The expenditure is mainly for the construction of ships, and that expenditure is almost entirely upon contracts. Contracts were made in 1884 which cannot now have expired, and the ships cannot yet have been completed. How, then, would it be possible for the First Lord of the Admiralty to make any sweeping reduction in the programme accepted by Parliament, and on the faith of which the contracts had been entered into? I have only one word more to say upon the subject, and that is that I cannot conceive anything more uneconomical than to have violent fluctuations in expenditure. When the country has once determined that a certain scale of expenditure shall be carried out in a certain time, it is the worst economy to endeavour for any purpose of the moment suddenly to alter that scale. I myself am one of those who believe that the greatest economy should be maintained in the spending Departments of the country; and, after the completion of the contracts made in 1884, and if the circumstances should be such as not to render it necessary to increase the strength of the Navy in any particular class of vessel, it appears to me very possible for the expenditure on the Navy to be again reduced to something like its former normal rate. But at the present time I think that it would not be consistent with the duty of the First Lord if he accepted the making of large and sweeping reductions in the expenditure on the Navy. In conclusion, it is almost sufficient to state the fact that these Estimates have been proposed by two successive Liberal Governments to satisfy the country that in no sense have they been Estimates formed upon any aggressive policy, or with any desire of going to war. In fact, considering the great expansion of the military forces of the principal States in Europe, it would be almost absurd for anyone to accuse this country of wishing to embark upon an aggressive war. Our first desire must be that our Navy should be so strong as to prevent any successful attack being made upon us, and I say, without fear of contradiction from any one who has paid any attention to the subject, that this expenditure has been made purely for defensive purposes, and to no greater extent than is rendered necessary for the safety of the country, by the introduction of modern systems of armament and the great increase in the forces of other nations.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH said, he merely wished to remind their Lordships that the programme drawn up by the Commission, over which Lord Carnarvon had presided, had not been carried out to its fullest extent, and some of the most important items had been omitted, especially the fortification of the Cape of Good Hope and of Singapore. He wished to know what was being done with regard to Singapore? He mentioned this in support of what had fallen from the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Wemyss).

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Lord HARRIS): I think your Lordships will agree with me that there was no occasion for the noble Earl (the Earl of Wemyss) who brought this subject forward to apologize for having done so. The great interest which the noble Earl takes in all military measures is a sufficient justification. The only thing I regret is that, in consequence of the changes which have recently taken place, I am not in a position to-night to give him as much information as I should have wished to do with regard to the Questions which he has addressed to me. I do not think that I am justified in anticipating, in any way, the remarks which may be made later on by the Secretary of State for War when the Estimates are brought forward. But I think I can give the noble Earl on the Cross Benches some information on one or two points which I hope will satisfy him. With regard to repeating rifles, in connection with the Schulhoff repeater, the question of magazine guns has certainly not escaped the attention of the Government and the Military Authorities. The Committee which has been sitting for some time have given it close attention; and, although I am unable to state what kind of rifle will be decided on, I can tell him that the adoption of a magazine rifle is very nearly approaching completion. I am not an expert myself in these matters; but I am inclined to think that the magazine could not have been attached to the Martini-Henry by cutting a piece out of the stock, and that the noble Earl's suggestion in this matter reminds me that it would have been very like putting a new piece in an old garment, and that the consequences would have been as bad in the case of the gun. I am informed that the magazine could not have been attached. The noble Earl pointed out that most foreign armies had already adopted the repeating magazine rifle, and that we ought not to be behind them. But, I should like to ask, is the noble Earl satisfied that each foreign army has the best possible repeating rifle?

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: Very possibly not.

LORD HARRIS: There is the greatest difference between England and foreign nations. From our position, it is not so absolutely necessary for us to be first in the field, and to jump at the first novelty in the market. I think we are taking the wiser course in considering the various patterns of repeating rifles that have been produced, and then testing them with the object of adopting the best of them. At any rate, that has been the course adopted at the War Office. The noble Earl also referred to the Militia, although he did not go into the matter so fully as last autumn. I hope that my statement then satisfied him. I think he is correct in his impression that the Military Authorities are elaborating a plan for placing two Army Corps in the field thoroughly equipped. I understand him to suggest that the Militia Reserve should be borne in excess of the Militia Establishment. We hold to the Militia Reserve as a body who, in case of mobilization, or in case of war, would be of great service in making up deficiencies in the Regular Army, and if he can persuade the country to increase the Establishment by 30,000 men, I do not think the War Department will make any objection, and for myself I shall be glad to welcome the increase. With regard to the suggestion of the noble Earl respecting the Volunteer Field Artillery, I am happy to be able to inform him that we propose to supply, at no distant date, something like 84 field guns to the Volunteer Field Artillery. I may mention, as I am upon this point, that what has been called the reduction in the Royal Horse Artillery is a misnomer, and ought more correctly to be described as a conversion; and this conversion has taken place because in our scheme of mobilization it was found that the Royal Horse Artillery was in excess of the proportion with regard to the other branches of the Service. The actual reduction in the number of guns is only 28, and we are going to supply, as I have already said, 84 guns to the Volunteer Field Artillery, and the reduction occurs in those batteries which would lose all their guns on a declaration of war; in order that they might form an ammunition column instead of withdrawing all their guns, two only per battery have been withdrawn. The actual reduction in batteries is only two—one horse and one field. With regard to the Transport and Commissariat for the Volunteers, I think it would be an excellent thing if the Volunteers were able to organize their own Transport and Commissariat; but I cannot say, from my six months' experience at the War Office, that I have found any great anxiety among them on this point. If, however, any demand was shown in this direction we should take it into consideration. That, however, could not be carried out without expense. It is true it might be done at little cost, but that it would cost something I am sure. The noble Earl has referred to what an article in *The Volunteer Service Gazette* calls a "startling announcement" of mine. I never for an instant suggested that the Volunteer Force should be reduced. What I stated was, that it was for the Military Authorities to say how many Volunteers there should be, and I am greatly surprised to find that anyone can regard this as a "startling announcement." Instead, however, of doing that, I thought I was making a very encouraging statement. Although Parliament votes the Estimates, it does so on the advice of the Secretary of State for War, who is advised by the Military Authorities. We are at present not up to the Establishment of Volunteers; but we are approaching that limit, and I think that any wise man when approaching a limit in his career would turn his attention to and consider what he would do when that limit was reached. Similarly, I think it is necessary for us to consider what is to be done when we have reached the full Establishment. We are still deficient 20,000; but there is a noticeable deficiency in certain branches, such as the Submarine Mining Corps and the Garrison Artillery, and it is absolutely necessary that before we reach the full limit of 250,000 men we should complete in directions that are specially necessary for the defence of the country. The Volunteers have been recruited for the defence of the country, and they have shown great patriotism and loyalty, and I do not think that that patriotism and loyalty will be damped or fail them when the Military Authorities ask them to do that which is necessary for the defence of the country. But it has not been contemplated to reduce the Volunteer Forces, and I did not suggest that it had. Indeed, I may tell the noble Earl that in the mobilization scheme a most important part has been assigned to the Volunteers. I may repeat that, as far as I know, there is not the slightest idea of reducing the number of the Volunteers. But we are anxious that in any increases that may be made, they should be in a direction that shall be of the greatest use to the country. We fully recognize the great value of the Force, and are extremely desirous that if the time should ever come when they should be wanted, they shall be in as efficient a state as possible. The noble Earl below the Gangway (the Earl of Ellenborough) referred to the reduction of the Staff appointments at Gibraltar and Aldershot. All I can say is that these matters have been carefully considered, and that the Authorities came to the conclusion that these reductions could be made. With regard to the reductions which he suggests on the Civil side of the War Office, I can only remind him that there is a Commission sitting now to inquire into Departmental administration, and it would be better to wait for the Report of that Commission than to rest on any remarks from me, who have had but a short experience of the Department. In reference to the question of the noble Earl as to the armament of the coaling stations, I wish I could give him a fuller reply. I have no doubt that in a short time I shall be able to go into more details; but for the present I will simply say that we are proceeding as fast as we can, and we are spending all the money that has been granted to us by Parliament; but delay has no doubt occurred owing to the longer time which it now takes, owing to the greater mathematical precision required, to make the requisite guns and emplacement. It will be found that this year's Estimates will contain provisions for continuing what has been done. In some cases the armaments are being completed as quickly as possible, and that is particularly so in the case of Singapore.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, he trusted that the House would consider that the course which he had taken had been justified, for he had elicited some valuable declarations from his noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for War. It appeared, from the speech delivered yesterday in the other House by Mr. Gladstone, that what he considered two years ago safe and judicious to do in order to increase our Imperial defences, he no longer thought judicious now that he was out of office. With reference to the argument that the War Office authorities were waiting for the best repeating rifle, he would observe that that was just the sort of argument that might have been used by the Austrians before Sadowa. He held that it was better to have an inferior repeater than none at all.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he fully concurred in the statement which had been made by the noble Earl (the Earl of Northbrook) as to the Votes for the Coaling Stations having been proposed by Mr. Gladstone's recent Administrations. The Government, he thought, however, had, for very good reasons, declined to be party to abandoning the further expenditure upon these stations; but he might go farther and say that the proposals originated out of arrangements with the Colonies which would make it exceedingly difficult to stop the expenditure, and, particularly after the Votes in Parliament, to now entirely repudiate them.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, that the two noble Earls (Earl Granville and the Earl of Northbrook) took credit to Mr. Gladstone for initiating the expenditure on the Coaling Stations; but Mr. Gladstone himself now rather approved of the resistance of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer to further expenditure on them, and considered his action was wise and judicious. No doubt, when his own Government decided to construct stations, or to spend money in defending them, he thought that also wise and judicious.

EARL GRANVILLE: The noble Earl seems to think that the members of the late Government are determined to oppose a Vote of money to which they agreed when in power. I wish to assure the noble Earl that he is wrong in thinking this. I did not hear Mr. Gladstone's speech. Indeed, I was engaged in receiving a severe lecture from one of the dearest and kindest friends (Lord Selborne) I ever had. I have read the speech, however, and I gather from it that, although Mr. Gladstone spoke very strongly in favour of economy, as he always does, he expressly guarded himself from giving an opinion on any particular point.

PROBATION OF FIRST OFFENDERS BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to permit the conditional release of first offenders upon probation in certain cases—Was *presented* by the Earl of Belmore; read 1a. (No. 3).

CHRISTCHURCH (SOUTHAMPTON) CHARTER (CORRECTION OF ERROR) BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to correct an error in the charter of incorporation granted to the borough of Christchurch, in the county of Southampton—Was *presented* by the Lord President; read 1a. (No. 4).

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE BILL [H.L.]

A Bill for extending the right of voting at Parliamentary elections to duly qualified women—Was *presented* by the Lord Denman; read 1a. (No. 5).

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 28*th January*, 1887.

MINUTES.]—New Writ Issued—*For* Sligo (Southern Division), *v.* Thomas Sexton, esquire, who, having been returned as a Member for the said County of Sligo (Southern Division), and also for the Borough of Belfast (Western Division), has elected to sit for the Borough of Belfast (Western Division).

New Member Sworn—Ralph Neville, esquire, *for* Liverpool (Exchange Division).

Public Bills — *Resolutions in Committee — Ordered — First Reading* — Herb and Ginger Beer Makers' Licence * [16]; Burial Grounds* [18]; Truck Law Amendment Bill* [21]; Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland)* [22]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ulster) * [33]; London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance * [44]; Religious Prosecutions Abolition * [84]; Suffragans' Nomination * [102]; Oaths * [104]; Truck * [109].

Ordered — First Reading — Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) [1]; Arbitration of Poor Law Questions (Scotland)* [2]; Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment* [3]; Hares Preservation * [4]; Places of Worship (Sites)* [5]: Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment* [6]; Agricultural Tenants (Ireland) Relief * [7]; Limited Owners (Scotland)* [8]; Returning Officers' Expenses (Scotland)* [9]; Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 2) *[10]; Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland)* [11]; County Government (Ireland)* [12]; Personal Property (Exemption from Sale)* [13]; Poor Law Guardians (Ireland)* [14]; Theatres (Metropolis)* [15]; Police Force Enfranchisement* [17]; Land Tenure (Scotland)* [19]; Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment * [20]; Mining Royalties * [23]; Municipal Franchise (Ireland) * [24]; Land Law (Wales)* [25]; Leaseholds (Facilities of Purchase of Fee Simple) * [26]; Criminal Law (Ireland) Amendment * [27]; Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment * [28]; School Board for London (Pensions) * [29]; Houses in Towns (Ireland)* [30]; Accumulations* [31]; Parliamentary Elections* [32]; Justices of Peace* [34]; Police Constables' Pensions* [35]; National School Teachers (Ireland)* [36]; Parochial Boards (Scotland)* [37]; Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment* [38]; Coal Mines Regulation Act (1872) Amendment* [39]; Representation of the People* [40]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday* [41]; Small Debts (Scotland)* [42]; Registration of Voters* [43]; Workmen's Certificates* [45]; Beer Adulteration* [46]; University Education (Ireland)* [47]; Butter Substitutes* [48]; Elementary Education (Evening Schools)* [49]; Technical Education (Ireland)* [50]; Access to Mountains (Scotland)* [51]; Crofters (Scotland) Act (1886) Amendment* [52]; Church Sites (Compulsory Powers Repeal)* [53]; Fisheries (Ireland)* [54]; Housing of Working Classes *[55]; Technical Education (Day Schools)* [56]; Piers and Harbours (Ireland)* [57]; Quarries* [58]; School Board Elections (Scotland)* [59]; Allotments of Land* [60]; Vestrymen's Qualification* [61]; Pauper Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) (Superannuation)* [62]; Settled Land Acts* [63]; Tobacco Cultivation (Ireland)* [64]; Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 3)* [65]; Fairs and Markets (Ireland)* [66]; Leasehold Enfranchisement (by Purchase or Rent-charge)* [67]; Port and Harbour Authorities (Ireland)* [68]; Bankruptcy Court (Belfast)* [69]; Market Tolls (Ireland)* [70]; Voters' Qualification and Parliamentary Elections* [71]; Office under the Crown (Vacating of Seats)* [72]; Municipal Corporations Acts (Ireland) Amendment* [73]; Belfast Government* [74]; Parliamentary Elections (Closing of Public Houses)* [75]; Merchant Shipping Act (1854) Amendment* [76]; Municipal Elections (Scotland) (Corrupt Practices)* [77]; Steam Engines and Boilers* [78]; Education (Scotland) Acts Amendment* [79]; Open Spaces (Dublin)* [80]; Police Force Enfranchisement (No. 2)* [81]; Metropolis Government* [82]; Leaseholds (Purchase of Freeholds)* [83]; High Sheriff Disqualification (Ireland)* [85]; Friendly Societies (Transmission of Money)* [86]; Agricultural Holdings *[87]; Bankruptcy (County Courts) (Ireland)* [88]; Electric Lighting Act (1882) Amendment* [89]; Justice of the Peace Qualification (Abolition)* [90]; Corn Sales *[91]; Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland)* [92]; Agricultural Labourers' Wages* [93]; Bankruptcy (Ireland)* [94]; Beer Adulteration (No. 2)* [95]; Steam Boilers* [96]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday* [97]; Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt Practices) Acts Amendment* [98]; Early Closing* [99]; Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act (1886) Amendment (No. 2)* [100]; Building Societies Act (1874) Amendment* [101]; Private Lunatic Asylums (Ireland)* [103]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Act (1878) Amendment* [105]; School Fees (Non-Paupers)* [106]; Private Bill Legislation* [107]; Metropolitan Board of Works (Fire Brigade Expenses)* [108]; Trees (Ireland)* [110]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturday (Ireland)* [111]; Small Holdings* [112]; Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 4)* [113]; Fishings, &c. Valuation (Scotland)* [114]; Free Libraries Acts Consolidation* [115]; Stipendiary Magistrates (Pensions)* [116]; Metropolitan Board of Works (Theatres, &c.)* [117]; Metropolis Management Acts Amendment* [118]; Felonious Use of Firearms* [119]; Shipwreck* [120]; Public Trustee* [121]; Free Libraries Acts Amendment* [122]; Primogeniture* [123]; Bankruptcy Courts (Ireland)* [124]; Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty* [125]; Railway Regulation* [126].

QUESTIONS.

—o—

BURMAH (UPPER)—MILITARY OCCUPATION OF THE RUBY MINES.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether there is any truth in the statement that the Ruby Mines in Upper Burmah have been taken possession of by British Troops; whether the mines have been leased, or are about to be leased, to a London jeweller, at an annual rental of £30,000; and, if so, who is to receive such rent; who were the former owners of the mines; whether force was employed to obtain possession of the mines; and, if so, whether the former owners will be compensated; and, whether any guarantee has been given to the leaseholder of the mines for their peaceable possession; and, if so, whether British Troops or the Native Police are to be employed for that purpose?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham) (who replied) said: The district of Upper Burmah, in which the Ruby Mines are situated, has been occupied by Her Majesty's Forces without opposition. The mines have not been leased by the Government of India to anybody. If they were so leased the rent received would form part of the Revenues of India. The Kings of Upper Burmah claimed to be the owners of the mines. It has been alleged, however, that their rights were subject to certain rights vested in the inhabitants or headmen of the villages in the Ruby region. These alleged rights are now being investigated on the spot, and no disposition will be made of the mines until they have been ascertained and defined. No person has been dispossessed by force of any right of property in the Ruby Mines, except King Theebaw, whom it is not intended to compensate. As there is no leaseholder of the mines, the question of guarantee has not yet arisen.

THE TREASURY AND THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, Camlachie) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, What sum is paid annually to the Bank of England for the safe custody of Government moneys; whether an intimation was given by the Bank to the various Public Departments that they could not collect these moneys on the 9th day of November 1886 (otherwise known as Lord Mayor's Day), on account of a projected Socialist procession; and, whether the Government took any steps to enforce fulfilment of agreement on the part of the Bank of England?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): The hon. Member's Question seems to be framed on a misapprehension. There is no sum paid annually to the Bank of England for the safe custody of Government moneys. The only payment made to the Bank is in respect of the management of the Debt—a payment which is made at a rate fixed by Parliament—all other banking business for the Government being undertaken according to the custom of bankers without direct remuneration. On the 9th of November, 1884, the cab containing the collection from Somerset House was placed in danger of being overturned by reason of the crowd. Since then it had been deemed more prudent not to attempt the collection on Lord Mayor's Day, according to the agreement with the authorities at Somerset House. No special intimation was given by the Bank to those authorities on November 9, 1886.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE VOLUNTEER CAPITATION COMMITTEE.

MR. HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked the Secretary of

State for War, If the Members of the Committee appointed by his Predecessor to inquire into the condition of the Volunteer Force have presented their Report; if they recommend any increase in the Capitation Grant; and, if he has come to any conclusion thereon?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Yes, Sir; the Volunteer Capitation Committee have presented their Report, and it contains a recommendation for the increase under certain conditions of the Capitation Grant. It only bears date the 11th of January, and I have not yet had time to give to all its recommendations the attention which they deserve. But I propose to lay the Report on the Table, in order that my hon. Friend and others who take an interest in it may have it in their hands before the time comes for discussing it; and I hope before long to be able to state my decision on the whole subject.

ADMIRALTY—ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

MR. BURT (Morpeth) asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, If he can state the reason for the extraordinary delay in issuing the Return relating to the Admiralty (Accountant General's Department), which was ordered on the 4th March last; and, when the paper is likely to be laid upon the Table of the House?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing) (who replied) said: The Return is in the hands of the printer, and will be presented at the beginning of next week. The delay was caused by the extraordinary nature of the Return, for the Accountant General informs me that the additional work thrown on the branch of the Department caused by the preparation of a Return of this magnitude can hardly be over-estimated. It was necessary to abstract from the salary registers for 33 years the amounts actually paid to each individual of the Accountant General's Department, as well as every increase or decrease in number of salaries, and the authorities for the changes. Notwithstanding the time, trouble, and money spent on this Return, I fear it will be of no public utility.

THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS—NON-REPRESENTATIVE BODIES.

MR. HOWELL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, in view of the changes in the electoral basis of the country, some representation of the interests hitherto neglected will be appointed on the Charity Commission, and other nominated bodies dealing with great public questions and public moneys, to adapt such non-representative bodies to the altered circumstances as regards the application of the principle of representation?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): The Charity Commissioners are appointed by the Crown, and I am not aware that any interests with which the Commissioners have in any way to deal have been neglected. Three of the Commissioners hold permanent and three temporary appointments. With regard to "other nominated bodies," I must ask the hon. Member to put his Question into more definite language, and to state what particular bodies are referred to, and what interests are neglected.

MARRIAGE LAW—ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

MR. KNOWLES (Salford, W.) asked the Lord Advocate, Whether it is the fact that where one of two parties intending to marry resides in England and the other in Scotland, they may marry in England upon production of a certificate of proclamation of banns in Scotland, but that there is no similar provision enabling them to marry in Scotland; and, if such is the fact, whether when the Bill is introduced by the Government for the purpose of dispensing with the presence of the Registrar at the celebration of marriages in Nonconformist places of worship, or at some other time, he proposes to authorize Superintendent Registrars of districts in England to issue certificates for the celebration of such marriages in Scotland, or otherwise remove the anomaly?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): I am not aware that any difficulty has ever arisen in regard to banns where a person whose residence is in England desires to be married in Scotland to a person residing there; but I shall make inquiry, and I shall feel obliged if the hon. Member will repeat his Question next Thursday.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—THE FISHERIES' DISPUTES.

MR. OSBORNE MORGAN (Denbighshire, E.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he can, consistently with the public interests, state whether Her Majesty's Government are taking any and what steps to bring about a speedy settlement of the pending Fisheries Dispute between Canada and the United States of America, or, if he can hold out any hopes that such a settlement will be effected?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): My answer to the right hon. and learned Gentleman is in tenour with what was stated by the First Lord of the Treasury last night. Her Majesty's Government have been continuously in correspondence with the Government of the United States on the question of the extent, if any, to which fishermen from the United States shall be permitted to fish in Canadian waters and to enter Canadian bays and harbours, otherwise than as prescribed by the Treaty of 1818, all subsequent agreements having lapsed. The House will bear in mind that the fisheries of the Dominion are by all admissions very valuable. Her Majesty's Government have followed the traditional policy of successive Administrations in maintaining the rights of the Colonies, with a desire to conciliate the United States. Without pursuing the course of the negotiations, I may say that a proposal has just reached Her Majesty's Government from the Government of Canada, which is under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, and which, from the liberality of its character, appears likely to contribute materially to the settlement of the disputes.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS.

MR. T. FRY (Darlington) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he has, or if not, if he will take steps to prevent the further burning and levelling of cottages at Glenbeigh; and, if it is by the authority of the Government that General Sir Redvers Buller has endeavoured to obtain from the mortgagee of that estate very large concessions of rent?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): General Buller's action in this matter is shown in the correspondence that has been published. He did not interfere at all until 70 ejectments were in the hands of the Sheriff; and he was thanked by both sides for aiding in effecting an agreement which, if kept by the tenants, would have prevented what has occurred. Of course, Her Majesty's Government are responsible for his action. I have no legal right, and therefore no power, to take the steps suggested by the hon. Member in the first part of the Question. I am sure the hon. Member is actuated in his interference in this matter by the most benevolent of motives; and I hope he will give me credit on my part for being quite as sorry as he can be for any suffering inflicted upon these poor people, although we may disagree as to the cause of that suffering. Now, I will give a friendly challenge to the hon. Member. There is but one real remedy for such a case as this. It is to remove these people from this poverty-stricken district.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): Shame!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

DR. TANNER: Remove the landlords.

MR. T. FRY: I rise to a point of Order. Is the right hon. Gentleman entitled to enter upon questions of debate?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Removed with their own free will to some other place in Ireland.

DR. TANNER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of Order. I ask you whether the right hon. Gentleman is not out of Order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The Chief Secretary for Ireland.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: To some other place in Ireland, or elsewhere, where they can live in real prosperity and comfort.

DR. TANNER: Shame, shame!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I must call the attention of the hon. Gentleman to the fact that he has just uttered a word which is not Parliamentary. He used the word "Shame." It is a word which is of recent use, and one which is becoming frequent. It is an expression which ought to be rigorously put down. With the authority and sanction of the House, I shall propose for the future to take notice of it.

Mr. T. FRY: I rise to a point of Order. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether, in answer to a Question of this kind, the right hon. Gentleman is at liberty to go into so many points which are really points of debate?

Mr. SPEAKER: Unquestionably in an answer to a Question it is the Question itself that has to be answered, and debate is not permitted.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: All I wish to say is this—that if the hon. Member and those who take an interest in this matter should desire to promote such a settlement, I shall be most delighted to give them all the aid in my power, public or private, towards carrying it out.

Mr. T. C. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour): I wish to know whether the right hon. Gentleman wishes to convey to the House that the expression of thanks on the part of both parties given to Sir Redvers Buller was an expression of thanks on the part of the tenants whose houses were levelled and burnt down under the process of eviction?

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): I wish to ask whether we are to understand by the answer of the right hon. Gentleman that this expression of thanks which we are told was conveyed by both parties to Sir Redvers Buller was conveyed to him for having instigated and advised the levelling of the tenants' own houses?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The expression of thanks appears in the correspondence to which I refer, and the thanks were given by Mr. Head on the side of the landlords, and on the side of the tenants by Father Quilter.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.): I wish to ask the Government a very simple Question arising out of this matter. It is, does the Government approve of the action of Mr. Winn and his agent in burning these people out of their homes?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: It is not my business to express any opinion whatever on the subject.

LAND ACT (IRELAND)—REPORT OF THE COMMISSION.

Mr. LEA (Londonderry, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, When the Report of the Commission to inquire into the working of the Land Act will be ready?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, that the statement in the Queen's Speech to the effect that the Report of this Commission would be shortly ready was based on the authority of the Chairman of the Royal Commission; but he was unable to say at what date it would be published.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION—JUDICIAL RENTS—THE RETURNS.

Mr. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, When the Returns of the Irish Land Commission with respect to judicial rents for the months of September, October, November, and December, 1886, respectively, will be in the hands of Members?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol W.), in reply, said, he was unable to answer the Question at present. He had communicated with the Land Commission on the subject, but had got no reply yet.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE RETURNS.

Mr. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, When the Returns of Evictions in Ireland for the three months ended 30th September, 1886, and 31st December, 1886, respectively, will be in the hands of Members?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, the Returns were in the hands of the printers.

Mr. J. E. ELLIS asked if the right hon. Gentleman would undertake that this information would be in the hands of the Members of the House before he moved the second reading of the Bill of which he had given Notice yesterday?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Which information?

Mr. J. E. ELLIS: The information referred to in these two Questions.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The Returns will be certainly in the hands of hon. Members of the House before the second reading of any Bill is likely to be moved.

DISPENSARY DISTRICTS (IRELAND)—MOHIGEELA.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Kilnamartyna section of the Mohigeela dispensary district contains seventeen townlands, with a population of 600 persons; whether the distances which must be travelled by the sick poor are considerable; whether four and five miles has often to be walked by the suffering poor; and, whether he will recommend that the local dispensary doctor shall visit the Kilnamartyna station in the Mohigeela dispensary district upon two days in the week? The hon. Member also expressed his regret that the names of the localities had been massacred by the printer.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, he would ask the hon. Member, and also hon. Members from Ireland, to be good enough, when they wished to ask Questions relating to matters of local details like this, to give him a few days' Notice. It would be quite impossible for him otherwise to reply to the Questions.

THE BELFAST RIOTS—THE REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Government intend to found a Bill upon the recommendations made in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Belfast Riots; and, if so, whether he can say when the Bill will be brought in?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, the Report was only presented to the Lord Lieutenant a few days ago, and it was only the Report of four out of the five Commissioners. The Report of the dissenting Commissioner had not yet been sent in; and, of course, it would be premature for him (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) to express any opinion as to what should be done in the matter.

MR. SEXTON: Has the dissenting Commissioner stated that he would send in an independent Report?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Yes; he has written to say that he would do so.

MINES REGULATION ACT—LEGISLATION.

MR. BURT (Morpeth) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Government intend to introduce a Bill this Session to amend the Mines Regulation Act?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said, it was the intention of the Government to introduce such a Bill very shortly. If the hon. Gentleman would permit him to say so, he should be very glad if he would allow him to communicate with him and show him the Bill before the second reading in order to receive any suggestion he might have to make.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER—TIME OF TAKING SEAT IN THIS HOUSE.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): As I am anxious to ask an important financial Question, perhaps the First Lord of the Treasury will be good enough to tell me when the Chancellor of the Exchequer is likely to be in his place?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): In answer to the hon. Member, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has not given me any information on the subject.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SECOND NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January.]—[See page 84.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said, the task he had to discharge was an easy one, because he believed the cause he had to plead was a just one, and because he had invariably experienced great indulgence from all quarters of the House when he had addressed it. Hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite would admit that he had every reason to desire the happiness, the peace, and the prosperity of his native land. He had the honour to be an Irishman, and he had the misfortune to be an Irish landlord. As an Irishman he wished to see Ireland peaceful and happy; and as an Irish landlord, from his desire to be in prosperous circumstances, the House would believe that it was to his interests that Ireland should be happy, rich, and contented. At present he was sorry to say that none of these adjectives applied to Ireland; the country was again in a crisis. Unhappily, they were accustomed to go through crises from time to time in Ireland, and now a crisis in that country had become the rule and not the exception. But crises in Ireland varied very considerably in their nature and character. There was the crisis of famine, due to climatic influences, perhaps the most terrible of all; then there was that crisis which appeared to be of a spontaneous character, and which manifested itself from time to time in crime and outrage, showing that under the surface of Irish society there was a smouldering fire ready at the first opportunity to break forth. But there was a third kind of crisis—a manufactured crisis, and that was the nature of the crisis from which Ireland was now suffering. Some years ago—in 1881 and 1882—there was a crisis of that description, and he then ventured to read to the House an extract from a speech made by the Leader of the Irish Party. That hon. Member was present in the House when it was read, and he did not then, and had not since contradicted it, and therefore the House might take it to be correct. In that speech, delivered in America before the present trouble arose in Ireland, the hon. Gentleman stated "that he intended to go over to England and make the situation a hot one for the English Government," although he (Colonel Saunderson) must admit that at the end of the speech he said he hoped the agitation would pass by without much bloodshed. Well, the hon. Gentleman went over to Ireland, and, with the assistance of able coadjutors, now probably sitting below the Gangway, he manufactured that crisis, and it was a matter of opinion whether there was much or little bloodshed on that occasion. Perhaps the House would allow him to read the butcher's bill of the Land League for two-and-a half years, in order to show that the manufactured crisis did not pass in a bloodless manner. From January 1, 1880, to September 30, 1882, there were 57 agrarian murders in Ireland. That was carrying on the hon. Gentleman's special mode of argument with the Government of England. There were 145 attempts at murder during that period. He would call that a large amount of bloodshed. Hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway and those who sympathized with them had the habit of describing such unfortunate crimes as "the desperate attempt of an unhappy people to vindicate their rights —the desperate remedy of revenge." If that were so, one would naturally expect that among the victims of those 57 murders in two-and-a-half years, and 145 attempts at murder, a large proportion would be found to be exterminating landlords. Nothing of the kind. Among the 57 murdered persons only four were landlords. The landlords came off very well. Equally so, among the 145 attempts at murder only 10 were made on landlords; and, therefore, the blood was not shed in order that the Irish people might take revenge upon their oppressors, but to establish permanently in Ireland the yoke of the Land League, a yoke which was still unbroken, and a yoke which, if Ireland was ever to be happy, rich, and contented, must be crushed and destroyed. This crisis was not unexpected. They had had a very fair warning. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), the right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), and other hon. Gentlemen opposite, made speeches in which they predicted that we were about to have a crisis in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian was under the very painful impression that, owing to the fact that the weather was threatening and the crops indifferent, there would be poverty and its concomitant distress in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman must have been very well satisfied that, on that one occasion, he had not prophesied in vain. The weather last autumn was not absolutely faultless; but he (Colonel Saunderson) would take it that it was better than the average weather in Scotland. Then as to the crops, as to the agricultural resources of Ireland, they had not, on the whole, a bad season. The right hon.

Gentleman the Member for Derby founded his prognostication on two facts—first, on the letter of Sir James Caird, which struck him very much as it struck everybody, and then on a letter he had seen written by a commercial person who had travelled in the South and West of Ireland, and who had in the month of September seen the stalks of the potato withered and brown. But if the right hon. Gentleman had consulted some more bucolic authority—for instance, the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere)—he would have learnt that in September, when the stalks got withered and brown, it was a sign, not of the death of the potato, but that it was ripe for gathering. Then came something more serious than either of those prognostications, a speech from the hon. Member for the City of Cork, in which he said he shuddered to contemplate the future before Ireland—there were to be evictions. Landlords, according to hon. Gentlemen opposite, had two desires—one to get the utmost farthing out of their tenants, and the other to turn those tenants out and to level their houses. Persons knew but little about landlords if they imagined that they desired to enter into possession and to farm their own estates. But according to the hon. Member for the City of Cork, who shuddered at the contemplation, there would probably be crime and outrage in Ireland. Well, he (Colonel Saunderson) was happy to say that, as far as crime and outrage were concerned, at the present moment there was comparatively little. Certainly, there were crimes occurring in Ireland of an unhappy agrarian character; but they were confined to one or two localities, and to him, as an Irishman, that was a matter of deep satisfaction. Then they had the crisis predicted by the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), who was perfectly certain there was going to be a crisis, and a prophet who could fulfil his own prophecy was always the most certain and successful at the present time. There were few Members in the House who could have forgotten the speech of the hon. Member last year. He (Colonel Saunderson) had listened to it with great attention, and to its conclusion with admiration. The end of it was almost still ringing in his ears. In that speech the hon. Member appeared to take up a challenge which England had thrown down; he was going across to Ireland to show to Great Britain and the world that there was still some fight left in the Irish race. He (Colonel Saunderson) said to himself, as he listened, that at last, after a course of centuries, we should see an Irish patriot on the war path. But what happened? What did those prophecies of future deeds of valour degenerate into? They would have to go to a town in the West of Ireland to see the result of the crisis manufactured by the hon. Member for East Mayo, a town on one side of which sat an agent, in his office, waiting patiently for his rents, which were never to appear; and at the other side of the town the hon. Member collecting those rents from the tenants as they passed by, and then getting up on his car—which, he believed, afterwards upset—with his pockets full of money, and himself filled with delight at having succeeded in becoming possessed of the landlords' money, which was to fight the enemies of the people and the National League—in short, that heroic patriot of the House of Commons, that eloquent Irishman, when he went over to Ireland, turned himself into a garnishee hero. The object which induced him (Colonel Saunderson) to trespass on the attention of the House was to try to get hon. Members on both sides to lay down clearly and distinctly what they believed the rights of property really meant. He maintained that, at the present moment, the question in Ireland was not between landlord and tenant — whether the landlord made too much money, and whether the tenant could not pay. The battle, in which they, the unfortunate Irish landlords, occupied the front rank, was whether the law of the land—that was to say the law of the Crown—or the law of the Land League should be the law in Ireland. Was the Crown going to protect the rights of the landlords? They, the Irish landlords, up to the present, desired to remain under the law of the Crown, which admitted the rights of property. It had curtailed those rights; well, he did not object to that; but it established certain rights clearly and distinctly. Now, he wanted to know whether the House intended to sweep those rights away? Did it intend to permit the law of the League to be superior to the law of the Crown? The law of the Crown prevented the landlords from tyrannizing over their tenants; and it laid down, by its Courts, certain conditions upon which, and upon which alone, the landlord could receive rents. The Irish tenant had rights possessed by no other tenant on the face of the earth. He (Colonel Saunderson) challenged hon. Members to go to America, their happy hunting-ground, to find out what the condition of the tenant was there. He did not mean to say that all landlords were good men. He supposed many of them were bad men. ["Oh, oh!"] Bad men were to be found everywhere but in the House of Commons. Was it because there were a few bad landlords in Ireland that the whole class of Irish landlords were to be swept into one category of condemnation? He should say he admired the astuteness and the ability of those who had designed the special mode of attack upon the landlords of Ireland involved by the Plan of Campaign.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Were you attacked by the Plan of Campaign? [*Cries of* "Order, order!"]

Colonel SAUNDERSON: No; because he lived in Ulster. There was an organized attempt at the present moment to render the government of Ireland by the law of the land impossible, and one of the instruments to bring about that object was the Plan of Campaign. It was a plan preconceived, by whom he did not know, but carefully carried out with an object. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had denied that he was the author of it. That was stated in the course of an interview with the representative of a paper (*The Pall Mall Gazette*) that indulged in slight flights of imagination. The hon. Member, it was also stated—and he (Colonel Saunderson) was sorry to hear it—was suffering from a complication of diseases—whether political or personal he could not say. [*Cries of* "Order!" *and* "Shame!" *from the Irish Benches.*] Well, he only gave what appeared in the papers. He knew nothing about it; but, whoever conceived the Plan, he should give him credit for astuteness in mounting the law upon the most unpopular and weakest horse in the country. By it the law was to be upset, and the government of Ireland was to be rendered impossible. To show that he did not exaggerate in that, and that the Plan had been long conceived, and had been deliberately carried out, he would ask the House to allow him to read extracts from two speeches delivered by the hon. Member for Wexford (Mr. J. E. Redmond), who he supposed was in his place. [*Cries of* "No!"] Well, at least there was a Relative of his in his place, who was eminently capable of speaking for him. This was what the hon. Member for Wexford had said at the Chicago meeting—

> "I assert here to-day that the government of Ireland by England is an impossibility, and I believe it to be our duty to make it so. Were our people tamely to submit to the yoke which has been once again placed on their necks they would be unworthy of the blood which they have inherited from their fathers, who preferred poverty to dishonour, and death to national slavery."

Therefore, it had been decided at Chicago that the government of Ireland by the Crown was to be rendered impossible. On January 25 the hon. Member for Wexford, speaking in Ireland, made a speech in which he used the following words:—

> "I do not believe that in the past 100 years of English rule in Ireland there was ever a time when the Irish people were more thoroughly disaffected, or at which the English Government was more thoroughly hated and despised by Irishmen, and rightly too. This Government that came into power with the boast that they would be firm and resolute have exhibited the most extraordinary cowardice and weakness. They have been confronted by the Irish people; in every step they have taken they have been thwarted, baffled, humiliated, and weakened. Why, their decrees are literally danced upon by the Irish people, their Proclamations from Dublin Castle are treated as waste paper. To-day the whole of the people of Ireland are against them."

The latter extract showed that the Chicago policy was still carried out in Wexford. The hon. Member also reminded his hearers that he had said at Chicago—

> "That the very laws of nature themselves would prevent the possibility of a peaceful winter in Ireland this winter."

And it was a Plan of Campaign involving this principle that had more or less commended itself to the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian. The Plan of Campaign was supposed to be intended to protect tenants who could not pay their rents from the greed of their landlords; but its effect had been to enable tenants who could but who would not pay to keep their rents. [*Home Rule cries of* "No!" *and cheers.*] Hon. Members below the Gangway opposite cried "No!" but he would show them that he was right, out of the mouth of one of their own Leaders. On the 24th of January the hon. Member for East Mayo, speaking at Glenbeigh, said—

> "I will show Mr. Roe, if he has any stomach for such work, men who can pay and will not pay, because I tell them not to pay. I will show him men who avow that they can pay and refuse to pay, because they are in the Plan of Campaign."

Five or six years ago the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian had manfully attacked and had crushed down the very organization which he had now taken under his protection. Then it had taken the form of a plan by violence; but violence was not found to pay, because it involved the possibility of being hanged, or of picking oakum, which were too disagreeable possibilities for Irish patriots to have to encounter. The Plan of Campaign was far superior to the "No Rent" Manifesto, because it prevented the landlords from getting the rents; it prevented the tenants from keeping it; and it poured it into the National till, the pockets of the League; and he imagined that after hon. Members had gone round collecting money which did not belong to them it was hardly to be doubted that, to some extent, somebody went shares in it. It had been said that the Plan of Campaign had not been put into force in Glenbeigh; and perhaps it had not been put into force directly, but it had undoubtedly been put into force indirectly, because it was quite in accordance with the Plan of Campaign that poor tenants should be evicted just before the re-assembling of Parliament in order that capital might be made out of the alleged rapacity of Irish landlords. [A Home Rule MEMBER: Exactly so.] So he imagined. The rapacity of the landlords in the Glenbeigh case might be judged of by the fact that there being six years' arrears of rent due by the tenants, amounting to £6,177, the landlord had offered to wipe out the whole debt if the tenants would pay a half-year's rent, amounting to £865. He had no personal acquaintance with the landlord in question; but he challenged hon. Members below the Gangway opposite to point out any landlord in England or Scotland who had dealt more generously by their tenants. But there was better testimony than anything he could urge—that of the parish priest. He would call the attention of the House to the letter of the parish priest, the Rev. Thomas Quilter, to Colonel Turner, the landlord. The parish priest very naturally and very rightly had interfered on behalf of his people, and obtained what he looked upon as most generous and satisfactory terms from the landlords. Then the hon. Members for both East and West Kerry came and held a meeting in the locality on the 15th of November, and the arrangement was thrown to the winds. Then the parish priest, like an honest man, washed his hands of the whole concern. [Mr. T. C. HARRINGTON: He presided at the meeting which was held.] Yes; but he had previously written the following letter to Colonel Turner:—

> "Glenbeigh, December 13, 1886.
>
> "My dear Sir,—I regret that only 17 of the 70 tenants have sent their rents to-day to Mr. Roe. Though promising that they would accept the terms, they have withdrawn at the last moment from its fulfilment. You have done your own part, and General Buller has acted a kind-hearted part, and my Bishop his part; but let Mr. Roe now do his part with them. I think we have done all that could be done, and I shall never again, during my time in Glenbeigh, interfere between a landlord and his tenants. I have poor slaves who will not keep their word. Now let Mr. Roe, or any other agents in future, deal with Glenbeighans in any way he likes. Again thanking General Buller and yourself,
>
> "I remain, &c.,
>
> "THOMAS QUILTER, P.P."

In a previous Session he (Colonel Saunderson) ventured to point out that the Irish people were enslaved by a yoke which they could not break. ["Oh, oh!"] He maintained that, in view of these wretched tenants, who were held up as specimens of the Irish people, who refused to fulfil their engagements owing to the interference of hon. Members opposite, he had a right to say that the Irish people were enslaved. Did the House believe that Ireland would be a better country, better governed, and more prosperous, by handing her over to the men who had enslaved her? Looking, as he very naturally did, with very great anxiety at the demonstrations that their opponents made in this country, he must admit that he felt considerable satisfaction. He did not believe tha the cement was yet hardened down which joined the English Radical Party to that below the Gangway. He had a right to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, after the distinct statements he had made, how it was he so suddenly changed his mind as to the form of government which he believed would be for the welfare of Ireland? A meeting of their opponents had been held at Leeds, at which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) spoke. The first-named right hon. Gentleman wound up by saying that "they had finally decided to adopt the old policy and the old Leader." They had a perfect right to adopt the old Leader—there was no man who had succeeded better than he had done in acquiring the affections of his followers. But what right had they to call their policy the old policy? When he (Colonel Saunderson) read that speech, he took considerable trouble to find how long the policy spoken of had then been their policy, and he found it was exactly eight months. It was the adoption of an eight months' child, and he believed that an eight months' child, if it survived its birth, had generally a delicate and precarious existence. Surely it was not the policy of the right hon. Gentleman five years ago; and he wondered that the ghost of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, made at Leeds, did not rise up to confront right hon. Gentlemen opposite. He had read, with very great interest, books entirely devoted to the life, career, and adventures of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian; but the writers of those books did not seem to have discovered why he had changed his opinions. But he (Colonel Saunderson) thought he had discovered for the first time why the right hon. Gentleman had changed his opinions. The right hon. Gentleman had, if he might say so in a respectful sense, the Napoleonic peculiarity of respect for big battalions. Little over five years before, in the very place where this policy was adopted, the right hon. Gentleman spoke of his present friends and allies. He (Colonel Saunderson) did not say this with the object of exciting a blush on one side or the other, or of exciting bad blood in that happy family; but he had a perfect right to ask and to try to understand why the right hon. Gentleman had changed his opinions. Speaking, then, five years ago, at Leeds, of his present friends and allies—the hon. Member for the City of Cork and his followers—the right. hon. Gentleman said that they were only a handful of men in Parliament following Mr. Parnell, and he could not call them a Party, as they were not entitled to be called a Party. At that time the right hon. Gentleman had a very small opinion of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway, for he went on to say:—

> "They are gentlemen who make themselves perfectly responsible for a new gospel of Irish patriotism; and, even with respect to them, it is hard to understand how far it may be with them compulsion and how far will—so hard is it that I do not attempt to identify them. I frankly take the case of Mr. Parnell as exhibiting to you what I say—that the state of things in Ireland is going to be a question between law on the one hand and sheer lawlessness on the other."

The hon. Member for the City of Cork was then followed by the same band of men, professing the identical principles which he at present holds, and maintaining them with courage and ability in the House. Yet, according to the right hon. Gentleman, he was the Leader of a gang not worthy to be called a Party. Those were then the views of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian with regard to Home Rule; but when the hon. Member for the City of Cork had a following of 85 followers, the right hon. Gentleman's political convictions appeared to change, and he framed a new policy for a new Party. So far as he (Colonel Saunderson) was aware, neither in nor out of the House had the right hon. Gentleman ever attempted to explain how it was he came to change his convictions. He did not suppose that the right hon. Gentleman would think it would secure the peace of the Metropolis in which they lived if the law breakers were to be made the law makers. At that period of his political history nothing could be too hard in the views he took of the hon. Member for the City of Cork, who then held precisely the same principles that he now held. He had not changed in any way. The very remarkable structure which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had constructed rested its foundation on the one side on British Radicalism, and on the other on Irish-American Fenianism, with himself as chief corner stone. Further, it depended for exterior ornament on two political gargoyles, the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) and the hon. Member for North-West Cornwall (Mr. Conybeare). He imagined they must be held in high repute, for they came over to Ireland the other day as the special Representatives of the Party of Separation. The hon. Member for Northampton did not come further than Dublin—he was arrested by the Lord Mayor's dinner; but the other hon. Gentleman went on, and in order to show that he (Colonel Saunderson) was not exaggerating when he said they were looked upon in Ireland as special Representatives of the Party of Separation, he would read what a very eminent judge on such a point had said. Mr. William O'Brien, speaking of their English friends present, said—

> "One of them is our ambassador to-day and my friend, Mr. Conybeare, an English Member of Parliament. I can say that from my experience of him in the House of Commons I know no man who is a better type of the young democracy of Great Britain."

Undoubtedly the hon. Member for North-West Cornwall appeared to be a very vigorous politician, taking very strong views of what ought to be done to rectify affairs in Ireland, for he said—

> "If in England these things were to happen, and he was a tenant whose house was to be torn down in that manner, he would take care indeed to have some weapon ready to brain the scoundrel."

This favourable specimen of the young British democracy certainly held strong views as to the manner in which agrarian disputes should be settled. It did not appear, however, that the hon. Gentleman went over to Ireland in fear of his life, because he had made a speech in which he said he would be able to prove to the English Parliament that he had said the same things both in Ireland and England as those for which the hon. Members (Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Dillon) had been prosecuted, but the Government dare not arrest and put into prison an English Member of Parliament. Then all he could say was, if the Government did its duty, they had a right to expect that any outrageous man, whether he was English or Irish, would ultimately find his way to gaol. He should like to ask, before concluding, if there was any daylight in the situation? He believed there was a better opportunity now of finally settling the Irish Question than they had had for years, and for this reason. Years ago, when he had the honour of sitting in the ranks of the Liberal Party—at that time the Liberal Party held on to the old policy—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian introduced a Land Bill which he supported most heartily; because he held—and he was of the same opinion now—that the final solution of the Irish Question could only come from the Irish people. ["Hear, hear!"] No one could hold that opinion more strongly than he, and he had always contended that the way to get the people on the side of law and order was to give the tenants of Ireland a stake in the country; and he held now that the stake given them was by the Land Bill of 1881, although at present it proved to be a failure, even in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian himself. For his part, he believed that that Bill was laying the foundation of the solution of the Irish Question. He believed they ought to enlist the Irish people on the side of the law, and he held that a successful Land Bill would have that effect, and that every man who owned his farm would be enlisted on the side of law and order, right and justice. In conclusion, he had to thank the House for having listened to him with so much attention; but he would try again, before he sat down, to impress upon the House the fact that the battle they were fighting now was a battle in which the whole future of the country was bound up. They had taught Ireland a terrible lesson in the past; they had taught her that she had only to consider that she had only to be riotous and rebellious, that she had only to commit crime, in order to get what she wanted from the English Parliament. They must teach her another and a different and a better lesson. If she showed her right she would get concession; but she would never get concession by the hand of crime and outrage. They had appealed to England in the past; they had asked the country—and the appeal had not been made in vain—to maintain the Union of the two countries. They now make an appeal which also would not be in vain; they asked the country and the House to maintain the law.

Mr. T. C. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour) said, that anyone who had listened to the speech of the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite must have found it extremely difficult to reconcile the opinions of that Gentleman with the votes he had given. The hon. and gallant Gentleman said that the settlement of the Irish Question, in his opinion, was to proceed from the people of Ireland themselves, and that the sympathy of the people of Ireland could only be enlisted by giving to them such a stake in the country by a satisfactory purchase scheme as would enable them to be contented. Where was the hon. and gallant Gentleman when the Liberal Government proposed the scheme? Where was he when recently in that House an opportunity was presented to Parliament of settling the Irish Question —a settlement which the landlords were advised by the hon. and gallant Member and his friends not to accept, but which to-day the landlords were yearning in their hearts for, and which would never occur to them again? He invited the hon. and gallant Gentleman to get his Party to consider whether he could offer the Irish landlords, with any hope of passing in that House, a settlement more generous than the one which had been introduced by the late Prime Minister and rejected. He did not intend to follow upon the general lines indicated by the hon. and gallant Gentleman's speech, but rather to refer to one or two matters with which his speech dealt. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had endeavoured to make some capital for his party out of the Glenbeigh evictions; and only lately the Tory papers had stated that these evictions, and the horrible atrocities which accompanied them, were got up by the National Party for dramatic effect. What were the facts which they had in the correspondence referred to by the Chief Secretary that evening? The Chief Secretary did not say who gave it for publication. He did not say it was Sir Redvers Buller who did so, in face of the oath he had taken at a recent inquiry that he did not interfere between landlord and tenant, except in one or two cases, and in face of his declaration that it was not his mission in Kerry to interfere. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had referred to a letter of Father Quilter, in which Father Quilter had stated that he had done all he could to bring these tenants to a settlement, and asking Mr. Roe to carry out his duty. The hon. and gallant Gentleman did not seem to be aware that that letter was the result of a formal complaint written by Colonel Turner to the Bishop of the clergyman, in which he had complained of the clergyman taking part, and in which the Bishop had interposed his authority in order to prevent the priest taking further part. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had read the letter as if the sympathy of the priest had been alienated from the people, and he referred to a speech in which advice had been given by the priest; but he omitted the fact that at that very meeting the chair was occupied by the priest who was said to have turned his sympathy from the people. What were the facts with regard to these unfortunate evictions, because it was alleged that a large arrear of rent was due by these tenants, and that it was intimidation of the National League which prevented the payments of these arrears? Now, on the Winn estate, the payments in the year 1877, which was a good year, were £1,690; but in 1880 these payments fell to £277. In 1880 there was not in Kerry, not alone in Glenbeigh, but in Kerry, a single branch of the Land League, nor did it exist there for a full year afterwards, so that there could be no interference on the part of the National League between landlord and tenant. In the year 1881 a great many evictions took place in that district, and afterwards these people crept back to their homes and retook possession of their holdings; but everybody who knew the circumstances of the case knew perfectly well that it was unfair to ask a tenant who got back in that manner without the sanction of the landlord or the law to hold by the obligation to pay the amount of rent he would be bound to pay had he obtained legal possession. The majority of the tenants against whom legal proceedings had been taken were mere trespassers during the last few years, and they found it impossible to make the rent out of their holdings. Now it was alleged that the tenants broke the solemn compact which they made to pay half-a-year's rent and costs; but it was evident from the statements of Sir Redvers Buller, and from the observations of the Chief Secretary that night, that if the tenants were to carry out that engagement, they would have to borrow money from the shopkeepers and the bankers to pay the arrears of rent which had not justly accrued. He (Mr. Harrington) said that if such intervention took place, which he denied, it was a merciful intervention to prevent the tenants from entering into such obligations. It was evident from the letter of Sir Redvers Buller that these people had all along desired a re-valuation of the land upon which the rents at the present time were double the Government valuation; and in order to secure that advantage they were willing to assent to an agreement which it was impossible for them to discharge without being assisted by the shopkeepers, who had been taught a very severe lesson by such negotiations in the past. The letter of Sir Redvers Buller showed the pressure which was being exercised by the Chief Secretary on the Judges of the land—on Judge Curran, in this instance.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I must deny that statement at once. It is quite untrue that I had anything to do in the action of Judge Curran.

MR. T. C. HARRINGTON: The right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that he was responsible for sending Judge Curran to Kerry, the removal of the regular County Court Judge having been one of his first official acts. Judge Curran was not so simple, nor so innocent, as not to know perfectly well that he was carrying out the plans of the right hon. Gentleman in making agreements between these tenants and their landlords, which he had no power, in the exercise of his official duties, to make. Judge Curran pretended to the tenants in open Court that he was able to reduce their rents, and to wipe off larger arrears than could be dealt with under the Plan of Campaign; whereas the evidence of Sir Redvers Buller's letter went to prove that this action of the County Court Judge was only the result of a private treaty between him and the landlord, and that the Judge took care, without the knowledge of the agents, to secure the assent of the landlords, whilst pretending that he was enabled to give this abatement in his capacity as County Court Judge. The County Court Judges knew the policy of the Government, and no sooner was the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) rejected in that House than the Chief Secretary applied himself to put pressure upon the landlords, and every official in Ireland who wished to stand well with the right hon. Gentleman proceeded to exercise that pressure by every means in his power. ["No!"] They had evidence of it. The right hon. Gentleman said, in Court—

> "The County Courts have exercised their power under the law with firmness and justice, and the Government have brought what pressure they could, acting within the law."

They all knew what that meant in Ireland. There was a story told of a drunken Castle messenger who knocked down a passer-by, and when a constable went to arrest him, he said—"Take care how you interfere with one of the members of the law." Everything which a Castle official in Ireland did was legal, and every interference with them by any other person was outside the law. Continuing his cross-examination, the right hon. Gentleman acknowledged also having used these other words in a speech from which the previous quotation was taken—

> "The Government have brought what pressure they could, acting within the law, to bear upon those few landlords who would not follow the example of their more generous fellows, and in doing so he believed they were acting in the best interests of the landlords as well as the tenants. There was no greater foe of the rights of property than the man who attempted harshly to execute those rights, and failed to perform its duties."

So said the promoters of the Plan of Campaign, and he challenged the right hon. Gentleman to say whether the number of those landlords upon whom pressure had been brought to bear by the Plan of Campaign was not smaller than the number of those against whom the right hon. Gentleman had brought pressure to bear. It was a question of figures. The Plan of Campaign, which had excited so much attention in England, had only been exercised against landlords in Ireland; and if the Chief Secretary would say who were the few landlords he spoke of—if he would give their names—the truth could soon be got at; but the right hon. Gentleman was very reticent at the police court on this point. It was to be hoped he would give the House more information. In that case there would be no difficulty in showing that the demands of the Plan of Campaign were more reasonable than those of the Government, as well as less numerous. Then, the right hon. Gentleman was asked—"What do you mean by pressure within the law?" and he answered—"Exactly what I said." That was a very candid reply to a question. There were frequent complaints in Ireland that the operation of the law was rendered abortive because of the reluctance of witnesses to give evidence; but he asked the House was there ever a more reluctant answer than this of the Chief Secretary—an answer better calculated to defeat the operation of the law than this? The right hon. Gentleman did not shelter himself behind privilege.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I beg pardon; it was on that ground that I refused to answer.

MR. T. C. HARRINGTON: It was most unfortunate that the right hon. Gentleman did not say that. He invited him again to go over his sworn testimony before it came up at the Assize Court, and see whether there was any statement that it was on any ground of privilege that he protected himself. There was another reason why the right hon. Gentleman declined to answer the question which had suggested itself to the Irish people. That was that he was afraid to incriminate himself, and make himself a party to the conspiracy which was the subject of investigation. Probably that had not suggested itself to the right hon. Gentleman, because he, like all the officials in Ireland, regarded himself as the law. Then, in reply to the question—"Tell us what was the pressure you used?" the right hon. Gentleman replied—"I decline to add to what I have said in my speech." There was no question of privilege in that; it was a question of convenience. Another question—"Do you give us any explanation of that speech beyond what is expressed on the face of it?" Answer—"I give you none." That was assisting the operation of the law in Ireland. That was the policy which Her Majesty's Government intended to pursue in order to make the people respect the law and the administrators of the law. In answer to another question, the Chief Secretary said the Government had acted in the interests of the landlords generally. Of course, the right hon. Gentleman was not thinking of the interests of the poor tenants. If the question had been pressed a little further, it would probably have been found that it was not in the interests of the landlords, but the interests of the Government, that this pressure was used. This was shown in another portion of the evidence. In a letter written by one of the officials whose conduct was impugned, and which letter was admitted by Captain Plunkett to be substantially accurate, there was an expression of hope that the writer of the letter would be able to arrange matters on a particular estate between the tenants and the agents. Of course, Captain Plunkett, with the candour which distinguished Government officials, denied having interfered between landlords and tenants. But that gentleman had intimated that unless landlords agreed to his terms police protection would be refused.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: In justice to Captain Plunkett, I must say that he distinctly denied having made such a statement.

MR. T. C. HARRINGTON: Of course, he had denied it. Would the right hon. Gentleman allow him to remind him that he had quite as distinctly denied having interfered at all? He made the right hon. Gentleman a present of the denial of Captain Plunkett, in the face of his declaration that he had never interfered at all; but did Sir Redvers Buller deny it? He (Mr. Harrington) would read a letter, also put in evidence at the trial, written by Sir Redvers Buller to the president of a League branch, who had asked his interference on behalf of a tenant, a secretary of a League branch. Sir Redvers Buller wrote—

> "You credit me with powers I do not possess. I have no power to stop evictions anywhere. I have forwarded your information to Captain Plunkett; but I fear it will arrive too late, but I know he will gladly do what he can—namely, inquire into the case, and find out if it is a deserving one."

Captain Plunkett also admitted having read, and not having contradicted, the letter of "Erigena" to *The Times*, which attacked the conduct of the Government, He admitted, too, that he had tried to induce one landowner to accept one year's rent instead of the three-and-a-half years' which was due, although he did not know the valuation and the circumstances of the holding. This was a fine specimen of the candour of Government officials. The fact was that the Government had gone far beyond the Plan of Campaign, for there was no case in which, under the Plan, the tenants had been advised to ask for a greater reduction than 35 per cent. Captain Plunkett also confessed that he did not know whether the tenant could pay or not, and said he suggested that a year's rent should be accepted. As against these illustrations of the way in which the Government had worked this Plan of Campaign, he (Mr. Harrington) would like to read to the House some facts as to the properties in Ireland upon which the League's Plan of Campaign had been put into operation. Let him say at once that there was nothing new in the Plan. It had been adopted by the tenants of Ireland under successive Governments, and the only new circumstance about it was this—that there was now greater security as to the preservation of the tenants' money. In former combinations money had been lodged in a bank; but the landlords brought processes against the banks, seized the books, and insisted upon these lodgments of the tenants being marked, and so obtained the money, without any opportunity of the tenants obtaining a reasonable reduction of rent. The only new circumstance of the Plan of Campaign was that the tenants had been taught the wisdom of concealing from the landlord and the public the name of the person with whom the money was lodged. The hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Saunderson) said the persons receiving the rents would share the spoils. No one knew better than the hon. and gallant Gentleman that every penny of the money went to the landlord if the landlord would receive it in satisfaction of the rent, and that this was the case on Lord Dillon's estate. The hon. and gallant Gentleman was a very close observer of the slanders that were being hurled against the Nationalist Members in Ireland. No one treasured these slanders more fondly than he did; and he defied him or any of his Colleagues to show a single instance where the contributions handed back to the landlords under the Plan of Campaign were diminished one penny by travelling expenses, law expenses, or the expenses of collection, or by bookkeeping, or any expenses whatever. If he only consulted his colleagues, the Irish landlords, they would tell him that wherever they had accepted the offers made by the tenants, or where they had come to a compromise with their tenants, they had been able to get back all the money which was put together in that collection. On Lord Dillon's estate the tenants had demanded a reduction of 25 per cent, which, considering the circumstances of the country, was not an unreasonable demand, and eventually the landlord and tenants agreed to a reduction of 20 per cent. A number of tenants who were unable to pay their rent last year, and whose rents had been reduced to the Government valuation, were excluded from the terms of the agreement, and the agent voluntarily included these afterwards. One of the estates upon which the Plan of Campaign was put in force was the estate of Lord Lansdowne in Kildare. The tenants demanded a reduction of 20 per cent upon the judicial rents which were fixed three years ago, and a reduction of 30 per cent upon non-judicial rents. Their demand was precisely the same as that which Lord Lansdowne had given to his tenants in Kerry; but there was this difference—that the Government were putting their Plan of Campaign in force in Kerry; but it was not necessary for them to put it in force in Kildare, because the tenants were perfectly quiet. He had taken care to examine the properties surrounding the estate of Lord Lansdowne in Kildare, and he found that the landlords on the surrounding estates had given reductions varying from 15 to 25 per cent; but Lord Lansdowne offered no reduction whatever in Kildare, because Her Majesty's Government were not exercising their Plan of Campaign there. Another of the estates where the Plan of Campaign was tried was the property of Lord de Freyne, where the rents were double the Government valuation. The tenants asked 30 per cent reduction, and several of the landlords on the surrounding properties had given 25 per cent reduction, and many more 20 per cent. He had no doubt that if the tenants had been offered 20 per cent reduction they would have receded from their position, as they had done on Lord Dillon's estate, where, if the 20 per cent had been offered at first, the Plan of Campaign would never have been put in force. On another property in Limerick—the O'Grady property—the tenants demanded 30 per cent reduction. That property was the most highly rented of any property in that part of the country; and in its vicinity Mr. O'Reilly Dease had given a reduction of 20 per cent, and Mr. Synan, a former Member of the House, had given a voluntary reduction of 25 per cent. Almost within a week after their rejection of the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork, Her Majesty's Government set about bringing their secret, and, as Irish Members alleged, their illegal pressure to bear upon the landlords; and what they alleged was that the reduction which Her Majesty's Government demanded was far greater than the reduction demanded under the Bill, or under the Plan of Campaign. He challenged the Chief Secretary to show that the secret pressure which Her Majesty's Government had used was used for the best interests of the country, and not for the sake of saving the Government from inconvenience and hostile criticism. He challenged the right hon. Gentleman also to show that it was not when his policy of pressure had failed, and when he had abandoned it in consequence of the loud complaints of the Irish landlords, that he turned round and endeavoured to place the responsibility upon the Irish Members. He made no doubt whatever that even before a fairly empannelled jury of the English House of Commons it would be shown that the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues in the Irish Government were the real conspirators.

Mr. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said, that the question of the Glenbeigh evictions had been put before them from an Irish landlord's standpoint. As a Metropolitan Member he had made a special study, and was himself intimately acquainted with the history and causes of the Irish evictions of which they had heard so much. He was not an Irish landlord; but as he represented a comparatively poor Metropolitan district, where evictions were not unknown, he had thought it his duty to ascertain all he could on the subject; and he begged hon. Members from Ireland to believe that if there were anything harsh or wrong, Gentlemen sitting on the Ministerial side of the House would be as keenly alive to it as those sitting on the Opposition Benches. Previously to 1863 the tenants on the Glenbeigh estate had been liberally treated by their landlord, who did much to promote the well-being of his tenants. Everything went well down to the year 1879, which was not a good time for agriculture. In that year, however, the tenants were able to pay £1,690 in rent. Since then troubles had come. It was only fair to the tenants to say that much of the trouble was the result of the unfortunate position of the owners of the estate. From 1880 to 1886 very little, or practically no rent had been paid, the arrears being £6,200 out of little more than £8,000. The landlord, however, resorted to no harsh measure. He applied to the County Court, and the tenants ultimately accepted an offer that the arrears should be wiped out if they would pay a year's rent up to November, 1885, and to allow a re-adjustment of the rent. The tenants willingly agreed to this proposal, and their assent to the arrangement proved that they could have carried it out if they desired. But, just before the year expired—for, as he should have said, they were given a year in which to make the payment—that was, to November, 1886—the tenants, who had come under the influence of the National League, refused to pay. [An hon. Member: Not all.] Well, the bulk of them refused to fulfil the arrangement they had entered into freely. Still, the landlord adopted no measure of a harsh nature. On the suggestion of General Buller and others he entered into a further compromise. Seventy of the tenants undertook to pay a gale's rent and costs, on condition that arrears were wiped out to May, 1886, and the holdings must then become subject to the judicial revaluation. That agreement was not, however, fully carried out, for, although 17 of the tenants fell in with it in spite of the tyranny of hon. Members opposite, the remainder would not.

Mr. T. C. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour) said, he wished to ask Mr. Speaker if it were in Order to use the word "tyranny" as applied to hon. Members of that House?

Mr. SPEAKER said, that the word used by the hon. Member did not contravene the Rules of Parliament, but it was, of course, a strong expression.

Mr. T. C. HARRINGTON said, at all events, he might be allowed to say the charge of tyranny was not true.

Mr. BARTLEY said, he was sorry to have hurt the sensibilities of hon. Members opposite, though he must say that they were not very keenly alive on the point themselves to the susceptibilities of hon. Members on his side of the House. He would substitute any other word they might prefer, which meant the same thing. He had said that 17 paid and the others refused to keep their bargain. The parish priest then separated himself from the tenants, calling them, in a letter which had been published, "poor slaves" who would not keep their word, and he left them to the mercies of the landlord, whose whole action had been merciful according to the statement of General Buller. Home Rulers were making political capital of those evictions, and he ventured to say that those who were responsible for the sufferings and misery of those poor tenants who had been so beguiled, and those upon whom the shame would ultimately rest, were the hon. Member for West Kerry (Mr. Edward Harrington) and his friends. Either the tenants could or could not pay their rent. If they could and would not, no one could sympathize with them; but if they could not pay or make a living out of their holdings they ought to give them up, and it would be great kindness and true statesmanship to remove them to other districts where they might be more fortunate in more easily obtaining the means of living. If agriculture in the district was not sufficiently good to maintain the tenants in their small holdings, it would be useless to do anything that would tend to keep them there. With regard to the four cases in which the houses had been burnt down, there could be no doubt that the case was a hard one. Public sentiment was against such a proceeding, and his first idea was one of strong objection to it. If he were a landlord he would rather sacrifice his property than carry out such a thing. But it was hard for the tenants and the landlords alike, and it must not be forgotten that the persons who occupied those houses had no right whatever to be in them. What were the facts? These four persons—they were not tenants—had been evicted some years ago, and they had no more right to take up their residence where they did than they would have to take it up in the dining-room of Hawarden Castle. If they were allowed to remain in possession of the holdings, and the demands made by them were to be recognised, in such circumstances all law and justice must be given up. It was said that if the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) had been passed last summer all this suffering would have been saved. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) knew better than anybody that if that Bill had been passed it would not have effected these evictions. One of the provisions of the Bill was that tenants in arrear should pay half the rent that was due. If these tenants had paid half of that which was due, they would have had to pay half as many thousands as the landlord asked for hundreds before they could have come under the Act. It was not fair, therefore, to throw the consequences of these evictions upon the throwing out of that Bill. Another subject referred to in the Queen's Speech was that of economy, and they had heard that the estimates were to be framed with economy and efficiency. He had spent over 20 years in the Public Service, and he knew something of its administration. There was no one in the House who was more keenly alive to the necessity of economy than he was. He regretted extremely that the noble Lord the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill), whom they hoped would have assisted in carrying out his well-known schemes of economy, had thrown up the sponge. They wanted his help in carrying out economy, which they knew was the real key-note of Parliamentary government. They must economize, there was no doubt of that, and the sooner the better. There were two ways of economizing. One was to get the most they could for their money in every possible way. He had no hesitation in saying, from his knowledge of the public service, that there was an enormous field for economy in this respect both at the War Office and Admiralty. It was a matter for investigation and practical work. There was another way to bring about economy, and that was by the action of the House. He ventured to say that the House of Commons was not always as economical as it might be. They did things sometimes because they were popular, but such items should be carefully looked after. No doubt economy in theory and on the platform was very popular and pleasant, but directly they applied it to individual things they found it most unpopular, and it could only be done by the joint action of the House. With regard to the Army, he agreed with the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) that it was not always likely to lead to peace if they increased their armaments and Army. He believed that great economy might be exercised in regard to the military armaments of the country, notwithstanding the alarming rumours on the Continent of the probability of war, for he thought it extremely probable that if England were to show by reduced military expenditure that she had no fear of war, it would tend more to maintain peace than any increase of our forces would be likely to do. He, however, would not extend that principle to the Navy and coaling stations. The efficiency of the Navy and the protection of our coaling stations were obviously in the nature of an insurance for the safety of the country. Although he was sorry the noble Lord had resigned, he thought it would have been a dangerous thing to retain him at the cost of postponing any longer the protection of our coaling stations. Nevertheless, he was certain that, with careful management, enormous reductions might be made in the public expenditure, and he hoped the House would resolutely devote itself to the task. He hoped to see the day when the expenditure might be cut down not by hundreds of thousands, but by millions. It could be done by all sides working together, and going together into details. If the noble Lord had sacrificed his Office of Chancellor of the Exchequer on the altar of economy and thrift, although as in the case of most self-martyrs there might be a little touch of something besides self-martyrdom in it, he sincerely hoped that like the grand old martyr of old he had lighted the candle of economy in England which would not very soon be put out.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co. S.) said, he was most anxious, as an Irish landlord, that the facts in relation to the Plan of Campaign should be laid before the House, because he was certain that it would be found that the combination of the Irish tenants who adopted it was not unlawful. The tenants combined to protect their interests and the property they had in the land, and the legality of action of that kind had been recognized by Acts passed in that House, and by political economists. He protested, therefore, against the charge that the Irish tenants who adopted the Plan of Campaign were acting illegally or immorally. They combined to keep the roofs over their heads this winter, and to preserve their own lives and the lives of their families. If ever combination were justified, it was justified in this case. It had been said that this combination was against the law of the land. That had yet to be decided before the Courts, and he believed that if those Courts were fairly constituted, and if the case were fairly tried, it would be proved that the combination was not contrary to British law. He was no lawyer, and could not express an opinion as to whether the Plan of Campaign was contrary to British law or not; but he was content to test it by the principles of political economy as laid down by Mr. Fawcett, Professor Walker of Boston, and Mr. John Stuart Mill. According to Mill, the right of combination could not be refused to any portion of the population without gross injustice. If English artizans might combine to protect themselves, why should the right of combination be denied to the Irish tenants? They had the same liberty, and were legitimately exercising it under the Plan of Campaign. He denied that the Plan of Campaign was employed for the purpose of evading legal obligations or repudiating lawful contracts. The condition necessary to a binding contract was that the parties should be free agents, and the contract must be a free contract. But he would ask, Did the principle of free contract obtain generally in the fixing of Irish rents? He denied that it did. Monstrous tyranny was used, and monstrous pressure was put upon Irish tenants by Irish landlords to compel them to come under impossible rents. He had heard of black marks being placed in the rent-books opposite the names of sturdy tenants who had refused to enter into agreements impossible to be carried out, and those marks would be brought up against them if ever they fell into the hands of their landlords. He had heard of great intimidation directed against tenants to compel them to surrender leases and take others at greatly enhanced rents. On many auspicious occasions, such as the marriage or coming of age of a son or daughter, efforts were made to raise the rents with a threat that unless the terms were accepted the lease would not be renewed when it fell in. He could cite cases which had come under his own observation, where industrious tenants had made good land out of barren mountain sides or useless bogs, and at the end of the lease the rent had been raised 200, 300, and 500 per cent, and all that, he supposed, was on the principle of free contract. It was often said that the Irish tenant, if he found his tenancy hard and onerous, might go elsewhere. But dispossession to him meant practically America, the workhouse, or the grave, because in Ireland land was absolutely necessary to the tenant's existence. He had no other means of livelihood. It had been said that the Plan of Campaign meant the payment of no rent. It meant absolutely nothing of the sort. The Plan of Campaign had been adopted to secure to the landlords the payment of a fair rent. The author of the Plan, in his directions as to its use, wrote that the trustees—those who had received the estate fund—should, in the event of a settlement, use their influence to have every defaulting tenant make his full contribution to the fund, and that they should take care that no man made his just contribution a cover for dishonesty. It was not to be used by the dishonest tenant as a shelter against the law, but was intended merely to protect the honest tenant against the tyranny of a grasping landlord. Members on the other side of the House paid a poor compliment to the intelligence, sagacity, and wisdom of the men who would soon be governing Ireland, in supposing that they would raise up for themselves such a tremendous difficulty in the future by propagating the doctrine of no rent. Hon. Members opposite entertained the crudest ideas of the meaning of the word "rent." Rent was that part of the produce of the soil which the tenant paid to the landlord for the use of his land. Every man had the right to live in this world, and the Irish tenant had the right to a fair return for his labour. After the tenant had been recouped his expenses in farming the land, and after he had received fair payment for his labour, the landlord was entitled to receive his rent out of the balance that remained. The value of land rose and fell with the value of its produce, and when the value of produce fell the amount of rent should fall also. His sole contention was that the Irish farmer should pay a fair rent, not that he should pay no rent at all. Another objection to the Plan of Campaign was that under it the Irish tenant should fix his own rent. But why should the landlord be entitled to fix an arbitrary rent now that Parliament had admitted that the tenant was a co-proprietor in the land? The Plan of Campaign had been invented because Parliament and the Irish landlords had refused to meet the demands of the Irish tenants by accepting the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork last Session; and, therefore, the farmers had been forced to settle the question for themselves. That, in his opinion, was a full justification of the Plan of Campaign. The Government were about to prosecute several of the Irish leaders for the offence of succeeding in doing what the Government had tried to do, but failed to carry out. He could tell the Government that these trials would have but very little effect on Irish opinion. The Government might succeed, by packing juries, in obtaining the conviction and imprisonment of some of the gentlemen who were about to be tried; but the Irish people were sufficiently well educated by this time to carry on the Plan of Campaign, if needs be, without their leaders. Whatever steps were taken by the Government, the Plan of Campaign would go on until Her Majesty's Government took steps to obviate the necessity for it. He had supported the Plan of Campaign as an Irish landlord, for he did not consider it did any injustice to a landlord anxious to meet his tenants fairly. The Plan of Campaign was promulgated only to bring pressure to bear upon those hard-hearted and cruel landlords who had brought down the detestation and opprobrium of the civilized world on the class to which they unfortunately belonged. He believed the Plan of Campaign to be essential to the peace of Ireland during the winter, and for that reason he supported it, and should continue to do so until Her Majesty's Government took such steps to meet the present crisis as would show they had some appreciation of the duties of their position.

Mr. C. GRAY (Essex, Maldon) said, that the state of agriculture in England—at any rate, in the Eastern Counties—was at the present time quite as deplorable as on the other side of St. George's Channel. He was right glad that Her Majesty's Government intended to take up the burning question of tithes, for it was a question that was causing great irritation between farmers and tithe-owners. Although by the Tithe Commutation Acts of 1835-6 the tithe was made a rent-charge on the land, yet, by an incongruity the tithe-owner is allowed to distrain upon the tenant's property. The whole question of tithes ought to be re-opened, as the Commutation Act was unsuitable to the circumstances of the present day. To treat it successfully, the Government should try to simplify the question by doing away with the sort of dual possession that at present existed, and make it what, he felt sure, it was the intention of the Commutation Act that it should be—a rent charge applying only to the property of the landlord. If they did this, they would confer a boon upon all agriculturists interested in the question, and would place the whole subject of tithe in such a position that, perhaps, at some future time, further legislation in connection with it could be introduced. Moreover, he might remind hon. Members the three agricultural products which were chosen as the basis for the assessment of tithes—wheat, barley, and oats—were no longer cultivated in many districts. In Essex large tracts which were formerly under tillage were now laid down to grass at great loss; and it was obvious that the prices of wheat, barley, and oats do not show what amount of tithe such land should pay. If the question were re-opened, he trusted, however, Her Majesty's Government would not allow tithes to be made use of for any purpose other than those which the original donors intended. He hoped that this question would be dealt with, and that the Government would remember, that although English agriculturists had been quiet and patient, they had undergone severe suffering and depression, and they would, with gratitude, cordially welcome any legislation the Government might introduce for the relief of what the Royal Commission on Trade and Agriculture acknowledge to be England's most important industry.

Mr. O'HEA (Donegal, W.) said the hon. Member who had last spoken (Mr. C. Gray) had made a comparison of English and Irish prices for agricultural produce, but there was really no parallel between English and Irish agriculture. With reference to the important question of tithes, he might inform the House that they did at one time obtain in Ireland. In Ireland 40 or 50 years ago, it was a burning question. It pressed very heavily and caused great hardship and suffering to the Irish people, and it was only by violent agitation more fierce than the present, and attended with loss of life, that the vile hardship was abolished. The speech of the hon. Gentleman on tithes was a full vindication of the adoption of the Plan of Campaign by the Irish people for the redress of grievances which fell with more severity on the poorer classes of Irishmen than the tithe grievance fell on the poorer classes of England and Wales. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) in his opening statement made mention of manufactured crisis, but he (Mr. O'Hea) thought that that House would admit it was not the Irish Members or Irishmen who manufactured the causes of this crisis. It was not the Irish Members who caused such an appalling amount of depression in articles of agricultural produce, and it was not Irishmen or Irish Members of Parliament who caused the bad seasons or influenced the fall in prices. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, when he informed the House that Mr. John Dillon received the rents from tenants on Lord Dillon's estate, omitted to mention that every penny so received had since gone into the pocket of Lord Dillon. The Plan of Campaign was not adopted with the view of defrauding the landlords, or doing any injury whatever; but it was adopted in order to save a tenantry over whose heads the sword of eviction was pending. The adoption of the Plan of Campaign had been attended with beneficial results to landlord and tenant. The hon. Member proceeded to refer to evictions which had been attempted to be carried out in Gweedore, County Donegal. The gross rental of the estates some years ago was £522, and yet the landlords, who had done absolutely nothing to enhance the value of the land, increased it to the present amount, £1,455 14*s.* 8½*d.* The most cruel clearances had been effected, as had also been the case in many other parts of Ireland. Mrs. Ernest Hart had given a pathetic account of the cruelties which had been perpetrated in this way in the North of Ireland, and especially in a district in Donegal which curiously enough bore the same name, Glenbeigh, as the place which had recently been so prominently before the public. In reference to the evictions in Gweedore, he might mention that for every £1 the tenant owed, he had to pay £1 10*s.* for law costs. The harsh treatment by certain Irish landlords of their poor tenants was not denied even by hon. Members opposite, and the buildings in which the peasantry in some parts of Ireland lived, he declared could not be described as "home." Wigwams would be a more appropriate term, and, indeed, he believed the wigwams of the North American Red Indians were abodes of comfort and luxury compared with these structures. He submitted that the Plan of Campaign was the only legitimate method by which it was possible to secure fair and equitable treatment for the tenants, when these poor people found starvation and ruin staring them in the face; and for the past two months he had never lost a single opportunity of advising the people to adopt it. He believed, from evidence which he had himself heard given in the Land Courts, that those tenants who did not pay rent for their farms paid it out of their savings, or out of remittances from America, and not out of the produce of the land itself. He did not think the people of Ireland had any reason to be pleased with the Speech from the Throne. In Her Majesty's Speech some reference was made to the desirability of making some amendment in the procedure of the criminal laws, but it occurred to him, after the proceedings in the Woodford cases, that the criminal law was quite sufficient for its purposes. Legislation for that country would be very difficult indeed until the full claims and aspirations of the Irish people were granted. The Irish people were now organized and determined not to suffer in the future as they had done in days gone by; but were determined to keep up the agitation until the Government conceded to them the right to legislate for their people on their own soil.

MR. GENT-DAVIS (Lambeth, Kennington) said, as the Representative of a Metropolitan constituency, he wished to enter a protest against the amount of time that had been given to the discussion of Ireland and Irish questions during the past year and in the present Session. He regretted that more time was not given to the questions which affected the Metropolis. He also observed that there was a most remarkable difference in the tone assumed by hon. Members opposite in the House from that which they adopted in addressing Irish audiences. Speaking for himself, he had great sympathy with the troubles and the anxieties of the Irish tenants, and had always shown that in all his speeches on the subject; but at the same time, he hoped that in the proposed new Rules of Procedure, which they confidently expected would shortly be brought forward for discussion, some alteration in the method of discussing the Speech from the Throne would be sanctioned. He would like to refer to the satisfaction he felt—which he was sure was felt by a great many other Metropolitan Members—in the fact that reference had been made in the Queen's Speech to the Commission which was issued in 1885 to inquire into the lamentable depression under which trade and agriculture had been suffering for many years. The Report of that Commission, and this reference to it, would be especially welcome to the working classes of London, as showing the interest Her Majesty's Government had taken in the widespread industrial depression. He rejoiced to see that in the month of December there was an increase of nearly £1,500,000 in the value of the imports. In his opinion that was a proof that the trade of the country was reviving. He wished to draw particular attention to Question No. 14, dealing with the causes to which the depression of trade was attributed. He had gone very carefully through the evidence of the Commission, and he found that the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce returned it as their opinion that foreign competition in neutral markets had been to a great extent the cause of the financial depression in that district. From Liverpool it was stated—

> "By all means let us have Free Trade, but bounties should be met by countervailing duties, and hostile tariffs on English goods should not be countenanced in treaty arrangements."

The North of England iron trade made the same complaint. They said that foreign bounties and tariffs had affected this country adversely—in fact, they had annihilated almost all trade with Germany, Russia, France, Spain, and America. In these circumstances he earnestly hoped that during the present Session it would be placed before the House how absolutely necessary it was that the manufacturers of this country should be enabled to maintain their position as against foreign nations. Indeed, it was absolutely a necessity that bounties should be met by countervailing duties. In expressing such views he believed that he was only fulfilling his duty. He had devoted several years to an inquiry regarding this matter, and he had come to the conclusion that it was impossible to compete with foreign nations unless some alteration of our fiscal laws was made. He was also glad to see the reference in the Queen's Speech to the subject of railway rates, and hoped that means might be found to alter in some way the unjust system of railway rating. He hailed with joy the reference made that measures dealing with the regulation of railways, and for preventing the fraudulent use of trade marks, would be brought under their consideration. He trusted that the Government might see their way during the present Session to lend their help in the introduction of a Bill which would impose countervailing duties on bounty-fed goods imported from abroad, and so give the traders of this country the means of holding their own in commerce.

Mr. J. NOLAN (Louth, N.), in replying to the opening observation of the last speaker, said, the method to adopt to prevent complaints of waste of time by Irish Members in discussing the affairs of their country was to give them a Legislature of their own. The Government, however, said the Irish people were not fitted for any measure of self-government, and that exceptional measures were needed to maintain law and order. He protested against this insulting view which was taken of the character of the Irish people. Parliament first gave the people of Ireland the franchise, allowed them to send Representatives to the House of Commons, and when the majority of the Irish Representatives gave effect to the predominant wishes of the people the majority of the Members of the House of Commons said that they would pay no heed to their recommendations with regard to Irish affairs. With regard to the reference in the Queen's Speech to affairs in the South-East of Europe, he echoed the hope that peace would be preserved. If it were true that hon. Gentlemen who sat with him below the Gangway were disloyal to the Empire, and that they sought its disintegration, they could not adopt any better policy than to try to goad Her Majesty's Government into a war with Russia; but, taking the circumstances of the case into account, as honest men they could better employ their power in warning the Government against any such course. If the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula wished to be allied with Russia this country might as well try to stem the tide with a pitchfork as to stop that union; if, on the other hand, they wished to retain their independence they would find ways and means of doing so without any foolish intervention on the part of the people of this country. If was cause for satisfaction that we were to withdraw from Egypt; but it was, he found, a vain hope that the military would carry away the demoralizing influences they had introduced in that country. In his opinion the great Power which this country had to fear after all was not the traditional enemy of England, but Germany. A great Colonizing nation with an overflowing population, and having an evident desire to extend its influence among foreign nations, Germany was more likely to come into collision with England than any of the other European Powers. As to the question of the reform of local government it certainly seemed strange that the Government should say that England and Scotland, which wanted it least, should have it first, while Ireland, which wanted it most, should have it last. He wished to call the attention of the House and the Government to the conduct of the officials in Dublin Castle with reference to the working of the Labourers' Act. These officials seemed to have set themselves deliberately to work to obstruct its beneficent operation. They had it on the authority of Royal Commissions appointed from that House that there was not on the face of God's earth a people who were so miserably housed as the working men in Ireland; and, notwithstanding the fact that an attempt had been made by the Local Authorities in Ireland to remedy this defect to some extent, the authorities at Dublin Castle had succeeded to a very great extent in causing unnecessary delay in the carrying out of the work of providing proper dwellings for the labourers. He gave early Notice to the Chief Secretary that he would inquire more closely into the matter when the Estimates came on. Then they were told that they were not to have the local self-government which England and Scotland were to get, because the law was not observed in Ireland. But if it was the case that the law was not observed in Ireland, he would ask who were the criminals, and who violated the law? Certainly it was not the poor long-suffering people. In England the law permitted people to meet in public in order to discuss their affairs; whereas in Ireland any petty police officer, even without instructions from his superior, could march his policemen, baton in hand, and without any ceremony break up a meeting, and if sometimes human nature was trespassed upon too far there was an outcry about the lawlessness of the Irish people. If in England two or three of the elected Representatives of the people were assaulted in the streets and had their heads broken, there would be such a storm of indignation throughout the length and breadth of the land that no Government would dare to condone the action of those who had been guilty of such an outrage. There had been no less than 86 occasions upon which officials charged with the administration of affairs in Ireland had come to that House for wholesale suspensions of the law. During the last suspension of law 1,000 innocent persons had been dragged from their homes and imprisoned without trial by Judge or jury. Referring to what was called the Crossmaglen conspiracy, he observed that the real conspirators were the representatives of law and order. He hoped that early attention would be given to the case of the unfortunate men who were imprisoned in connection with that alleged conspiracy. He was not inclined to blame the Government for the tender and humane policy which they pursued in Ireland in trying to induce the landlords to hold their hands and give the poor people a chance of living, although they had been remiss in asking for powers to effect that result in another manner, because he believed that the highest law of all was the safety of the people. As to the question of land purchase, he was not desirous of depriving the landlords of one iota of their property or their just rights, but he was not prepared to give them undue privileges, or to pay them for the purchase of their land a price above its value. He had been quite prepared to accept the scheme of the late Prime Minister for the purchase of the land in Ireland; but it was because he regarded it as the price which was to be paid by Irishmen for the right of managing their own affairs, and every farthing under that arrangement would have been paid. But circumstances had changed since then. Reference was made in the Queen's Speech to crime in Ireland. He did not approve of one man taking the life of another, for this could not be returned to him, but a tenant who in a moment of exasperation took the life of another was less culpable than certain hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who in cold blood instigated the Orangemen of Belfast to riot such as had been the subject of recent inquiry, and in the course of which so many lives were lost. When the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Saunderson) spoke of the "butcher's bill" in Ireland, as he facetiously termed it, it was significant that he made no reference to Belfast. He did not, however, desire to make any attack on the Orangemen, for, however misguided, they were his countrymen, and he did not wish to hold them up to the scorn and ridicule of Englishmen. In conclusion, he had to say that no matter what might be the opinion of certain eminent authorities about contentment following the settlement of the Land Question, the Irish people would never be satisfied until they had obtained the rights denoted by the words "Home Rule."

Mr. FULTON (West Ham, N.) said, that the all-absorbing subject in the Queen's Speech was the paragraph which related to the condition of Ireland. He would remind the House that last summer the constituencies were called upon to pronounce judgment on the Irish measures of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). The Party to which he belonged believed then, and believed still, that the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman amounted to a practical repeal of the Act of Union, and that if carried out it would have led to separation or civil war. The verdict of the country upon the scheme was emphatic and decisive, and, he believed, final. A little examination must satisfy the inquirer that the Unionist victory at the last Election could not be measured by the Unionist majority in that House. The victory was quite as apparent in the diminished majorities of the Separatist Liberals who were fortunate enough to be returned to Parliament. To illustrate his meaning he would compare the results in some of the Metropolitan boroughs at the Elections of 1885 and 1886. At the General Election in November, 1885, the Radical majority in the borough of Poplar was 1,977; in July, 1886, it sank to 76. In South Hackney the Radical majority in 1885 was 942; in 1886 it sank to 100. In Battersea in 1885 the majority was 712; in 1886 it sank to 186. In West St. Pancras the majority of 469 in 1885 sank to 60 in 1886. He drew attention to these facts because hon. Members opposite were never tired of reminding the House that the last Election was all a mistake, and that the verdict was very likely to be soon reversed. They said that the result of the last Election was due, not to the Government of Ireland Bill, but to the Land Purchase Bill. He should be the last in the world to deny the immense influence at the last Election of the Land Purchase Bill. It was a monstrous political abortion, and it enabled the Unionists to bring home to the electors the political incapacity of a Government which could gravely present such a measure for the serious consideration of the Nation. But although the Land Purchase Bill was undoubtedly a cause, it was not the cause of the defeat of the Separatist army. The real cause was the proposal to hand over the government of Ireland to the apostles of public plunder — to give up the lives and liberties of the loyal subjects of Her Majesty to the tender mercies of the National League. He believed that the rumours, so industriously circulated, of dissension in the Unionist ranks, were destitute of the smallest shadow of foundation, and that the Unionist Party would give unwavering support to any Government, however constituted, who would carry out the mandate of the country. Their victory had imposed great responsibility upon the Unionist Government. They were pledged to restore the supremacy of the law, to stamp out the conspiracy against the landlords, to put down Boycotting, and to proclaim the National League. To attain ths end they were told that coercion would be necessary. In discussing this question it was desirable that they should clear their minds from cant. If by coercion was meant the passing of measures giving power to the Executive Government to imprison large numbers of Irishmen without trial, or penal legislation of a Draconian character applicable to Ireland alone, and only destined to remain in force for a limited period of time—in other words, if by coercion was meant the kind of coercion which until recently found so much favour with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), he was as much opposed to it as any Member of that House could be. But he might, on the other hand, remind the House that all criminal law was coercive, and was intended to protect the many against the few, and to enable others besides strong men armed to keep their goods in safety. In every civilized community it became necessary from time to time to strengthen the ordinary Criminal Law by new statutes framed to cope with new forms of crime. What was needed in Ireland was such an amendment of the Criminal Law as would enable the authorities to grapple quickly and successfully with intimidation, conspiracy, and Boycotting. The present system pursued in Ireland was, to an English criminal lawyer, absolutely unintelligible. There was apparently no power in Ireland to compel the attendance of an accused person on the hearing of a charge of misdemeanour. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), the House would remember, absented himself when he was a defendant on a trial for conspiracy in Dublin, and quite recently the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) absented himself from a preliminary hearing before the Chief Magistrate in Dublin. Such conduct appeared to be a gross contempt of Court, and could not fail, if unchecked, to weaken the authority of the law. In England the Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1848 gave a magistrate power in every case in which a summons was issued upon a sworn information to issue a warrant to compel the defendant to appear. In a trial for misdemeanour, before a Court of Oyer and Terminer, and general gaol delivery, or at Bar, the Court could proceed to the trial without the presence of the accused, but in practice it never did so, and constantly enforced the attendance of misdemeanants by the issuing of Bench warrants. It appeared to him to be very desirable that magistrates in Ireland should be empowered to deal summarily with cases of intimidation. He would give them the power, in the event of any breach of recognizances, to commit the offender to prison for a term of two or three months. If such powers as these were steadily put in force in Ireland the so-called patriots would be subjected to a very severe test. The detestable form of intimidation known as "Boycotting" ought to be put down by imposing on every person who sold necessaries of life a statutory obligation to sell them to every applicant. In case of refusal the offender should be condemned to pay 20 times the value of the goods demanded, and in default of payment should be committed to prison. He thought that such a law would produce a very satisfactory result in Ireland. Recent events in that country had shown that in many cases trial by jury was a farce. He thought that both in Ireland and in England any accused person ought to have a right to claim a trial by special jury. Again, there ought to be a power in Ireland, as there had been in England since 1856, to change the venue. It was desirable that in all cases either the persons accused or the Crown ought to have the power to change the venue. That, he believed, had been the law in Scotland from time immemorial. Again, when a crime was committed the magistrate ought to be empowered to institute a preliminary investigation, and to summon before him all persons who were likely to throw light upon the undetected crime. This amendment of the law would, he hoped, form part of the measure which Her Majesty's Government had in contemplation. It was likewise desirable that the prisoner and his wife should be competent but not compellable witnesses. If the Government made such changes applicable not only to Ireland, but also to England, he believed they would receive the support of every honest man. He could not understand why the Executive Government in Ireland permitted the Plan of Campaign to take root and spread while they were waiting for a decision of the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice as to whether it was an illegal conspiracy. If that information could not be secured in Ireland, here in England the Government might have obtained it from any criminal lawyer in the Temple for the moderate sum of £1 3*s*. 6*d*. The senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had placed it upon record that the Plan of Campaign delighted his heart, and had described it as trade unionism applied to agriculture. He might remind the hon. Member, however, that trade unionism was a perfectly legal institution, and that it owed its vitality to two Statutes, the Employers' and Workmen's Act and the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, both of which were passed by a Conservative Government, and which had been described by a distinguished member of the working classes as "the charter of their social and industrial freedom." Trade unionism was designed, among other things, to enable the wage-earning classes by combination to compete with their employers in fixing the terms of future contracts, whereas the Plan of Campaign was used for the purpose of arbitrarily repudiating contracts already subsisting. He commended this elementary distinction to the serious consideration of the hon. Member. The activity of the Government ought not to be limited by a Bill for the amendment of the Criminal Law. There would never be peace in Ireland until the National League was proclaimed. It was an illegal and a treasonable association—a political tapeworm, which he hoped would be seized by the head and crushed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had said that the classes were against him. This was true. The classes were against him, and among them were the working classes. If, when the present Prime Minister was forming his Cabinet, he had sent for the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), and offered him the Chancellorship of the Exchequer on the condition that he would turn his back on every political profession he had ever made respecting Ireland, he believed the hon. Member would have resisted the temptation; and thus he would have compared very favourably with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, who, speaking at Glasgow on the 25th of October, 1881, said—

> "It is true there is a strong Party of irreconcilable politicians who do not represent Ireland. . . . Men whose object I am sorry to say I believe is not so much to benefit Ireland as to injure England. Theirs has not been a policy of reconciliation and reform, but of hatred and disunion. No doubt we are at issue with them to the last extremity, to the extremity which was unhappily reached in the United States of America, where men were satisfied to pour out their blood like water to maintain the integrity of their country and their Empire. . . The land agitation in their hands was an agitation whose object was to destroy the union of the Empire and to overthrow the established Government of the United Kingdom. Mr. Parnell admits now that what he wants is not fair rent—he wants no rent at all. He wants to get rid of the landlords in order that he may get rid of the English Government; and for this object every kind of intimidation has been employed to deter honest men from doing their duty and fulfilling their obligations. The Land League has employed terms whose avowed object is to set aside and over-rule the law of the land. It is utterly impossible that any Government responsible for civilized society can tolerate such a condition of things. The Land League has thrown over the false colours of fair rent; it has hoisted the red flag, and the buccaneering craft sails under its true colours."

What a wealth of vocabulary, and what accuracy of description! But there was another great man—the hon. Member for Camborne (Mr. Conybeare). It might be said of him as was once said of a former very distinguished Member of Parliament (Mr. Horsman) he was a very "superior person." He was ready to make a new constitution in Church and State. He was a striking example of the truth of the saying of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian that the further from the Metropolis the greater the political enlightenment. The working classes in London and the home counties had had an opportunity of seeing and hearing the Irish Representatives. They knew them; they understood them, and they had formed a distinct opinion of the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), and the unassuming modesty of the Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner). They saw and believed that the ambition of those Members, in their microscopical examination of the Estimates, was to impede the Business of Parliament.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) rose to Order. Was it right to allege that he impeded the Business of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing in the remarks of the hon. Member to call for my intervention, although an imputation of motive is un-Parliamentary.

Mr. FULTON said, he was sorry he had wounded the feelings of the hon. Member.

Dr. TANNER: Not at all.

Mr. FULTON said, he would withdraw the observation in the most unqualified manner. The object of the hon. Member was not to impede or delay the Business of Parliament. But he had not said otherwise. He had said that the working classes of London might have drawn that conclusion. He could tell hon. Members from Ireland that he admired their courage, their endurance, and their discipline, but he hoped hon. Members would believe that they, on the Ministerial Benches, were animated with equal courage, endurance, and discipline. They were, moreover, fortified by the assurance that they had received from their constituents a double mandate on the one hand to maintain the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, and on the other to preserve, unimpaired, the authority and the dignity of Parliament.

Mr. THEODORE FRY (Darlington) said, he could not understand the observation of the Chief Secretary for Ireland in charging him with interference in Irish affairs, which he appeared to think unjustifiable.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): I beg the hon. Member's pardon. I did not at all imply that.

Mr. THEODORE FRY said, then he should refer to the reports in the evening papers, and it was in the right hon.

Gentleman's own paper, *The Globe.* However, he was glad it was withdrawn.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND: What I said was, that I was sure the hon. Member interfered with the most benevolent motives.

MR. THEODORE FRY said, he was glad the right hon. Gentleman had corrected the report. He could not understand in what way he had interfered in Irish affairs. The question he had asked that evening was the first time he had spoken about Ireland in that House, and the only other interference on his part was a visit to the sad scenes now going on in Glenbeigh. It seemed to him a most remarkable thing that the Chief Secretary should suggest that some Member of the Opposition should bring in a Bill to settle this complicated question. If the right hon. Gentleman himself was unable to do so, he should resign the position he held in Her Majesty's Government. As Chief Secretary for Ireland, it should be his duty to promote the wished-for settlement, and if he were unable to do so he should give place to some other Gentleman who would be able to deal with the difficulties arising in the sister country. The only course suggested by the right hon. Gentleman was that these poor people of Glenbeigh should be relegated to some other part of Ireland, or removed from Ireland altogether. That was not a legislative measure at the present moment, though he was willing to admit that there were parts of Ireland where the removal of the poorest might be of advantage to them. He thought it was an extraordinary thing to hear the Chief Secretary for Ireland saying, in reference to these sad scenes in Glenbeigh—"It is not my business to express any opinion on the subject." He believed he had never heard a sentence so entirely unworthy of the position held by the right hon. Gentleman—so full of self-distrust. He thought that if the right hon. Gentleman had accepted the cordial invitation sent to him from Glenbeigh to visit the district, he would now have been able to express some opinion on what he saw and heard there. He did not think it was necessary for him to say that he had not the slightest sympathy with those who, being able to pay a fair rent, refused to do so; and perhaps it was still less unnecessary for him to say that he had not the slightest sympathy for those who committed crime of any kind in Ireland. The hon. Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) informed the House that the landlord of the poor cottiers of Glenbeigh was willing to accept six months' rent, which amounted altogether to £865. But the hon. Gentleman forgot to tell the House that in addition to that £865 there were very heavy law costs which had followed the non-payment of the gale's rent. These costs in many cases amounted to the full rent, and in other cases to more. The rent of one man was £1, while the costs amounted to £2 19*s.* 6*d.*, or three times more than the rent which it appeared to the eye of the people of England this man was only asked to pay. The argument of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh was that these people were able to pay a considerable portion of their rent, far more than a half-year's, and he said the action of Sir Redvers Buller was kind and generous. He was not going to say a word about the Plan of Campaign at the present moment, either for or against, as that was not the business before him; but he considered that nothing had given such a strong impetus to the Plan of Campaign as the action of Sir Redvers Buller on this occasion, and the interference of the present Government in endeavouring to obtain from the landlords such a large concession of rent. It justified more fully than anything else the action of those who had tried to get a large reduction, but get much smaller than Sir Redvers Buller. It could not be so heinous a crime as it was sometimes made out to be. He was glad to find the Chief Secretary had that night taken the entire blame of the action of Sir Redvers Buller in Ireland. The hon. and gallant Member for Mid Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) complained that the Plan of Campaign made the payment of rents impossible; but the action of the Government, in instructing Sir Redvers Buller to do what he had done, would have far more effect in strengthening the Plan of Campaign than anything else. They had already been told that it was in operation only upon 20 estates, and that was a very small number in comparison with the number of estates in Ireland. Something was said by the hon. and gallant Member for Mid Armagh as to what Father Quilter had said in reference to the action of the tenants. There had been another letter published which was written by Father Quilter, and which was read at the meeting at Killorglin on Saturday last. In that letter Father Quilter expressed himself strongly to this effect—that when he had written the previous letter, which had been quoted in the House that night, he was very much misled as to the ability of many of these tenants to pay rent. He had a conversation himself with Father Quilter, who had told him the same thing, and had also stated that many of these tenants —40 out of 70—who had not paid the half-year's gale, as suggested by Sir Redvers Buller, were entirely unable to pay their rents; and, therefore, when the previous letter was read from Father Quilter he thought it would have been well that the letter, in which he, to some extent, altered his opinion, should have been read also. They could not have a better testimony to the poverty of the people of Glenbeigh than the words of Sir Redvers Buller himself, which might well have been read by the Member for Mid Armagh. He would read five or six lines from that letter, which was written on the 29th of November. Sir Redvers Buller wrote—

> "There may be, and perhaps there are, a few rogues amongst them—say five or six—who could pay more; but I do believe the offer represents, in respect of the majority of them, a somewhat larger sum than they are actually in a position to pay. In my opinion a great number of the tenants are nearer to famine than to the payment of rent."

Having paid a visit to that district, and having seen what was going on, he could, to a large extent, confirm the statement just read. He had seen the evictions in these houses, and every morsel of furniture thrown out on the hill side. He saw everything these poor people possessed in the way of food. In one house, in which there were five children, besides the father and mother, there were not as many potatoes as would make a meal for a family. In the next house, which was a joint tenancy, there were the father and mother and nine children; and they had, perhaps, enough potatoes to last a week, whilst neither of these families had anything which they could possibly sell to raise the rent. He was certain that any Gentleman in that House would not give 5*s.* for the whole furniture that was turned out, and there was nothing at all scarcely in the shape of food. It must be borne in mind that there had been a tremendous fall in the prices of stock and other things in Ireland, which Gentlemen there were acquainted with. He had it from an extensive cattle dealer that Kerry cows, which in 1882 would fetch £7 and £7 10*s.* each, would not realize one third of that amount; and they could, perhaps, scarcely understand what that meant to the small farmers, whose only power of paying rent was the number of cattle they were able to graze and then dispose of. He had never seen a district like Glenbeigh so utterly and entirely barren, so difficult of cultivation, and which, he believed, would not be worth one farthing per annum for 100 acres if it had not been for the labour spent upon it by the tenants. There were thousands of acres of rocky hill-sides covered with boulders, and it was perfectly impossible for anybody to till it until he had moved the stones into heaps and placed them in the middle of little plots, upon which they placed their cows or planted potatoes or oats. The cows went great distances on these mountains. They had great difficulty in picking up herbage, many of them got clefted or lost, and the hardships of the poor people were something which many hon. Members had not the slightest conception of. The whole argument raised on the other side was this—the people in Glenbeigh, at any rate, were able to pay the half-year's gale and costs, and were unwilling to do so because of the oppression put upon them by the National League. He should leave it to hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway to speak upon that point; but he did not believe it applied to that district. He felt certain that that House would, before long, come to the belief that many of the poor people in that district were unable to pay their rents. He had every desire to do justice to the landlords, and he sympathized with many of them in their trials and difficulties; but the landlords should remember that every hedge, every wall, every fence, every drain, every patch of potato ground, the cultivation of the bog-land, and everything else was brought about by the direct labour of the tenants or their predecessors in title. Many of these improvements had been capitalized by the landlords, who for many years had received large rents upon them. They must consent to lower the rents, in these times of depression, if the tenants were to exist and keep body and soul together. It was impossible, upon many of the holdings, that the rents charged by the landlords could be paid in the future; and, therefore, the humane policy, in accordance with their boasted Christian teaching, should be in respect of these tenants, to allow them to exist in this time of great distress. He hoped they would hear some definite expression of opinion before very long, if not from the Chief Secretary, from some other Member of Her Majesty's Government, as to what the opinion of Her Majesty's Government was as to the evictions which had recently taken place in Ireland. He had not the least idea what an eviction was until he had seen it. He believed hon. Gentlemen would have their best feelings stirred if they could see evictions for themselves. They would see 135 or 150 armed Constabulary wending their way up the hill-sides and surrounding these little homesteads as if they contained some of the greatest malefactors on the face of the earth, and these soldiers were paid by English money, and they were acting for English landlords or English mortgagees, and it was no wonder if hatred was engendered. He regretted, as much as anyone possibly could, that such was the case; but if they treated men like malefactors, and sent an army with crowbars to destroy their houses over their heads, was it possible to avoid ill-will and hatred between two nations which ought to be connected by the bonds of friendship? If these things were done in South Africa or Bulgaria it would be different. If they were far enough off they would arouse indignation, and attention would be paid to them in that House. Motions of regret would be adopted, and Foreign Ministers would be asked to interfere; but, because these things were so near, because they did not sufficiently realize them, and because their own pockets were touched, they forgot the sufferings and sorrowings of the Irish people. He felt it was necessary, having seen these things, to ask the House to give patient attention to the representations which were made respecting them, and see if it was not possible for some better era to be ushered in, so that the ill-will and hatred existing between two countries, which ought to be closely connected, might be diminished and finally die out. He hoped they would have an expression of opinion as to the advisability or otherwise of these things, which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary seemed unable to give them.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Fry) will feel, upon reflection, that he has been somewhat unfair to me in his remarks upon the observations I made this evening. I do not wish to shrink one iota from the very difficult duty that is cast upon me, in my capacity as a Member of the Government responsible for the state of Ireland, in dealing with this great, important, and difficult question of the congested districts of Ireland. It is a question which has occupied the attention of previous Governments and Parliaments; and it is a question the most difficult of all, I venture to say, which await solution in Ireland. It has occupied my attention already; it is occupying it daily now; it is occupying also the attention of the Royal Commission recently appointed; and I assure the hon. Member that we will do our best to propose to Parliament, and that before long, some measures that may ameliorate the condition of the unfortunate inhabitants of these congested districts. In the answer I gave this evening to the hon. Member respecting the evictions at Glenbeigh, I had no intention whatever of raising the whole question of the congested districts of Ireland. I will tell the hon. Member frankly what I had in my mind. I had in my mind a suggestion that had been discussed by a gentleman who is well known to hon. Members below the Gangway—an English clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Fagan—who had visited the district, and who had discussed with Father Quilter, the parish priest, that very scheme of the migration of some of the inhabitants of Glenbeigh which I ventured, in my answer to the hon. Member, to allude to. And, in all good faith with respect to these unfortunate persons, I expressed to the hon. Member my own desire, either publicly or privately, to give whatever aid I could to those who were anxious to carry out any suggestion of the kind. The hon. Member has charged me with "caring for none of these things." It is because I have cared very much for these things during the last four months; it is because I have been anxious to go even beyond the ordinary duty of the Member of the Government responsible for Irish affairs, in endeavouring to prevent some of the sufferings the hon. Gentleman has alluded to—it is for that I have been misrepresented and accused, even by the hon. Member himself, of abetting the Plan of Campaign. I should very much like hon. Members to look at this matter for a few moments from a practical point of view. I do not want to enter now into the question whether the Glenbeigh tenants were able to keep the terms they had entered into, or to pay a half-year's rent. But, admitting their poverty, admitting that they were unable to pay anything, is not that all the greater proof of their wretchedness and the misery of their position? Does it not afford greater proof of the necessity, if you are going to benefit them, of interfering to move them from their present position? Does it not prove that unless you are to accept the maxim that poverty gives a man a right to live in a house that does not belong to him—[*Cries of* "No!" *from the Irish Members.*] I am talking of what the law is. Hon. Members who accuse me of illegality, and who seem to get particularly angry when anybody accuses them of the same, ought, for the purposes of discussion at least, to treat the law as they find it. The dwellings which were destroyed—I do not like their destruction, of course; but it was not my business to express any opinion on the conduct of any person not subject to my authority—were, by law, the property of the owner of the estate, and they were destroyed for the simple reason that the persons occupying them had been before evicted under the ordinary process of law, and had chosen, contrary to the law, to retake forcible possession of them. What could the owner do? If he had simply evicted the people they would have gone back again. [An hon. MEMBER: Quite right, too!] An hon. Member says, "Quite right, too!" In his opinion, then, poverty is to give a right to a person to live in a house that does not belong to him; but are you to apply that maxim not only to the West of Ireland, but to other parts of Ireland, and to England and Scotland as well? And, if so, what remains of the rights of any kind of property in the United Kingdom? I can only say this—that if any hon. Member can suggest a solution of the problem which shall maintain the rights of property—aye, and, while maintaining the rights of property, shall deal with persons in the unfortunate position of the Glenbeigh tenants with the humanity and consideration which I am as anxious to show as any hon. Member can be, I shall be thankful to consider any suggestion which he can offer; but, as I began by saying, this matter is as difficult a problem as any with which Parliament can be called upon to deal, and it is not to be solved by any such observations as the hon. Member (Mr. Fry) has addressed to the House to-night. I do not think it necessary to deal generally with what has been said in this discursive debate, especially as I am informed that points of great importance connected with Ireland are to be raised in the form of Amendments to the Address. In the few observations, therefore, with which I shall trouble the House, I shall endeavour to remove what, in my opinion, has been the most extraordinary misrepresentation and misunderstanding of my own conduct in Ireland which has affected me since I have been in public life. Now, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), speaking last night, told the House that when he was asked his opinion as to the Plan of Campaign, he said it was a consequence of the rejection of the measure of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) in September last; and the right hon. Gentleman further went on to say that I had been exercising pressure in one direction, while some of the Nationalist Members had been exercising it in another direction; evidently accepting the contention which has been made to-night by the hon. Member for the Harbour Division of Dublin (Mr. T. Harrington), that my action, as the Minister responsible for the Irish Government, had been tantamount to the action of himself (Mr. T. Harrington) and his colleagues in the Plan of Campaign. Now, let me, in the first place, say that the Bill of the hon. Member for the City of Cork was certainly very far removed from any action I have taken during the time which has elapsed since its rejection. That Bill, on its introduction, was described—and, I think, rightly described—as a Bill for stopping for a time the collection of rents all over Ireland, and making the eventual collection of more than half the rents of the country a matter of extreme difficulty. It would be applied not only to cases of real inability to pay the full rent, but it would be applied, practically, to any case in which the tenant chose to take advantage of its provisions. I think, Sir, that the Bill was rightly and wisely rejected by the House of Commons, and if it was proposed again to-morrow I should be prepared to take the same course with regard to it as I did in September last. Now, Sir, I have been told, though I think not in the course of this debate, that I, through my subordinates in Ireland, exercised a dispensing power. I have contradicted that—they have contradicted that—over and over again. The charge has been repeated all the same, and yet not one single atom of proof has been advanced. In no case that can be shown has protection ever been denied by the Government, or its officials, to a Sheriff in the execution of his duty. In no case has it been suggested to the police that they should hesitate for a moment to give the most prompt aid to the Sheriff and his officers in the execution of their duty.

MR. T. C. HARRINGTON: Ten days' notice was required. What about that?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Quite so. The 10 days' notice has been required for a great many years past. That 10 days' notice was part of a consolidating Circular which was issued some time in the autumn of last year, and which was issued for the simple purpose of defining more clearly the respective duties of Sheriffs and police, so as to secure, on the one hand, that the Sheriff should give sufficient notice to the police, in order to enable an adequate force to be provided to protect him, and, on the other hand, that the police should more efficiently discharge their duty of protecting and aiding the Sheriff. And yet, Sir, that very Circular is misrepresented, just as my action has been misrepresented to-night, as a proof that the Government intended to exercise a dispensing power. Well, Sir, no less a person—I wish to speak of him with all respect—than Chief Baron Palles appears to have fallen into some mistake of the kind in his charge to the jury at Sligo. I think that learned Judge discovered something in the evidence that was put before him in respect to the evictions at Woodford in the middle of August, a very few days after the present Government assumed Office, which led him to suppose that, acting under instructions, the police had hesitated to do their duty promptly in that matter. Well, Sir, I can only say this—that I myself never heard of what was going on at Woodford until I heard of the remarkable delay in the evictions that were taking place there; and my first act was to telegraph to the Divisional Magistrate of the district to take command, in order that the law might be promptly asserted. And what was the reason for the delay? Why, the reason was simply this—that the houses from which the tenants at Woodford had to be evicted were made little fortifications, to which the Sheriff and his officers could not obtain entrance without appliances which they had not at their command, and which took some time to procure. Directly the proper appliances were procured the Sheriff and his officers were efficiently aided by the police in the execution of their duty; and I myself was challenged in this House by one of the hon. Members sitting below the Gangway for permitting the police to go beyond their ordinary duty in the aid which they gave to the Sheriff on that occasion. I can only say, speaking with all respect of the learned Chief Baron, I am quite sure that all these circumstances could not have been within his knowledge when he made those suggestions as to delay and hesitation on the part of the Government in enforcing the law in Ireland. A good deal has been said in this House by the hon. Member for the Harbour Division of Dublin with respect to my examination at the police court in Dublin. Sir, I should have been very glad, if I could have felt it consistent with my duty, to speak my mind on that occasion, and to clear away the extraordinary tissue of misrepresentation which had been woven. It was on the ground of privilege, and privilege alone, as I have said this evening, that I declined to answer questions in the witness-box of a police court as to my action as a Member of the Executive Government.

I preferred, Sir, to suffer under misrepresentation, cruel as it was, than to do anything towards establishing a precedent which would be fatal to good government in any part of the United Kingdom. But, Sir, now I will say something—it is my right and my duty to speak to this House, to which I am responsible. I have said there is no truth in these stories about the dispensing power, and the hesitation on the part of the Government to enforce the law. And now about the pressure upon landlords. I used that word, and I admit it was a word which was susceptible of more than one interpretation. I certainly directed General Buller and other Divisional Magistrates, when any circumstances came under their notice in which evictions were likely to take place, to inform the owners or the agents of the property, particularly if those owners or agents were non-resident, of those circumstances, and to use the influence of reason and argument to promote a settlement between landlord and tenant. Now, Sir, was that wrong? I admit it was going beyond the ordinary duties of the Chief Secretary for Ireland; but of this I am quite sure—that no one can adduce an instance in which I, or any other official of the Government, coerced a landlord into any course of action by telling him he would not be protected, or that his caretakers would not be protected. I can only say that, in spite of all the allegations that have been made, no one case has been brought forward in which any proof of the kind has been shown. The hon. Member for the Harbour Division of Dublin asked me to-night whether these gentlemen had applied pressure to any of the landlords on whose property the Plan of Campaign had been put in force? So far as I know, Sir, these gentlemen have not been in communication with any one of those landlords on the subject of their relations with their tenants.

Mr. COX (Clare, E.): I can show you General Buller's letter sent to an estate on which the Plan of Campaign has been put in force.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I said so far as I know. But if there has been any such communication I am convinced, as I have already stated to the House, that that communication was not in the nature of a threat. Well, Sir, what I have described is simply what I hold to be fair and legitimate influence, and nothing more, in the direction of avoiding those very hardships and sufferings which the hon. Member for Darlington has described to the House, and which created so much feeling, no doubt, in some quarters. This was misrepresented, as I have stated — it was sedulously misrepresented—by hon. Members below the Gangway and their Press in Ireland. In that way the impression may have been created that the Government shrank from enforcing the law in Ireland, and this may have done harm; but I am not to blame for that misrepresentation. I did what I have stated to the House, and no more, and I am content to submit myself to the judgment of the House, if my action in the matter is challenged. Well, Sir, according to the view of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian Mr. Gladstone), my pressure of suggestion, argument, and reason, to induce creditors to be merciful to their debtors, was tantamount to the Plan of Campaign, which was initiated on the properties on which it has taken root by hon. Members who sit below the Gangway opposite, summoning those debtors together, advising those who could pay to unite with those who perhaps could not pay, in a common resistance to the payment of their just debts, and themselves receiving money which belonged to others. Well, Sir, I do not want to enter into any examination of the Plan of Campaign. It is now the subject of a trial which is actually pending, and it is, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, fortified by the judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench in Ireland, a criminal conspiracy. I say nothing more about it now than this—that it is not the fact that the Plan of Campaign was applied only in cases of inability to pay rent. No, Sir; the Plan of Campaign meant a good deal more than that. The Plan of Campaign meant a combination on the part of tenants to force their landlords either into taking what those tenants chose to offer them, to be reduced again to a lower point next year, or else to leave the tenants in the occupation of the land rent free, and then to raise a cry throughout the country about the hardships and sufferings of evictions, such as has been got up concerning the evictions at Glenbeigh. That has been the way in which the Plan of Campaign has been worked, and it has been avowed by speeches made by hon. Members sitting below the Gangway opposite to be aimed at the destruction of landlordism, and the eventual extirpation of what they are pleased to call English rule in Ireland. Then, Sir, that is the plan which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian compares to my pressure upon the landlords, as if they were equally laudable, or as if not one word of blame can be attached to either. I do not wish to detain the House any longer. I will not enter upon the tempting field which the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Fulton), who spoke so ably just now from this side of the House, laid before you. I will not enter into any details as to the legislative measures with regard to the Irish Criminal Law which it may be the duty of Her Majesty's Government to propose to Parliament; but, Sir, what I would say is this—that we have done what we could with the tools ready to our hand, but that the difficulties and delays inseparable from the working of the ordinary Criminal Law, as it now exists, render it, in our judgment, inefficient to cope with such proceedings as are described under the name of the Plan of Campaign. We, Sir, are pledged to maintain the Union, but it is no use maintaining the Union—it is worse than useless to maintain the Union; better, as it was eloquently stated in "another place" last night, better have separation— unless, with the Union, you maintain the reign of law in Ireland.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Bradlaugh.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

MOTIONS.

——o——

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE. FIRST READING.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH): As the Bill I now ask leave to bring in is a very short Bill, and also an urgent Bill, I wish to explain the reasons both for its shortness and its urgency, in the hope that hon. Members may permit it to become law at an early date. The Bill is introduced in consequence of the existing vacancy in the Chief Justiceship of the Common Pleas in Ireland. In the English Judicature Act power was taken, by Order in Council, to abolish the offices of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and to fuse the three Divisions of the High Court into one. In the Irish Judicature Act no such power exists; but it is generally admitted, I believe, that what was done in England ought also to be done in Ireland. It would be a step in the direction of economy, but it would also be a more valuable step in the direction of efficiency; because by fusing the Divisions in Ireland the Judges in which are few, there being only three in the Common Pleas and three in the Exchequer, you would enable Courts to sit for business, when sometimes now, owing to the Divisions, the Court cannot be formed, and consequently you would make a change of great advantage to suitors. The Bill is confined solely to these objects. Unless it becomes law soon, it will be impossible to maintain the present position; because if there be no Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the remaining Judges of the Common Pleas will practically be often, from ill-health or from other causes, unable to form a Court, and there will be no one to do certain duties which, under statute, appertain to the Chief Justice of Common Pleas. Therefore, the position, if this Bill does not pass, and if the office of Chief Justice is left unfilled, will very soon become impossible. I hope that the House will allow this Bill to pass rapidly for the reasons I have named; and I am bound to say that if it should be delayed by opposition, or by an endeavour to attach to it other reforms, however important, in the Irish Judicature, we shall be compelled, in order to secure the proper performance of justice in the three High Courts in Ireland, to fill up an office which by this Bill we desire to reduce, as a like office in England has already been reduced.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend 'The Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland), 1877.'"—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): From an economical point of view, I should be very glad if we could do away entirely with one of the Irish Judges; but, as I understand the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, it is to appoint an ordinary Judge in the place of the Chief Justice of Common Pleas. The Irish Judges are underworked, and, therefore, I think the proper thing to do is to abolish this Judgeship altogether, and then to carry out the reforms which the right hon. Gentleman suggests.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH and Mr. JACKSON.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 1.]

ARBITRATION OF POOR LAW QUESTIONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Mason, Bill to enable Parochial Boards in Scotland to determine cases of disputed settlements by arbitration, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Mason, Mr. E. R. Russell, Mr. Macdonald Cameron, Mr. Watt, Mr. Williamson, and Mr. Lacaita.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 2.]

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Lane, Bill to amend "The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Lane, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Connolly, and Mr. Sheil.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 3.]

HARES PRESERVATION BILL.

On Motion of Colonel Dawnay, Bill to enact a "close time" for hares, *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel Dawnay, Sir John Lubbock, Lord Elcho, Mr. Dillwyn, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Beach, and Mr. Staveley Hill.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 4.]

PLACES OF WORSHIP (SITES) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. John Ellis, Bill for giving further facilities for the acquisition of Sites for places of Worship, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Borlase, Mr. Burt, Mr. M'Arthur, and Mr. Henry Wilson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 5.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT (1875) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Norton, Bill to amend "The Friendly Societies Act, 1875," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Norton, Viscount Folkestone, Mr. Tomlinson, and Mr. Hoyle.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 6.]

AGRICULTURAL TENANTS (IRELAND) RELIEF BILL.

On Motion of Mr. O'Kelly, Bill for the relief of Agricultural Tenants in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Biggar, and Mr. Arthur O'Connor.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 7.]

LIMITED OWNERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Haldane, Bill to enlarge the powers of Limited Owners of Land in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Haldane, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Arthur Elliot, and Mr. Ferguson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 8.]

RETURNING OFFICERS' EXPENSES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Provand, Bill to amend the Law relating to Expenses of Returning Officers in Scotland; and for other purposes relating thereto, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Provand, Mr. Hunter, Mr. J. Bolton, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Watt, and Mr. M'Ewan.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 9.]

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Cox, Bill to extend to certain leaseholders and other persons the provisions of "The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881," to amend the Law relating to the rights of Turbary in Ireland; and for other purposes relating thereto, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Cox, Mr. Dillon, Mr. O'Doherty, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. William Redmond, and Mr. Henry Campbell.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 10.]

ECCLESIASTICAL ASSESSMENTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Mark Stewart, Bill to amend the Law in regard to Ecclesiastical Assessments in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Mark Stewart and Mr. J. A. Campbell.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 11.]

COUNTY GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. James O'Brien, Bill for the better government of Counties in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. James O'Brien, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Sexton, and Mr. Healy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 12.]

PERSONAL PROPERTY (EXEMPTION FROM SALE) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Edmund Robertson, Bill to exempt (to a limited amount) Personal Property of householders from seizure and sale under legal process, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Picton, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Howorth.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 13.]

POOR LAW GUARDIANS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Parnell, Bill to amend the Law relating to the election and constitution of Boards of Poor Law Guardians in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, and Mr. Dwyer Gray.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 14.]

THEATRES (METROPOLIS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Dixon-Hartland, Bill for the better regulation of Theatres and Music Halls in the Metropolitan area, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Woodall, and Mr. Lawson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 15.]

HERB AND GINGER BEER MAKERS' LICENCE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill for the granting of Licences to Makers of certain non-intoxicating fermented beverages, therein more particularly defined.

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. H. S. Wright, Colonel Eyre, Mr. Whitmore, Mr. Broadhurst, Colonel Anstruther, and Mr. Byron Reed.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 16.]

POLICE FORCE ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Bill to remove the disabilities of the Police to vote at Parliamentary Elections, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Whitmore, Mr. Radcliffe Cooke, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Howard Vincent, Lord Claud Hamilton, and Colonel Laurie.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 17.]

BURIAL GROUNDS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to Burial Grounds.

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Richard, and Mr. Woodall.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 18.]

LAND TENURE (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Mackintosh, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Tenure of Land in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Barclay, Sir George Balfour, and Dr. Farquharson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 19.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT (1875) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Francis Stevenson, Bill to amend "The Friendly Societies Act, 1875," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Francis Stevenson, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Sir Savile Crossley, Mr. Channing, Mr. Burt, and Mr. Mason.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 20.]

TRUCK LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to Truck.

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. Mason, and Mr. Edmund Robertson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 21.]

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to enable owners and occupiers in burghs, wards of burghs, parishes, and districts in Scotland to prevent the common sale of Intoxicating Liquors or otherwise to have effectual control over the Drink Traffic within such areas.

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Lyell, Mr. M'Lagan, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Lacaita, Dr. Clark, and Mr. Ferguson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 22.]

MINING ROYALTIES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Conybeare, Bill to regulate the imposition of Mining Royalties in the United Kingdom, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, Mr. Burt, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Borlase, and Mr. Blake.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 23.]

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Carew, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Municipal Franchise in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Carew, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. E. D. Gray, and Sir Thomas Esmonde.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 24.]

LAND LAW (WALES) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. John Bryn Roberts, Bill to amend the Law relating to the occupation and ownership of land in Wales and Monmouthshire; and for other purposes relating thereto, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. John Bryn Roberts, Mr. John Roberts, Mr. Warmington, Mr. Bowen Rowlands, and Mr. Thomas Ellis.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 25.]

LEASEHOLDS (FACILITIES OF PURCHASE OF FEE SIMPLE) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Lawson, Bill to enable Leaseholders of Houses to purchase the Fee Simple of their Holdings, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Lawson, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. J. Rowlands, Mr. Warmington, Mr. Reid, Mr. Puleston, and Mr. T. E. Ellis.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 26.]

CRIMINAL LAW (IRELAND) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Sexton, Bill to amend the Criminal Law of Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Sexton, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Chance, Mr. Healy, Mr. Reynolds, and Mr. Donal Sullivan.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 27.]

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Matthew Kenny, Bill to amend the Labourers (Ireland) Act, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Matthew Kenny, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Tuite, and Mr. Lalor.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 28.]

SCHOOL BOARD FOR LONDON (PENSIONS) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Richard Temple, Bill to enable the School Board for London to grant Superannuation Pensions, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Richard Temple, Sir Guyer Hunter, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. Francis Powell, and Mr. Gent-Davis.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 29.]

HOUSES IN TOWNS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Bill to amend the Law relating to the tenure of Houses in Towns (Ireland), *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Crilly, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Colonel Nolan, Sir Thomas Esmonde, and Mr. Leahy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 30.]

ACCUMULATIONS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Bill to amend the Law relating to Accumulations, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Mr. Bryce, and Mr. Haldane.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 31.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Howell, Bill to consolidate, simplify, and amend the Law relating to Parliamentary Elections; and for other purposes relating thereto, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Howell, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Fenwick, Dr. Clark, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. Warmington.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 32.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (ULSTER) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to enable Voters in towns and districts in the Province of Ulster to prevent the common sale of Intoxicating Liquors, or otherwise to have effectual control over the Drink Traffic within such areas.

Resolution *reported*:—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Johnston, Mr. T. W. Russell, and Mr. De Cobain.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 33.]

JUSTICES OF PEACE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Seale-Hayne, Bill for the purpose of amending the Law in regard to the appointment, qualification, and removal of Justices of the Peace, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Seale-Hayne, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Howell, Mr. Rendel, and Sir Bernhard Samuelson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 34.]

POLICE CONSTABLES' PENSIONS BILL.

On Motion of Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Bill to make provision respecting the Pensions, Allowances, and Gratuities of Police Constables in Great Britain, and their widows and children, and to make other provisions respecting the Police of Great Britain, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Lord Claud Hamilton, Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Sir George Russell, Mr. Gerald Balfour, and Mr. Howard Vincent.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 35.]

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Tuite, Bill to amend the Law relating to National School Teachers in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Tuite, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Conway, and Mr. Nolan.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 36.]

PAROCHIAL BOARDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Dr. Cameron, Bill to reform the constitution of Parochial Boards in Scotland, and the mode of electing such Boards, *ordered* to be brought in by Dr. Cameron, Mr. Barclay, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Graham, and Mr. Esslemont.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 37.]

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT (1880) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. William M'Donald, Bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act of 1880, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. William M'Donald, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Chance, and Mr. Clancy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 38.]

COAL MINES REGULATION ACT (1872) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Hayden, Bill to amend "The Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1872," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Hayden, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Conway, and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 39.]

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. O'Hea, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Representation of the People, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Chance, Mr. Healy, and Mr. M'Cartan.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 40.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

On Motion of Mr. James Stevenson, Bill to prohibit the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sundays in England, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. James Stevenson, Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Walter James, and Mr. Cozens-Hardy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 41.]

SMALL DEBTS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Caldwell, Bill to extend and amend the Law relating to the recovery of Small Debts in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Thorburn, and Mr. Watt.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 42.]

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS' BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Stansfeld, Bill to amend the Law with respect to the Registration of Electors at Parliamentary and Municipal Elections, modifying with a view to the simplification of their registration the qualification of such Electors, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Childers, and Sir Charles Russell.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 43.]

LONDON COAL AND WINE DUTIES CONTINUANCE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to further continue and appropriate the London Coal and Wine Duties.

Resolution *reported*: — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Sir Robert Fowler, Mr. Hubbard, Colonel Duncan, and Mr. R. G. Webster.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 44.]

WORKMEN'S CERTIFICATES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Gent-Davis, Bill to enable Workmen to obtain Certificates of service and character, and to prevent the use of fraudulent Certificates, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Gent-Davis, Mr. Byron Reed, and Mr. Macartney.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 45.]

BEER ADULTERATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Quilter, Bill for better securing the purity of Beer, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Quilter, Mr. Heneage, Viscount Wolmer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Herbert Gardner, Mr. Francis Stevenson, and Mr. Gurdon.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 46.]

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Murphy, Bill to amend the Law relating to University Education in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dillon, Dr. Fox, Mr. Henry Gill, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Clancy, and Dr. Kenny.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 47.]

BUTTER SUBSTITUTES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Mayne, Bill to regulate the importation, manufacture, and sale of Butter Substitutes, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Mayne, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Lane, Mr. Biggar, and Mr. Kenny.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 48.]

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (EVENING SCHOOLS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. James Stuart, Bill to make further provision for instruction in Evening Schools, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. James Stuart, Mr. A. H. Dyke Acland, Mr. H. J. Wilson, Mr. T. E. Ellis, and Sir Henry Roscoe.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 49.]

TECHNICAL EDUCATION (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Hooper, Bill to promote Technical Education in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Hooper, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Dwyer Gray.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 50.]

ACCESS TO MOUNTAINS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Bryce, Bill to secure to the public the right of Access to Mountains and Moorlands in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Bryce, Mr. Haldane, Mr. J. C. Bolton, Sir Henry Roscoe, Mr. Donald Crawford, and Mr. A. L. Brown.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 51.]

CROFTERS (SCOTLAND) ACT (1886) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Dr. Clark, Bill to amend the Crofters (Scotland) Act (1886), and to extend it to the whole of Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Dr. Clark, Mr. Barclay, Mr. Esslemont, Dr. M'Donald, and Mr. Mackintosh.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 52.]

CHURCH SITES (COMPULSORY POWERS REPEAL) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Francis Powell, Bill to repeal the provisions of the Church Building Acts relating to the compulsory purchase of sites for Churches and Burial Grounds, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Francis Powell, Mr. John Talbot, Mr. Addison, and Mr. Tomlinson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 53.]

FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Harrington, Bill to amend the Law relating to Fisheries in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Harrington, Mr. Sexton, Mr. J. A. Blake, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Hooper, and Mr. O'Hea.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 54.]

HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Pyne, Bill to provide for the better Housing of the Working Classes, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Pyne, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Dr. Fox, Mr. P. J. Power, and Mr. Quinn.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 55.]

TECHNICAL EDUCATION (DAY SCHOOLS) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Henry Roscoe, Bill to make further provision for technical instruction, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Henry Roscoe, Sir Lyon Playfair, Mr. Dixon, Sir John Lubbock, and Sir Richard Temple.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 56.]

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Biggar, Bill to amend and extend the Laws relating to Piers and Harbours in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Biggar, Mr. Deasy, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Mahony, Mr. Jordan, and Mr. Corbett.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 57.]

QUARRIES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Thomas Blake, Bill to provide for the fencing of Quarries, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Thomas Blake, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Burt, Mr. Cobb, and Mr. Abraham (Glamorgan).

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 58.]

SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. M'Lagan, Bill to amend the Law relating to School Board Elections in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Shiress Will, and Mr. Lacaita.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 59.]

ALLOTMENTS OF LAND BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Jesse Collings, Bill to facilitate the creation of Allotments of Land, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Newnes, Mr. Cyril Flower, Mr. Winterbotham, and Mr. Pitt-Lewis.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 60.]

VESTRYMEN'S QUALIFICATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. James Rowlands, Bill for the abolition of the Ratal Qualifications for Members of Vestries, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. James Rowlands, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Howell, Mr. Pickersgill, and Mr. James Stuart.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 61.]

PAUPER LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND) (SUPERANNUATION) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Chance, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Superannuation of Officers and Servants in Pauper Lunatic Asylums in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Chance and Mr. William Corbet.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 62.]

SETTLED LAND ACTS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Elton, Bill to amend the Settled Land Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Elton, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Puleston, nd Mr. Tomlinson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 63.]

TOBACCO CULTIVATION (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Flynn, Bill to permit the Cultivation of Tobacco in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Flynn, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. Pyne, and Mr. Mayne.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 64.]

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT (NO. 3) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. T. W. Russell, Bill to amend the Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) in regard to Leaseholders, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. T. W. Russell, Lord Ernest Hamilton, Mr. Lea, Mr. Johnston, and Mr. Sinclair.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 65.]

FAIRS AND MARKETS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Dr. Tanner, Bill to amend the Law relating to Tolls at Fairs and Markets in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Dr. Tanner, Dr. Commins, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Lane, and Mr. Healy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 66.]

LEASEHOLD ENFRANCHISEMENT (BY PURCHASE OR RENT-CHARGE) BILL.

On Motion of Colonel Hughes, Bill to enable certain Leaseholders to acquire the Freehold of their property, by paying compensation or (at the option of the Freeholder) a perpetual rent, *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel Hughes, Mr. Fulton, Mr. Evelyn, Mr. Holloway, and Major Banes.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 67.]

PORT AND HARBOUR AUTHORITIES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Peter M'Donald, Bill to amend the Law relating to Port and Harbour Authorities in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Thomas Mayne, and Mr. Hooper.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 68.]

BANKRUPTCY COURT (BELFAST) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Ewart, Bill to establish a Local Court of Bankruptcy in Belfast, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Ewart, Sir James Corry, Mr. William Johnston, and Mr. Macartney.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 69.]

MARKET TOLLS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Captain M'Calmont, Bill to facilitate the payment and recovery of Tolls in Fairs and Markets in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Captain M'Calmont, Mr. Smith Barry, and Mr. Macartney.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 70.]

VOTERS QUALIFICATION AND PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Cremer, Bill to amend the Laws with respect to the Qualification and Registration of Voters and the conduct of Parliamentary Elections, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Cremer, Mr. Burt, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Pickard, and Mr. James Rowlands.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 71.]

OFFICE UNDER THE CROWN (VACATING OF SEATS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. W. F. Lawrence, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Vacation of Seats by Members of the Commons House of Parliament accepting office under the Crown, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. W. F. Lawrence, Mr. A. D. Elliot, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Francis Stevenson, and Mr. E. Robertson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 72.]

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACTS (IRELAND) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Sir James Corry, Bill to amend the Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Act, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir James Corry, Mr. Ewart, and Mr. Johnston.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 73.]

BELFAST GOVERNMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Nolan, Bill for the better Government of Belfast, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Nolan, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Mr. Healy, Mr. M'Cartan, and Mr. O'Kelly.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 74.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CLOSING OF PUBLIC HOUSES) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Shirley, Bill for the Closing of Public Houses on the Polling Day in Parliamentary Elections, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Shirley, Mr. Game, Mr. T. W. Russell, and Mr. Caleb Wright.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 75.]

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT (1854) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. King, Bill to amend "The Merchant Shipping Act, 1854, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. King, Mr. Baggallay, Mr. Fitzgerald, and Mr. Lacaita.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 76.]

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS (SCOTLAND) (CORRUPT PRACTICES) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Lacaita, Bill to amend the Law relating to Corrupt Practices at Municipal Elections in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Lacaita, Mr. Edmund Robertson, and Mr. Shiress Will.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 77.]

STEAM ENGINES AND BOILERS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. William Crawford, Bill to provide for the examination of persons having charge of Steam Engines and Boilers on land, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. William Crawford, Mr. Burt, Mr. William Abraham (Glamorgan), Mr. Pickard, Mr. Fenwick, and Mr. A. H. Dyke Acland.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 78.]

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Sutherland, Bill to amend the provisions of the Education (Scotland) Acts relating to the payment of school fees for children of poor parents, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Buchanan, Dr. Farquharson, and Mr. Thorburn.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 79.]

OPEN SPACES (DUBLIN) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. William Redmond, Bill to provide for Open Spaces and Public Recreation Grounds in Dublin, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. William Redmond, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dwyer Gray, and Mr. Timothy Harrington.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 80.]

POLICE FORCE ENFRANCHISEMENT (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Seton-Karr, Bill to extend the Parliamentary Franchise to the Police Forces of the United Kingdom, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Seton-Karr, Mr. Puleston, Colonel Saunderson, Mr. Bigwood, and Viscount Curzon.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 81.]

METROPOLIS GOVERNMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Isaacs, Bill for the better Local Government of the Metropolis and other matters connected therewith, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Isaacs, Mr. Kimber, Major-General Goldsworthy, Mr. Baumann, Sir Albert Kaye Rollit, Mr. Morgan Howard, Mr. Hunt, Sir Guyer Hunter, and Colonel Duncan.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 82.]

LEASEHOLDS (PURCHASE OF FREEHOLDS) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Bill to facilitate, on equitable conditions, the conversion of long Leasehold Tenures of houses in towns into Freehold, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. John O'Connor, and Mr. Connolly.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 83.]

RELIGIOUS PROSECUTIONS ABOLITION BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill for the abolition of Prosecutions against laymen for the expression of opinion on matters of religion.

Resolution *reported* :— Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Courtney Kenny, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Coleridge, and Mr. Crossley.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 84.]

HIGH SHERIFF DISQUALIFICATION (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Alderman John O'Connor, Bill to remove the disqualification of holders of retail spirit licences in Ireland from filling the office of High Sheriff, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Alderman John O'Connor, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. Cox, and Mr. John O'Connor.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 85.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (TRANSMISSION OF MONEY) BILL.

On Motion of Viscount Curzon, Bill for the free transmission through the Post Office of benefits from Friendly Societies to their members, *ordered* to be brought in by Viscount Curzon, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Captain Fellowes, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Godson, and Sir Albert Rollit.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 86.]

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Channing, Bill to amend the Law relating to Agricultural Holdings in England, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Cobb, and Mr. Francis Stevenson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 87.]

BANKRUPTCY (COUNTY COURTS) (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Mulholland, Bill to grant more extensive powers to County Court Judges in Ireland in cases of Bankruptcy, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Mulholland, Colonel King-Harman, Colonel Waring, Mr. Macartney, and Mr. O'Neill.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 88.]

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Watt, Bill to amend "The Electric Lighting Act, 1882," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Watt, Mr. Graham, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Howell, and Mr. Crossley.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 89.]

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE QUALIFICATION (ABOLITION) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Arthur Williams, Bill to render unnecessary any Qualification by Estate for Justices of the Peace in Counties, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Winterbotham, and Mr. Burt.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 90.]

CORN SALES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Rankin, Bill to provide for greater uniformity in the weights and measures used in the Sale of Corn, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Rankin, Sir Joseph R. Bailey, Mr. H. T. Davenport, and Mr. Williamson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 91.]

ASSISTANT COUNTY SURVEYORS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Macartney, Bill to enable Grand Juries in Ireland to increase the remuneration of Assistant County Surveyors, and for other purposes relating thereto, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Macartney, Colonel King-Harman, and Colonel Waring.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 92.]

AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS' WAGES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Charles Acland, Bill to amend the Law relating to the payment of Wages to Agricultural Labourers and others, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Charles Acland, Mr. Theodore Fry, Mr. Channing, Mr. Cossham, and Mr. Stewart.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 93.]

BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. John O'Connor, Bill to amend the Law relating to Bankruptcy and Bankruptcy arrangements in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Sexton, and Mr. M'Cartan.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 94.]

BEER ADULTERATION (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Edward Birkbeck, Bill for better securing the Purity of Beer, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Edward Birkbeck, Baron Dimsdale, Sir Savile Crossley, Mr. Charles Hall, Mr. Fellowes, and Baron F. de Rothschild.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 95.]

STEAM BOILERS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. William Abraham, Bill to provide for the better control and management of Steam Boilers, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. William Abraham, Mr. Nolan, and Mr. Flynn.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 96.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

On Motion of Sir Joseph Pease, Bill for closing public houses on Sunday, making exception for the Sale of Beer during certain hours, and for the Metropolitan District, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Joseph Pease, Sir Charles Palmer, and Mr. Isaac Wilson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 97.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (CORRUPT PRACTICES) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. De Lisle, Bill to amend the Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt Practices) Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. De Lisle, Colonel Saunderson, Mr. Webster, and Mr. Macartney.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 98.]

EARLY CLOSING BILL.

On Motion of Sir John Lubbock, Bill to provide for the Earlier Closing of Shops, and to make further provision with respect to trading on Sunday, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir John Lubbock, Mr. John Barry, Mr. Burt, Mr. A. Cohen, Mr. Cameron Corbett, and Mr. Whitley.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 99.]

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACT (1886) AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Anderson, Bill to extend the provisions of "The Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, 1886," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Anderson, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Wallace, and Mr. Provand.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 100.]

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT (1874) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. O'Neill, Bill to amend "The Building Societies Act, 1874," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. O'Neill, Colonel Waring, and Colonel Saunderson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 101.]

SUFFRAGANS' NOMINATION BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend an Act of 26 Hen. 8, c. 14, intituled "An Act for nomination of Suffragans and their Consecration."

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. John Talbot, Mr. Powell, Baron Dimsdale, Admiral Field, Mr. Dixon-Hartland, and Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 102.]

PRIVATE LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. William Corbet, Bill to alter and amend the Law relating to Private Lunatic Asylums in Ireland, and to make other and more suitable provision for paying patients, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. William Corbet, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. P. J. Power, Dr. Cameron, and Mr. Molloy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 103.]

OATHS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law as to Oaths.

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Bradlaugh, Sir John Simon, Mr. Courtney Kenny, Mr. Burt, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Richard, and Mr. Jesse Collings.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 104.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (IRELAND) ACT (1878) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Lea, Bill to amend and render perpetual "The Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Act, 1878," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Lea, Sir James Corry, Mr John Blake, Mr. Ewart, Mr. John Redmond, and Mr. T. W. Russell.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 105.]

SCHOOL FEES (NON-PAUPERS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Llewellyn, Bill to amend the Law relating to the payment of School Fees of Non-Pauper Children, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Llewellyn, Sir Richard Paget, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Whitmore, and Mr. Quilter.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 106.]

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Craig Sellar, Bill to amend the system of Private Bill Legislation in the United Kingdom, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Craig Sellar, Sir Lyon Playfair, Mr. Howorth, Mr. John Morley, and Mr. Arthur Elliot.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 107.]

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (FIRE BRIGADE EXPENSES) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Webster, Bill to amend the Law relating to the expenses of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Webster, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Mr. Tatton Egerton, Mr. Cochrane-Baillie, and Mr. Isaacson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 108.]

TOWN HOLDINGS.

Ordered, That the Select Committee be reappointed to inquire into the terms of occupation and the compensation for improvements possessed by the occupiers of Town Houses and Holdings in Great Britain and Ireland; and to inquire into the expediency of giving to leaseholders facilities for the purchase of the fee simple of their property; and also into the question of imposing a direct assessment on the owners of ground rents, and on the owners of increased values imparted to land by building operations or other improvements. — (*Colonel Nolan.*)

TRUCK BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend and extend the Law relating to Truck.

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Warmington, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Howard Vincent, and Mr. Esslemont.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 109.]

TREES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Chance, Bill to encourage the planting of Trees in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Chance, Mr. Gilhooly, Mr. Marum, Mr. P. J. O'Brien, Mr. Sheehan, and Sir Joseph M'Kenna.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 110.]

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SATURDAY (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. T. W. Russell, Bill to close Public Houses in Ireland at an earlier hour on Saturdays, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Johnston, and Mr. Lea.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 111.]

SMALL HOLDINGS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Jesse Collings, Bill to facilitate the creation of Small Holdings of Land, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Newnes, Mr. Flower, Mr. Winterbotham, and Mr. Pitt-Lewis.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 112.]

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT (NO. 4) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Lea, Bill to amend the Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) with regard to Turbary, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Lea, Mr. T. W. Russell, and Mr. Sinclair.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 113.]

FISHINGS, &C. VALUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Caldwell, Bill to amend the Laws relating to the Valuation and Assessment of fishings, woods, copse, and underwood in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Caldwell, Dr. Cameron, and Dr. Clark.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 114.]

FREE LIBRARIES ACTS CONSOLIDATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Caldwell, Bill to amend and consolidate the Free Libraries Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Caldwell, Dr. Cameron, and Mr. Cameron Corbett.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 115.]

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES (PENSIONS) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Richard Temple, Bill to enable Municipal Corporations to grant Pensions to Stipendiary Magistrates, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Richard Temple, Mr. Hastings, and Mr. Godson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 116.]

PERPETUAL PENSIONS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire how far the several hereditary pensions, allowances, and payments ought to be continued, having due regard to any just claims of the respective recipients, and to economy in the public expenditure; and, further, to inquire into the circumstances of the commutation of hereditary pensions, allowances, and payments which have been commuted since the 1st day of January 1881. That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records."

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Mr. Bradlaugh.*)

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (THEATRES, &C.) BILL.

On Motion of Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Bill to confer further powers upon the Metropolitan Board of Works for inspecting Theatres and Music Halls, and granting Certificates, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Mr. Tatton Egerton, and Mr. R. G. Webster.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 117.]

METROPOLIS MANAGEMENT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Bill to confer further powers with respect to the subsoil of streets and to the laying of mains or pipes in the Metropolis, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Colonel Hughes, Mr. Whitmore, and Sir Algernon Borthwick.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 118.]

FELONIOUS USE OF FIREARMS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Howard Vincent, Bill for the better prevention of the felonious use of Firearms and other Weapons, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Howard Vincent, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Seager Hunt, Mr. Lawson, and Mr. Hulse.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 119.]

SHIPWRECK BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Howard Vincent, Bill for the better prevention of loss of life in cases of Shipwreck, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Howard Vincent and Sir Edward Birkbeck.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 120.]

PUBLIC TRUSTEE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Howard Vincent, Bill to provide for the appointment of a Public Trustee, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Howard Vincent, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Edward Russell, and Mr. Anderson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 121.]

FREE LIBRARIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Sir John Lubbock, Bill to amend the Free Libraries Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Arthur Cohen, Mr. Collins, Sir John Kennaway, and Sir Lyon Playfair.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 122.]

PRIMOGENITURE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Courtney Kenny, Bill to alter the Law relating to the descent of land by the custom of Primogeniture, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Courtney Kenny, Mr. Courtney, and Mr. Milnes-Gaskell.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 123.]

BANKRUPTCY COURTS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Sexton, Bill to establish certain Courts of Bankruptcy in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Sexton, Mr. Chance, Mr. O'Hea, Mr. M'Cartan, and Mr. Reynolds.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 124.]

SOLICITORS' ANNUAL CERTIFICATE DUTY BILL.

On Motion of Mr. O'Hea, Bill for the repeal of Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Sexton, Mr. A. O'Connor, and Mr. Deasy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 125.]

RAILWAY REGULATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Channing, Bill to make further provision for the safe Working of Railways, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Mr. Arthur Acland, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Charles Parker, Mr. Jacoby, and Mr. Lawson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 126.]

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House will, at the rising of the House this day, adjourn till *Monday* next.—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas.*)

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock till Monday next.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 31st January, 1887.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Lunacy Acts Amendment* (7); Lunacy* (8); Cathedral Churches* (9); Electric Lighting Act (1882) Amendment* (10).

Second Reading — Christchurch (Southampton) Charter (Correction of Error)* (4); Women's Suffrage* (5), *negatived*.

PRIVILEGE—"THE QUEEN *v.* LORD GRAVES."

OBSERVATIONS. QUESTION.

LORD RIBBLESDALE rose to call attention to the case of "The Queen *v.* Lord Graves," a trial recently held in the Court of Queen's Bench before the Lord Chief Justice. Lord Graves was put upon his trial, on the 19th of January, with another person, upon two indictments for felony, and one for misdemeanour against the defendant Lord Graves himself. As their Lordships were aware, a Peer charged with felony must be tried by his Peers. The misdemeanour in this case ended in an acquittal, and the learned counsel representing Lord Graves objected to his being tried for felony except by his Peers, and left the Court; but, in his absence, there being a desire that the felony indictments should be taken, a conversation arose as to the jurisdiction of the Court over him in the remaining cases, and something was said about a Peer being tried by his Peers, in the course of which the Lord Chief Justice stated in effect that there was no doubt in his mind that, provided Lord Graves was willing to waive his Privilege as a Peer, he could be tried by a common or special jury, and he cited the case of Lord Ferrers in support of his view, and as an illustration of the difficulty in the matter. As to the illustration of the difficulty in the case, so far from Lord Ferrers being tried by a common jury, he (Lord Ribblesdale) believed that a Commoner was raised to the Peerage to preside at the trial of Lord Ferrers by his Peers. That, of course, therefore, was a slip of memory on the part of the Lord Chief Justice. On hearing that, Lord Graves at once said he was prepared to waive his Privilege as a Peer, and he accordingly did so, and a verdict of "not guilty" was taken. He (Lord Ribblesdale) brought the question forward as a question of Privilege, because the matter placed their Lordships in this dilemma—that if a Peer could not waive his Privilege, then the action of the Queen against Lord Graves was from beginning to end a solemn informality. If he could waive his Privilege, it was certainly only since that trial; it never had been so ruled before the Lord Chief Justice's *dictum*. He would leave it to their Lordships to consider whether a precedent, evidently based on an error of memory, was a desirable precedent, or one of an authoritative kind. He wanted to know whether a Peer could waive that Privilege? It was not a personal Privilege, but it was a Privilege that belonged to the ancient constitution of the House of Lords; and his contention was that it was not in the power of a Peer to waive it, in the same way as he might do in the matter of precedence, say, in going down to dinner, or similar matters of that kind. All authority was against the Lord Chief Justice's view of the case. Before the trial of Lord Dacre he believed the 14 Puisne Judges of England met in solemn conclave, so as to be able to put on record their unanimous decision whether a Peer could waive his Privilege, and their opinion was that a Peer indicted for felony must be tried by a jury of his

Peers, and by no other jury. He did not care about the Privilege as an individual Member of their Lordships' House. It was, no doubt, a melancholy Privilege at best; but it was a matter of some importance affecting their Lordships' House as a constituted body. He believed, speaking of course under correction, that Lord Graves's waiver of Privilege was informal and impossible under the appointed constitution of the House of Lords; and under the circumstances, and with a view of getting the matter set at rest and that informality placed on record, he now asked the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, Whether a Peer indicted for felony is competent to waive the Privilege of being tried by his Peers? It did not belong to an individual simply as such, and he thought the subject should be set at rest by the highest authority.

LORD COLERIDGE (LORD CHIEF JUSTICE of ENGLAND), in reply, said, that, by the courtesy of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack (Lord Halsbury), he was allowed to say a few words to their Lordships before his noble and learned Friend answered the Question. It was right that their Lordships should know exactly how the facts stood; and how it was that the opinion, from which he certainly did not shrink, came to be given by him. Lord Graves and a gentleman named Keymer were indicted at the Central Criminal Court, and true bills were found against them in three cases; in one case for conspiring together in order to obtain money by false representations, and in two other cases for the forgery, in fact, of a large number of shares in the company called Lewthwaite and Co. Those indictments, having been duly found at the Old Bailey, were moved by *certiorari* into the Court of Queen's Bench, to be tried there by a jury, because it was supposed that questions of law might arise. The indictments came on before him without any notice, and without his having any idea that any question, either Constitutional or otherwise, could be raised on the trial of them. Before the indictments came on, the learned counsel who represented the prosecution, as well as those who represented the defendants, informed him that, if he saw no objection, it was desired that the prosecution should come to an end for want of evidence; and the prosecuting counsel, a very eminent and honourable man, instructed by a solicitor of the highest possible character, was satisfied by the evidence shown him in the briefs of Sir Henry James and his learned friend that it was useless to continue the prosecution, and that it would be a mere waste of time to go on with the trial, which could have only one result, and that a result favourable to the defendants. The matter was fully discussed before him, and it was necessary that his sanction should be given to the withdrawal of the prosecution; because the one case being misdemeanour and the two others being felonies, anything like withdrawal from a prosecution of that sort, especially in the case of a man of high social rank, if it were not sanctioned by the Judge, after inquiry by him, would be open to just and grave censure. It might be said that a very different measure of justice was meted out to defendants, according to whether or not they were of high rank in society. He, therefore, satisfied himself that he was fully entitled to trust the statements made by the learned counsel on both sides, and he gave his entire sanction to the withdrawal of the prosecution. He was not, at the time, aware of the form of the indictments, but only of the substance of the charges. The charge of misdemeanour was brought on, and resulted in the counsel stating in public what they had stated to him in private, and a verdict of acquittal being taken. Then arose the question of the two felonies, and Mr. Keymer, who was indicted jointly with Lord Graves, was anxious to get rid of the whole matter. Something was said about the difficulty connected with Lord Graves's Privilege as a Peer; and he (Lord Coleridge) said he saw no objection, if Lord Graves waived his Privilege, to the case being tried by a special jury. Lord Graves was present in person, and, addressing him (Lord Coleridge), stated that he desired to waive any Privilege he might possess, and that the trial might proceed. It was therefore agreed that the jury should be sworn, and they pronounced a verdict of "not guilty." He was also informed that it was immaterial whether Lord Graves really could or could not waive his Privilege; because, a communication of all the circumstances having been made to the Attorney General, the Attorney General undertook to do what he had a perfect right to do—namely, enter a *nolle prose-*

qui, and put an end to all questions in the matter. His (Lord Coleridge's) ruling, therefore, was, in fact, immaterial. He did not shrink from any censure, if it was due; but his ruling was absolutely immaterial, because the action of the Attorney General put an end to the case, whether he liked it or not, and whether the defendants liked it or not. Under these circumstances, he had said he was of opinion that the Privilege of Peerage might be waived by the person possessing it; that if he chose to throw himself on the country, and to be tried by the ordinary tribunal, he could do so; that it was a Privilege which belonged to Lord Graves, who could waive it if he liked, and if he desired the trial to proceed. It was proper to mention that the Peerage of Lord Graves was not stated in the indictment, for he was indicted as "commonly called Lord Graves," and had pleaded to an indictment so describing him; and he (Lord Coleridge) did not well see, as Lord Graves's Peerage was not stated as a fact, and as Lord Graves had pleaded to an indictment so describing him, how he (Lord Coleridge) could possibly avoid trying him. Those were the facts, and, under those circumstances, he had given the opinion which the noble Lord (Lord Ribblesdale) now challenged. He had justified it by a case as to which he admitted at once that he had made a mistake—the case of Lord Ferrers. As to Lord Ferrers he had been in error. *Foster's Crown Law* and the histories of the time ought to have been remembered by him. He frankly admitted that the case which occurred to him at the time, and on which he rested for justifying him in what he was doing, did not justify him at all. He had made a mistake, and there was an end of it so far as he was concerned. The question now arose, seeing that the case of Lord Ferrers did not support it, whether the opinion he gave on that occasion was, or was not, right in itself? Upon that point the statement of authorities was very curious. He did not say that the matter was clear; but he did say that there was a great deal more in favour of his view than he had certainly been aware of. He thought their Lordships would admit that there was a good deal to be said for the position that a Peer, when he liked, might waive his Privilege. Now, the matter stood in this way. In the first place, this was a Privilege which most undoubtedly did not exist, except in cases of treason or felony, and in cases of misprision of either. Not only was that laid down in books of authority, but a very moderate acquaintance with celebrated cases in modern times would show that the thing had been done; and Peers had been repeatedly tried by juries in cases which were not treason or felony, nor misprision of either. He might mention a good many cases; but he would content himself by citing the case of Lord Thanet, a very famous case tried before Lord Kenyon in 1798, in which Lord Thanet was defended by Lord Erskine. In more recent times there was the case of Lord Dunboyne, who was tried before Lord Campbell for misdemeanour in 1850. There were other cases, showing that there was no question that the Privilege—if it be a Privilege—applied to cases only of felony or treason, or misprision of either. It was so laid down in the books of authority; in any other class of offence a Peer must be tried by the jury, in the Court in which the indictment was found. So said Blackstone, Lord Coke, and others. In Hawkins's *Pleas of the Crown*, a book of great authority, it was said—

> "I take it to be agreed that he has a right to be tried by his Peers upon an indictment of treason or felony, whether made such by the common law or by statute, and also upon an indictment for misprision of treason or felony; but it seems that regularly he is to be tried by the country for all other crimes out of Parliament."

The question is also stated in this way further on in the same book—

> "It hath been adjudged that if a Peer, on an arraignment before the Lords, refuse to put himself upon his Peers, he shall be dealt with as one who stands mute; for it is as much the law of the land that a Peer be tried by his Peers as a Commoner by Commoners. Yet there is said to be a record in 4 *Edward* III. that Lord Berkeley put himself on his country, and was tried by a jury. Yet if one who has a title to Peerage be indicted or arraigned as a Commoner and plead not guilty, and put himself upon his country, it hath been adjudged that he cannot afterwards suggest that he is a Peer and pray a trial by his Peers."

It seemed to him to be clear, therefore, that it was only in the cases he had referred to that the argument applied; and it seemed to be allowed that if a Peer was indicted and put himself on the country, and afterwards claimed to be tried as a Peer, that then the case would be disallowed and it would be tried by the country. It was also curious to see on what ground the Privilege of Peerage and the impossibility of waiving it stood. As far as *dicta* were concerned, it stood, no doubt, on the highest authority. It would be found laid down by Lord Coke, and in a case reported by Lord Chief Justice Keeling. It was also curious to observe on what Lord Coke founded his *dictum*. He placed it on the words of Magna Charta, that no freeman should be imprisoned, and then went on—

> "This is to be understood of the King's sute, for the words be *nec super eum ibimus, nec super eum mittemus nisi per legale judicium parium suorum vel per legem terræ*."

Lord Coke, therefore, put it on the venerable Magna Charta, and on the ground that the King having undertaken not to prosecute, not to issue process, except *per legale judicium parium suorum*, it was a Privilege inherent in a Peer and could not be waived. But, speaking with the greatest deference of Lord Coke's authority, he (Lord Coleridge) did not say that he was wrong; but he did not explain how it was that the doctrine had no application to misdemeanour. The King was just as much a necessary party to a suit of misdemeanour as he was to a suit for treason or felony; and if it be true that the words of Magna Charta were the reason why a Peer must be tried by the Peers, because it was at the suit of the King, he asked how it was to be accounted for that during the earliest times, so far as he knew, the trials of Peers for misdemeanour had always been by the ordinary tribunals of the country, and not by the House of Lords? There was also the case of Lord Dacre, which was referred to by the noble Lord, and which was to be found in the reports of Lord Chief Justice Keeling. But it was a curious thing to see how that matter really stood. It was not a report of Lord Chief Justice Keeling's at all, who was Chief Justice in the time of Charles II. It was the report of a Judge, no doubt an excellent man, in the time of Henry VIII., and one of the Judges who sat on the trial of Sir Thomas More and Cardinal Fisher. Lord Dacre was tried, apparently in the time of Henry VIII., for being too friendly with the Scotch, who were at that time the King's enemies. It was true that the Judges were summoned for the trial of Lord Dacre; and, among other things, the Judges appear to have said that a Peer could not waive his Privilege. That was also true; but when they came to look at the authority which was cited, it was found that there was no judicial determination, and the decision had not the authority of Lord Chief Justice Keeling. The case of Lord Dorset, on the other hand, was the authority of a decided case, because, in that case, Lord Dorset had been indicted as a Commoner. He claimed that he was a Peer; but it was determined that, having once been indicted as a Commoner, he could not urge his Privilege as a Peer and must be tried by the country. There was also an interesting circumstance in this case. Lord Graves was not a Member of their Lordships' House. He was a Peer of Ireland; and, undoubtedly, upon unquestioned authority, if the case had happened before the Union, Lord Graves, for any offence committed in England, must have been tried by the country. The rule was the same as to Scottish Peers before the Union with Scotland, at the time of Queen Anne. A Peer of Scotland, if accused of any offence in this country, could not claim the Privilege of a Peer, but would have to be tried by the country, as was distinctly held in Lord Sanquhar's, a case reported by Lord Coke. By the last paragraph of the 4th Article of the Act of Union with Ireland there were expressions which seemed to say that all Privileges of trial of Peers of Ireland would henceforth be the same as in the case of Peers of the United Kingdom; but it appeared to be a curious thing to hold that, whereas, before 1800, if a Peer of Ireland had been guilty of offence in this country, he certainly would be tried by a jury, yet that since the Union such a person, although not a Member of the House of Lords, and having a right to sit in Parliament only under certain circumstances or by representation, should have a right to be tried by their Lordships' House. These were the authorities—and he had taken some trouble about the matter—which he had thought it right to bring before their Lordships. It struck him that there was much to be said for the view that this Privilege of the Peerage was a Privilege which a noble Lord might waive if he thought fit. So far as his present opinion went, he should think a Peer might do so; for the reasons given for the view that a Peer could not appeared to him as, if sound, it would carry the case of misdemeanours, to which, nevertheless, the Privilege in question had never, from the earliest times of our history, ever been applied. Whether the Privilege was one which, in the present day, it was advisable to maintain was a question on which he did not presume to offer an opinion to their Lordships. It was enough for him to say that he was by no means satisfied that he was wrong in the opinion which he gave, although he admitted that there were strong *dicta* against it, and that it was given without very much consideration, because of the reason which he had assigned to their Lordships—namely, that it was wholly immaterial in the particular case before him; and having said this much, and having thanked their Lordships for the attention which they had given to him, he now left the matter in their Lordships' hands.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY) said, that, owing to the accident of the position which he had the honour to hold, he was called upon to pronounce what came to be a dogmatic opinion, which he regretted was not in harmony with what his noble and learned Friend the Lord Chief Justice had just laid down. He thought it could hardly be doubted that, in every text-book, it was accepted as a fact that a Peer must be tried by his Peers for a felony, and by no one else. That had been the current of authorities broadly stated. He was aware of the phrase used in the new text-book of authority which his noble and learned Friend had referred to; but his noble and learned Friend's memory was playing him false in regard to the quotation in question from Hawkins. The language there was guarded; it did not say "a person who is a Peer," but "a person who has a title to the Peerage;" and it might well be thought that the learned writer had very accurately in his view the case referred to in the margin. Such was the point in the case quoted as the Marquess of Dorset's case. So far as one could judge from the report of that case, what happened was that, after the trial, the accused claimed, not that he was a Peer and had established his right to a Peerage, but that he was the person in whom the title to the Peerage was, and that, therefore, he was entitled to be tried by his Peers. So much for the authority of that case. He could not in any way concur with his noble and learned Friend as to the authority of Lord Dacre's case. He was indicted on a charge of high treason; the question was raised whether a Peer could waive his Privilege, and the Judges solemnly decided that he could not. The noble and learned Lord had argued that this rule never applied to misdemeanours; but he had not, he (Lord Halsbury) submitted, given sufficient value to the arguments of the learned Judges with reference to the chapter from Magna Charta which he had construed. It was quite true that the Privilege was applicable only to treason and to treason-felony; and, under the circumstances, it appeared to him that the learned Judges had placed on that chapter a just and proper construction. Speaking always with the deference due to the knowledge and experience of his noble and learned Friend the Lord Chief Justice of England, he was compelled, in answer to him, to say that, according to the best judgment he had been able to form, a Peer was not competent to waive his right to be tried by his Peers, because it was not in the proper sense a Privilege at all, and the difficulty had arisen from the misuse of the word. It was called a Privilege, but that was a misnomer. If the reasoning of the Judges was right, the ground on which it rested was that the Statute—and that was what the Judges said in Lord Dacre's case—prohibited the Crown from proceeding against the Peer except by judgment of his Peers; and if it was a statutable prohibition, he need not tell their Lordships that that was a matter which they could not waive, because it was simply a question of law.

LORD FITZGERALD said, he should hesitate very much before he adopted the view of the case that had been put forward by the noble and learned Lord the Chief Justice. For himself, he thought that this question of trial by Peers was not one of Privilege, but rather of jurisdiction. Magna Charta was a declaration of the previous law of England, and it contained negative words to the effect that a Peer was only to be tried by his Peers—namely—

> "Nullus liber homo capiatur, &c. . . . nisi per legale judicium parium suorum vel per legem terræ."

It was also laid down that—

> "An Earl or Baron shall not be amerced but by their Peers and according to the manner of their offence."

In 1322 Thomas of Lancaster was executed after the Battle of Pomfret; but the judgment of forfeiture was reversed in 1327 on a Writ of Error, the principal ground being that the said Thomas was a Peer and Magnate, and had been adjudged to death otherwise than by the legal judgment of his Peers, the passage from Magna Charta being recited. The case of Lord Dacre was also a strong argument in favour of the view that the right of a Peer to be tried by his Peers was one which could not be waived. Looking, then, at the authorities on the subject, and at Constitutional history, he thought that it was shown to be not a Privilege of the individual, but a right of the House of Peers, which could never be taken from it except by Act of Parliament.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, that the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Coleridge) appeared to be under the impression that the right of a Peer to be tried by his Peers arose from his being a Lord of Parliament. In this instance he (the Earl of Milltown) ventured to think the noble and learned Lord was mistaken; it was a privilege of the Peerage, and had nothing to do with legislative rights. Bishops, though Lords of Parliament, were not triable of nobility, because they were not Peers. The Peers of Ireland and Scotland—whether in Parliament or not—had the right, because they were. Before the Union the Peers of Ireland—which was then a distinct Kingdom—were triable before their own House of Lords; and all their rights and privileges as Peers, except that of personally sitting in Parliament, were expressly reserved to them by Statute. The Act of Union made the two countries one Kingdom with one House of Lords.

LORD HERSCHELL said, he wished to point out that the question was one of some difficulty, and that a learned Judge was placed at some disadvantage in being called upon to decide a matter of this kind off-hand, without the opportunity of searching for precedents, and thus verifying his impressions. While there undoubtedly was some authority in favour of the decision arrived at in the matter by his noble and learned Friend the Lord Chief Justice of England, he (Lord Herschell) was of opinion that that authority was far outweighed by the authorities to the contrary. The case of the Marquess of Dorset was itself open to considerable criticism. He thought that his noble and learned Friend had shown that, on the occasion in question, he took the course which Judges frequently and necessarily took—of deciding according to the impression on his mind at the moment. He concurred with the view that had been expressed by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. For his own part, as far as he was able to judge, the better view seemed to be that a Peer could not waive his Privilege of trial by his Peers.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE BILL.—(No. 5.)

(*The Lord Denman.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD DENMAN, in moving the second reading of the Bill, said: My Lords, if my wife were to become a widow it would be very unfair if she, as a ratepayer, were unable to choose her Representative. On September 2 I moved the second reading of this Bill, in case the Houses of Parliament should have been adjourned instead of prorogued, in which case it might have been in a more forward state at this time. I hoped that only the report given by *The Morning Post* and the answer of the Lord Chancellor would have appeared in *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates;* but, to my surprise, I found an almost verbatim report of my speech. I venture to refer your Lordships to it. The excellent Rulers in the East and in the West to whom I alluded were a Princess of the Holkar Family, named in Sir J. Malcolm's *India*, and in the review of that work in *The Edinburgh Review*. Her only daughter was burnt at the funeral of her husband. The Potentate in the West was the Empress - Queen Maria Theresa, of whom the Hungarians exclaimed, "*Moriamur pro Maria Theresa Rege Nostra.*" Her Majesty's beloved daughter—Marie Antoinette—was beheaded in France. For ladies of courage, I named (in the presence of one, now of two, of her descendants) the Countess of Derby, who defended Lathom House. Her lord was beheaded. On the occasion of ladies being admitted to this House, the Leader of the Opposition, in answer to Lord Redesdale, said it reminded him of a gentleman who said the sight of ladies at a dinner table took away his appetite. The Earl of Redesdale, in 1869, said, on the Municipal Corporation Amendment Bill, that women were not capable of the higher duties which some wished to trust them with; but I will lay upon the Table of your Lordships' House a preface by a lady to her translation (dated 1848) of a speech by M. Begnon, in the Chamber of Deputies, in Paris, in 1821, on the Persecution and Proscription of the Jews—it proves the capacity of at least one woman. With regard to the choice of Members of Parliament, I will only say that if Mr. Bradlaugh were a candidate for Exeter in opposition to her son, I should consider it extremely unjust if the honoured Countess of Iddesleigh were (if a householder) prevented from voting.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Denman.*)

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY): I do not desire to express any opinion upon the subject which the noble Lord has brought forward, not for the first time. It is, I admit, a subject of very great interest, and one on which I should think there is very considerable feeling among great numbers of the public out-of-doors; but the point to which I wish to draw his attention is that, as far as I know, it is not usual for either House of Parliament to undertake legislation for the purpose of altering the constitution of the other House. To initiate such legislation, though not beyond our powers, would be, to a certain extent, a breach of Parliamentary etiquette. The Government, therefore, propose to reserve their opinion upon the subject-matter of the Bill, until the question shall have been dealt with in the other House. On that ground alone, and without entering into the general question, I move, as an Amendment, that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("now") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day six months.")—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion?

Resolved in the *negative.*

Bill to be read 2ª *this day six months.*

ROLL OF THE LORDS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table: The same was ordered to be *printed.* (No. 6.)

LUNACY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.] (NO. 7)

A Bill to amend the Acts relating to lunatics: And

LUNACY BILL [H.L.] (NO. 8)

A Bill to consolidate the enactments respecting lunatics:
Were *presented* by The LORD CHANCELLOR; read 1ª

CATHEDRAL CHURCHES BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to provide for making Statutes respecting deans and chapters and cathedral churches in England; and for other purposes relating thereto—Was *presented* by The Lord Bishop of CARLISLE; read 1ª. (No. 9.)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Electric Lighting Act, 1882—Was *presented* by The Lord THURLOW; read 1ª. (No. 10.)

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 31*st January*, 1887.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEES — Public Petitions, *appointed* and *nominated;* Printing, *appointed* and *nominated;* Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (House of Commons), *appointed* and *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee—Ordered—First Reading* — Merchandise Marks Act (1862) Amendment * [142].

Ordered—First Reading—Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to Women) * [128]; Borough Funds * [129]; Coal Mines, &c. Regulation * [130]; Criminal Law (Scotland) Procedure * [131]; First Offenders * [132]; Agricultural Tenants Relief * [133]; Deacons (Church of England) * [134]; Hyde Park Corner (New Streets) * [135]; Public Parks and Works (Metropolis) * [136]; Lodgers' Goods Protection Act (1871) Amendment * [137]; Ballot Act (1872) Amendment * [138]; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Cornwall) * [139]; Miners' Wages Payment * [140]; Water Companies (Regulation of Powers) * [141]; Rod Fishing (Scotland) * [143]; Sites for Churches, &c. Ireland * [144]; Sanitation of Houses (Metropolis) * [145].

Second Reading—Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) * [1].

Provisional Order Bill — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) * [127].

MOTION.

NEW WRIT FOR THE BOROUGH OF ST. GEORGE'S, HANOVER SQUARE.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Saint George's, Hanover Square, in the room of Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, esquire, commonly called Lord Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, who since his Election for the said Borough hath accepted the Office of Steward or Bailiff of Her Majesty's Manor of Northstead, in the County of York."—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas.*)

Sir WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): I rise, Sir, as an elector for the Division of St. George's, Hanover Square. It appears to me that this is a very hasty proceeding. The constituency has had no information until this morning that there was likely to be a vacancy. Do you not think, Sir, that it would be more seemly to delay the issue of this Writ, at any rate until to-morrow? I think Notice ought to have been given formally before the Writ was moved; and if the Motion is pressed I shall take the liberty of moving that the debate be adjourned.

After a pause—

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any hon. Member second that Motion?

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to second the Motion, Sir.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 93; Noes 173: Majority 80.—(Div. List, No 1.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to*.

Ordered, That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Saint George's, Hanover Square, in the room of Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, esquire, commonly called Lord Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, who since his Election for the said Borough hath accepted the Office of Steward or Bailiff of Her Majesty's Manor of Northstead, in the County of York.

QUESTIONS.

SCOTLAND—THE TRUCK ACTS—MINES AND WORKS IN SCOTLAND.

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he can now give the House any information as to the inquiries promised last Session into the alleged prevalence of Truck in Scotland; whether any breaches of the Truck Acts have been discovered, and to what extent; whether any and what steps have in any case been taken to enforce the law; and, if no prosecutions have taken place, whether he will state the reasons for not prosecuting; and, whether he is prepared to lay upon the Table of the House the various statements made to him alleging breaches of the Truck Acts in Scotland, and the correspondence thereon with the Inspectors of Mines, Inspectors of Factories, and other officials?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said, the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories in Scotland was now in the hands of the printer, and as soon as it was ready he would be happy to show it to the hon. Member. He believed it would contain answers to several of the hon. Member's Questions; but he could not anticipate the Report. He must decline to lay on the Table any documents which were of a confidential character, or that related to matters that might lead to a prosecution.

BURMAH — MILITARY EXPEDITION TO THE RUBY MINES — MESSRS. STREETER.

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Under Secretary of State for

India, Whether any gentlemen connected with Messrs. Streeter, jewellers, London, were present with the military expedition to the Ruby Mines in Burmah; and, if yes, in what capacity they were present, and by whose permission or authority; and, whether any agreement has been made between the Government and any person relative to the working of such mines?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): Mr. Streeter, junior, accompanied the expedition to the Ruby Mines in Burmah, in his private capacity, with the permission of the British authorities. No agreement has been made between the Government and any person relative to working the mines.

LAW AND JUSTICE—CASE OF THOMAS THOMPSON, CONVICTED OF MURDER.

MR. W. H. JAMES (Gateshead) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has directed, or proposes to direct, an inquiry to take place into the mental condition of Thomas Thompson, now lying under sentence of death in Durham Gaol, for the murder of his child at Gateshead on the 16th instant?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said, he had directed all such inquiries to be made as were necessary and proper to enable him to advise Her Majesty as to the exercise of her prerogative of mercy; but he could not enter into any detailed statement as to a criminal case still under consideration.

HAMPTON COURT PALACE—SAFETY OF THE ART TREASURES, &c.

MR. DIXON-HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether, in view of two fires having taken place at Hampton Court Palace during the last four years, he is prepared to take any, and, if so, what, steps for the preservation of the Art Treasures in that Palace from further risk of destruction?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): The question of the safety of the works of art at Hampton Court was carefully considered by a Departmental Committee after the fire which occurred in the Palace in 1882, and on the recommendations of that Committee measures were taken for affording them protection; for instance, structural alterations were made in the galleries, by which they were subdivided into compartments, separated by fireproof partitions; and elaborate arrangements were devised for facilitating the removal of the pictures and tapestries in case of fire. Since the fire of last November the subject has again been very fully gone into by the Departmental Committee; and they have come to the conclusion that the precautions taken after the fire in 1882, with some modifications of detail, are sufficient for the safety of these works of art.

MR. DIXON-HARTLAND asked if the First Commissioner was satisfied that there was no risk to the pictures in the event of another fire breaking out? There had been two fires in four years.

MR. PLUNKET said, he was satisfied that the pictures were as safe in Hampton Court as they could be in almost any building they could be removed to; and certainly the country air, he was assured on the best authority, agreed with them better than London air would do.

LAW AND JUSTICE—THE REVISED STATUTES—ISSUE OF A NEW AND CHEAP EDITION.

MR. HOWELL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government has, during the Recess, considered the question addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer last Session, as to the advisability of issuing in a cheaper form a new and revised edition of the Statutes, with Index and Tables up to date; and, whether Her Majesty's Government will undertake that such new edition shall be issued with the view of bringing the Statute Law of England within the means and reach of a larger class of readers?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I am informed that the question of a new and revised edition of the Statutes is under the consideration of the Statute Law Committee, and with it the question of a cheaper form of edition. The Committee have not, as yet, made their formal recommendation, as there are many details connected with a new edition which require settlement; but I may be allowed to state that I sympathize with the object which the hon. Member has in view, and I hope it may be attained.

LAW AND JUSTICE—CODIFICATION OF THE CRIMINAL LAW.

MR. HOWELL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government has considered the question addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer last Session, as to the advisability of introducing a Bill during the present Session to Consolidate and Codify the Criminal Law; and, whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce a Bill with that object this Session?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): It is not the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill during this Session to consolidate and codify the Criminal Law; but certain proposals with regard to the amendment of the Criminal Law will be brought before Parliament.

COMMISSIONERS OF EDUCATION (IRELAND)—SCHOOL LANDS AT CAVAN.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Commissioners of Education, of which body the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Lord Chancellor, and Senior Member of Dublin University, are *ex-officio* members, were applied to early in November, and again in December, 1886, by the tenants on the school lands adjoining Cavan, for an abatement in the year's rent; whether they were guided by the advice of their land agent, J. J. Benison, Ballyconnell, in offering on 10 per cent; whether the same land agent last year, when agricultural produce brought much higher prices, advised a reduction of 15 per cent; whether, whilst negotiations were proceeding between the tenants and Commissioners, within the knowledge of Mr. Benison, he issued civil bills and ejectments against a number of the tenants; whether, notwithstanding the production in Court of Letters from seven of the Commissioners denying all knowledge of the matter, he pressed for and obtained decrees; whether a number of the tenantry have lodged with the secretary declarations of their inability to pay; and, whether, under these conditions, he, acting as one of the Board, will permit the enforcement of these decrees?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I find from a Report, made by the Secretary to the Commissioners of Education, that the Board was applied to in November and December last by the Cavan tenants for an abatement in the year's rent. The matter received the most careful consideration of the Commissioners, and they resolved to grant an abatement of 10 per cent. The Board declined to disclose the confidential communications made between themselves and their agent. No negotiations were proceeding between the tenants and the Commissioners at the time that the civil bills for rent and one ejectment process were issued by the agent, Mr. Benison. The resolution of the Board to grant 10 per cent abatement had been arrived at in November, and confirmed in December, and this offer of 10 per cent had been made by Mr. Benison to the tenants. The tenants had been informed by the Secretary that all communications with the Board should be made through Mr. Benison, and in reply their representative stated that he was of opinion they would not do so. Mr. Benison appointed the 9th of December for payment of rent, when the tenants refused to meet him. He again appointed the 22nd of December, when but one tenant paid. It was thereupon that the agent issued civil bills for rent and one ejectment process. Upon the 22nd of December the tenants wrote to the Board, and a few days later to various members of the Board individually, to the effect that they did not consider the 10 per cent abatement sufficient, and requesting that the matter should be again considered. At the next meeting (January 13) the Commissioners decided not to alter their previous decisions. The Board have no information as to any letters from individual members produced in Court. Ten of the tenants have within the past week forwarded through the post to the Secretary declarations of their inability to pay their rents. The constitution of the Board being well known, it can hardly be necessary that I should trouble the House by repeating the names of the Commissioners. The quorum is fixed by the Statute at three, and the average attendance was, I am informed, rather above that number in the period mentioned. The Commissioners do not feel called upon to publish the names of the members of their body present at any particular meeting. It is a fact that the Chief Secretary for Ireland was made an *ex-officio* member of this Board by a Statute passed in 1813. But as no Chief Secretary has attended the meetings for many years, and I am quite unable to do so, I can take no responsibility for the acts of the Board.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1881—SUB-COMMISSIONERS—SITTINGS AT KILKENNY.

MR. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the sitting of the Sub-Commissioners under "The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881," at Kilkenny has been postponed from a date before to a date after the 25th March next; whether, in consequence of such postponement, tenants who have applied to have fair rents fixed will become liable to the payment of a half-year's rent, from the 25th March next, at a rate which the said Sub-Commissioners' decisions may show to be unjust and excessive; and, whether steps will be taken to have the sittings of the Sub-Commissioners held before the above date?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Land Commissioners inform me that the sitting of the Sub-Commission at Kilkenny is fixed for a date prior to the 25th of March—namely, the 15th of March—and that there is no intention of postponing it.

METROPOLIS—RENEWAL OF THE COAL AND WINE DUES.

MR. BUXTON (Essex, Walthamstow) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government adhere to the decision of the noble Lord the Member for Paddington in regard to the renewal of the Coal and Wine Dues; or, whether they intend to support the renewal of these dues; if so, whether they will strictly limit the period of renewal, and will secure that the proceeds of the dues shall be applied to the erection of free communications across the Thames east of Tower Bridge, and of open spaces in London generally?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): In answer to the hon. Member, it is the intention of the Government to adhere to the declarations of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) on the subject of the Coal and Wine Dues; but I must remind the hon. Gentleman that my noble Friend expressly invited the inhabitants of the districts affected by the proposals in question to make their wishes known to Parliament through their Representative Bodies and their Members in this House; and he assured them that due consideration would be given by Her Majesty's Government to those opinions when they were expressed.

LIGHTHOUSE ILLUMINANTS—EXPERIMENTS AT THE SOUTH FORELAND.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, When the Correspondence between the Trinity House, the Board of Trade, Mr. J. R. Wigham, Mr. Howard Grubb, F.R.S., Professor Barrett, and shipowners of various ports, on the subject of the Report of the Trinity House on the experiments made by that Corporation with lighthouse illuminants at South Foreland, which at the close of last Session the right hon. Gentleman promised should be laid on the Table as soon as practicable, will be ready for presentation to Parliament?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Correspondence referred to by the hon. Member was laid by me on the Table of the House and ordered to be printed on Thursday last.

ORANGE SOCIETIES—OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND MILITIA.

MR. P. O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he is aware that officers of the Army and Militia in the North of Ireland are members of Orange Lodges in the districts where they are stationed; whether an Address was carried in this House in 1836, praying His Majesty to take such measures as should be effectual for the suppression of Orange Societies; whether, in consequence of this Resolution of the House of Commons, orders were issued from the War Office prohibiting all persons in the Naval or Military Service from having any connection with Orangeism; whether Queen's Regulations were also issued by Her Majesty to the same effect; and, whether such Regulations are still in force;

and, if not, whether, in view of recent events in the North of Ireland, and particularly of the fact that it has been necessary to rely largely on the Military for the suppression of riots, in which Orangemen take a large part, it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to re-issue or enforce these Regulations?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) (who replied) said: In answer to the first Question, I would say that I have no knowledge of the political views of officers in the Army in their private capacities, and therefore I have no means of knowing whether they belong to Orange Lodges or not. As to the second and third Questions, such an Address was carried in Parliament on the 11th of August, 1835, and an Order was issued by the Adjutant General on the 31st of August, 1835, peremptorily forbidding the attendance of either officer or soldier at Orange Lodges, by whomsoever or wheresoever held. Fourthly, the King's Regulations of June 1, 1837, embodied the Order of 1835, and it was included in any edition of the Queen's Regulations up to the year 1868. Since then it has not been considered necessary to refer specifically in the Queen's Regulations to Orange Lodges; but the end is held to be sufficiently met by the Regulation still in force, which prohibits officers and soldiers from instituting or taking any part in any meeting, demonstration, or procession for party or political purposes, in barracks, quarters, or camp, or in their vicinity and anywhere, if in uniform. I would, at the same time, refer to the answer made by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) on February 21, 1884, in which he refused to regard a military man as being deprived of his civil rights, which he would be, if debarred entirely from attending political meetings. With that opinion I agree.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACTS—LEGISLATION.

MR. BROADHURST (Nottingham, W.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether it is the intention of the Government to propose legislation this Session on the question of employers' liability for injuries to their workpeople?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Yes; it is the intention of the Government to propose legislation this Session dealing with the question of employers' liability for injuries to their workpeople.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—THE LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS.

MR. O'HEA (Donegal, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If, having regard to the importance of the work in connection with the Labourers' Ireland Acts, and the desirability of having services of the various forms under those Acts properly effected, he will give a direction to the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary to have those services effected by the members of the police force, in the same way as voting papers in connection with the election of Poor Law Guardians are served by them upon the persons entitled to vote at those elections?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Government are not aware of any reason why the Sanitary Authority should not continue to perform this duty, and they are not prepared at present to throw it on the Constabulary.

IRISH LAND COMMISSIONERS—SALE OF LAND, CO. DONEGAL.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true, as reported, that the Irish Land Commissioners have sanctioned the sale by Messrs. Musgrave, of Belfast, of the lands of Fannett, county Donegal, to the tenants at 20 years' purchase; whether it is a fact that the lands are of very inferior quality; whether many of the tenants are on the verge of pauperism; and, whether the Government are going to continue to lend the money of the British taxpayer on such security?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Land Commissioners inform me that they have not even provisionally sanctioned any such sales as are here mentioned. Eight applications have been received from tenants of the Messrs. Musgrave; but they have not yet been considered. No doubt the Commissioners will satisfy themselves as to the security before they arrive at any decision.

ARMY—QUARTERMASTERS AND RIDING MASTERS.

COLONEL DUNCAN (Finsbury, Holborn) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, under the Royal Warrant which was to take effect from 1st October 1886, any Quartermasters or Ridingmasters have received the local rank of Major as being in performance of special duties?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The honorary rank of Major has not yet been conferred on Quartermasters or Ridingmasters under the Royal Warrant of November 3, 1886. The selection of officers for this advancement is still under consideration.

INLAND REVENUE—THE CARRIAGE TAX AND GUN TAX.

MR. ANDERSON (Elgin and Nairn) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If he has considered a recent communication addressed to him on the subject of the repeal of the Carriage Tax and the Gun Tax; and, whether any decision thereon has been arrived at by Her Majesty's Government?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I am sure the hon. Member will see that it is impossible for the Government to give any information as to the provisions of the Budget before it is stated to the House by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

SCOTLAND—THE WESTERN ISLANDS—PROCURATORS FISCAL.

MR. BARCLAY (Forfarshire) asked the Lord Advocate, Whether he has succeeded in the negotiations entered into by his Predecessor in Office with certain Procurators Fiscal in the Western Islands of Scotland, with the object of preventing them from engaging in private business while they act at the same time as public prosecutors; and, if not, whether he intends to take any steps to carry out such a reform?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): I am not aware of more than two cases where negotiations have been entered into with Procurators Fiscal for the object mentioned by the hon. Member. The first is the case of the Procurator Fiscal of Inverness-shire at Portree, in which the arrangement is complete, I believe, although, in consequence of not having received an answer to my telegram, I cannot say definitely. The other case is that of the Procurator Fiscal of Stornoway, where there has been a change recently; but that case is now under the consideration of the Treasury. I am making inquiries to ascertain if any negotiations have been entered into with other Fiscals. I have given consideration to the question, and I am now in communication with the Treasury in regard to it, but am not able, at present, to answer any general Question.

POST OFFICE—CONVEYANCE OF MAILS TO THE GAMBIA.

MR. M'ARTHUR (Leicester) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the subsidy for the conveyance of Mails to the British Settlements on the Gambia has been withdrawn from the British and African Steam Navigation Company; whether an arrangement for the transference of the Mails has been made with a French Company *viâ* Bordeaux and Dakan; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government will consider the expediency of re-establishing direct Mail communication between this Country and the Gambia?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): The subsidy of £1,200 a-year has been withdrawn. It was paid by Gambia, in addition to the sea postage of 4*d.* per letter, and a remission of port dues. No other West African Government pays a subsidy; and, owing to the financial condition of the Colony, my right hon. Predecessor (Mr. E. Stanhope) found it necessary, among other economies, to place the Gambia Mail arrangements on the same footing as those of the other West African Colonies. No contract has been made with a French or any other Company. I may add that I have received an offer from the British and African Steam Navigation Company to carry the mails temporarily at a reduced subsidy, which will receive my careful consideration; but, as at present advised, I doubt whether the Colony can afford to pay any subsidy. Papers will be presented on the subject.

Lord CLAUD HAMILTON (Liverpool, West Derby): I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman, Whether he will give an undertaking that no final settlement of this matter will be arrived at until the House has had an opportunity of considering it?

Sir HENRY HOLLAND: No, Sir; I do not think that I can give that undertaking.

SCOTLAND—THE SKYE CROFTERS—SHERIFF IVORY.

Dr. CLARK (Caithness) asked the Secretary for Scotland, If it is true, as stated by *The Scottish Highlander*, that Sheriff Ivory had been reprimanded for the action he took in regard to the control of the police during the late expedition to Skye; and, if he will lay a Copy of the official Correspondence on this matter upon the Table of the House?

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): It is not usual, and would not be to the advantage of the Public Service, to lay the Correspondence referred to on the Table of the House. It is not accurate to say that Sheriff Ivory has been reprimanded.

AFFAIRS OF SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE—AUSTRIA AND RUSSIA.

Mr. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to an article in *The Fortnightly Review*, in which it is stated that a Despatch was sent to Vienna by Her Majesty's Government, offering the support of England to Austria, in the event of a war between that Power and Russia; and to a statement in *The Pall Mall Gazette* that such Despatch was sent to Vienna, but its presentation stopped by telegraph; and, whether either of these statements is correct; and, if so, whether the Despatch in question will be laid before Parliament?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): There is no truth in the statement that such a Despatch was sent; and it necessarily follows that there is no truth in the statement that its presentation was stopped by telegraph. I may add that I have read the article in *The Fortnightly Review* for January, to which the hon. Member refers; but I do not find the statement professed to be quoted from it by *The Pall Mall Gazette.*

RAILWAYS—RETURN OF RATES FOR CARRIAGE OF ENGLISH AND FOREIGN PRODUCE.

Mr. DIXON-HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, The cause why the Railway Companies have not yet handed in the Returns of the Rates for the Carriage of English and Foreign Produce, ordered by the House as long ago as the 9th April last?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Return in question is in the hands of the printers, and will be circulated immediately.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS—RETURN OF DUES, &c.

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will cause to be prepared a Return similar to that recently granted, on the Motion of the hon. Member for the Chester-le-Street Division of Durham (Mr. Joicey), showing in respect of each of the remaining counties in England and Wales, the amount of all dues, royalties, rents, wayleaves, and water or other charges paid and payable to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in each of the years 1881-86 by all mines, collieries, quarries, claysetts, and other mineral or metalliferous workings?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) (Sheffield, Hallam) (who replied) said: The hon. Member can have a Return in the same form as that granted last year with regard to the county of Durham.

ARMY—THE ROYAL HORSE ARTILLERY.

Colonel HAMILTON (Southwark, Rotherhithe) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the pay of the non-commissioned officers and men of the batteries of Royal Horse Artillery, ordered to be converted into batteries of Field Artillery, is to be reduced from the date of conversion; and, if so, whether any compensation will be given to them?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. E. Stanhope) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The pay of the non-commissioned officers and men referred to will be reduced to that of the Field Artillery from the 1st of April. Compensation will not be given to them; but as opportunities offer those who may be recommended for it will be re-posted to the Horse Artillery. I may add that men for the Royal Artillery are enlisted for the corps generally, and not for service in any particular branch of it.

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES (IRELAND)—THE RETURNS.

MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, When the Return of Agrarian Outrages (Ireland), for the quarter ended 31st December, 1886, will be in the hands of Members?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Return has already been sent on from the Irish Office for presentation, and no doubt it will be forthwith laid on the Table.

BELFAST RIOTS—THE REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether, considering that the Belfast riots inquiry closed more than three months ago, the Government had yet received from the dissenting Commissioner, Mr. M'Hardy, his Report; and, what steps the Government intended to take to press forward arrangements for the preservation of the peace in Belfast, in view of the recurrence of serious disturbances within the last few days?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, he would remind the hon. Member for West Belfast that the other four Commissioners only presented their Report a week ago. He did not doubt that Mr. M'Hardy would present his Report very shortly. It was obviously desirable that the matter should be considered at once; but he did not think it would be wise to attempt hurried legislation on account of the unfortunate outbreak of Saturday.

EGYPT—THE SOUDAN—RELIEF OF EMIN BEY.

MR. JUSTIN HUNTLY M'CARTHY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he was in a position to give the House any information with regard to the reported escape of Emin Bey?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): No, Sir; no intelligence of that kind had been received up to the time I left the Foreign Office.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS.

MR. O'HEA (Donegal, W.) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it was the intention of the Crown to persevere with the prosecution of the tenants evicted from their homes; and, if so, why the trials were not gone on with?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, he had not received Notice of the Question; and, so far as he could gather, it should be addressed to the Attorney General for Ireland.

MR. O'HEA said, he would repeat the Question. ["Order!"] He called at the Irish Office the other day—— ["Order!"] Well, he would repeat the Question the next day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [THIRD NIGHT.]

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January.]—"That, &c." [See page 84.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) said, he was desirous of calling the attention of the House to the systematic breaches of the Truck Act alleged to have taken place in Scotland. He had brought the matter on previous occasions under the consideration of the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Henry Matthews), and he knew that the right hon. Gentleman had made inquiries, and he (Mr. Bradlaugh) had had confidential communications from him on the subject; but he desired to know why, in many of the cases, a prosecution had not taken place? He had no doubt that the reason was that, in the opinion of the Home Office, these matters were too small to be worth a prosecution; but he submitted that such considerations ought not to weigh at all. When the Government had prosecuted poor crofters for breaches of the law, they ought not to spare the rich manufacturers. In Ayrshire and Lanarkshire breaches of the Truck Act extensively prevailed, and he had brought to the notice of the Home Secretary two cases, in which it was utterly impossible, if proper inquiries were made, to fail in bringing home the guilt to the person in each instance. He admitted that the owners were very rich men; that they were men of influence, men of great respectability; but, having agreed with the desire of the Government to have the law enforced elsewhere, he suggested that it would be as well to enforce it fairly. Unless the law was enforced fairly and impartially as well against men of influence, respectability, and riches as against the poor, it might lead to misapprehension as to the manner in which justice was administered, and the gravest results might follow. Coming to the Address which the House was asked to vote, he remarked that there was in the very first paragraph a statement that there was no apprehension that any disturbance to the European peace would result from the unadjusted disputes which had arisen in South-Eastern Europe; but not quite 20 minutes before that Speech was communicated to the House they had heard read by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Randolph Churchill) a letter from the Prime Minister, in which he stated that the outlook on the Continent was very black, and that it was not too much to say that the chances were in favour of war at an early date. Now, he should feel a difficulty in voting for an Address until he knew what the meaning of that language was. If it meant that there was no danger of war except in relation to Bulgaria, then he thought it would have been franker for the Government to have let that be really stated. If it did not mean that—if the larger phrase included the lesser, then he wanted to know whether any other favourable incident than that of the resignation of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington had happened since the letter of the 22nd December was written, to lead to hopes of peace? Before voting the Address, he thought the House was entitled to some very clear and distinct information on this point, especially as they had been told by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer that he found objection to the foreign policy of the Cabinet—that he regarded it as unwise, and as likely to bring us into difficulties with Austria, Russia, Germany, and France.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL (Paddington, S.): Read my words.

MR. BRADLAUGH said, he would do so. If he had not correctly translated the words of the noble Lord it was his obtuseness. The noble Lord's words were:—

> "A wise foreign policy will extricate England from Continental struggles, and keep her outside German, Russian, French, or Austrian disputes. I have for some time observed a tendency in the Government attitude to pursue a different line of action, which I have not been able to modify or check."

He apologized to the noble Lord if he had not correctly translated his words, and he quite agreed with him that the policy of the Government had been an unwise and irritating policy, and a policy likely to lead to war and a considerably increased military expenditure. He hoped the noble Lord would tell the House what were the particular points in which he thought his Colleagues not wise in reference to Russia and France, and on which he tried to check them and failed, and the manner in which he tried to check them. Supposing they did not understand the explanations of the noble Lord or of the Government, he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith) when they would have Papers relating to these subjects in their hands? It was quite impossible to vote the Address without knowing whether the Government meant peace or war. The country was against war; it was against that pretence of assertion in the interference with affairs with which they had no concern which had increased our Expenditure year by year. Turning to the second paragraph of the Royal Speech, referring to the affairs of Egypt, he wished to ask Her Majesty's Government whether it was true that the English Government had agreed that the cost of the Egyptian garrison in Suakin was to be paid by the English taxpayer? If yes, why? Whether that cost amounted now to

£73,080 a-year, or what other sum? If yes, how long the people of this country were to contribute £73,000 to the Egyptian Government for the government of a town in which they had no interest whatever? He further asked whether it was true that the English Government handed over to the Egyptian Government at Suakin stores which cost this country £15,404, without getting a solitary farthing for them? If yes, why? Whether the Egyptian Government had applied to Her Majesty's Government for stores for Suakin amounting to £14,660, and how much Her Majesty's Government had supplied? Whether there were other stores, valued at a considerable sum, which had also been handed over, and whether these concessions were not some of the fortunate results of Sir H. Drummond Wolff's Special Mission in Egypt? Trifling matters of that kind, he knew, did not weigh very much with the Government, but they did with people outside, who saw their tax bill swelling, and who wanted to know why it should be swollen in relation to Egypt—why, when their wages were being reduced, when they were compelled to work short time, they should be asked to contribute to the conduct of military affairs, not only by the English Government, but the Egyptian Government, over which they had no control? With reference to Burmah, they were informed by the Royal Speech that the district of Upper Burmah had been occupied without opposition by Her Majesty's Forces. He was at a loss to understand how it could be said that the country was occupied without opposition, if the accounts which had appeared from time to time in *The Times* were correct as to attacks on armed stockades, and fights with Natives, and other military operations. He asked whether the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for India (Sir John Gorst) considered an attack upon an armed village in the light of a fight; whether he considered an armed stockade assaulted by our men with great gallantry in the light of something which had the nature of a military operation, or whether the whole of the telegrams which had appeared in the newspapers, stating that the expedition to the Ruby Mines had been conducted with great military skill, with much slaughter of the dacoits who opposed us in several places, and with little loss on our side, were untrue; and whether "without opposition" meant without opposition, or simply without opposition of which the hon. Gentleman (Sir John Gorst) had official knowledge at the time? It had been stated that a representative of the firm of Messrs. Streeter had accompanied the expedition to the Ruby Mines. This was most unfortunate. Why, in a matter of stealing the jewellery of other people, should the Government give preference to one firm over another? Many people would fail to understand why British soldiers—who had died by dozens on the road to these Mines—should die by disease for this object. In November the noble Lord the Member for Paddington refused to listen to pacific proposals made by Burmese Ambassadors to our Ambassador in Paris. These proposals could not be made to our Indian Government, as that Government had again and again refused to receive the Ambassadors. The noble Lord gave as his reason for not listening to these proposals that it was not possible to interfere with the Government of India. How came it, then, that within 48 hours the noble Lord telegraphed to the Viceroy of India instructing General Prendergast to advance at once? In the face of all these experiences, he thought it was not asking too much, before the House voted the Address, that hon. Members should have in their hands Papers which would enable them to form an opinion on the subject for themselves. Turning to Ireland, and particularly to the evictions at Glenbeigh, he understood the Chief Secretary to have suggested that these evictions were really the result of the action of the Land League, whose Plan of Campaign was an attempt to drive tenants into such a position of existence that evictions must necessarily follow. The condition of the people of Glenbeigh did not need any great incitement from the Land League, for General Redvers Buller himself had declared that, in his opinion, a great number of the tenants were nearer famine than the payment of rent. That was the declaration of the Representative of the Government—a declaration frankly accepted by the Chief Secretary. Was it not rather true that the Land League was the outgrowth of the persistent practice of evictions for many generations? He would be the last to deny the exceeding gravity of the question. It was one on which all should unite in trying to get some cure for a disease which everyone admitted, not as the result of Land League violence to-day, but which had existed for a century and a-half, and was the offspring of artificial laws made by the English few against the mass of a population who were prevented from earning their livelihood except on the land, and who could only obtain the land under conditions which often rendered earning a livelihood practically impossible for them. This was fruit which grew on a tree whose roots went back a century and a-half, and which should be dealt with without the party strife and bitterness which got imported into a question of this kind. Sometimes Irish representatives used language which he thought wicked, and which hon. Members opposite recalled and denounced. But this did little good. It was hard to refrain from speaking rashly when one's friends were hungry; but, instead of speeches filled with personal attack, it would be better if Parties could unite to find some cure for a disease which everyone admitted to have existed for 150 years, and to have had its origin in social laws made in the interest of the few against the many. The man who had built the wretched hovel, in which hon. Gentlemen opposite would not kennel their dogs—the man who gave the only productive value to the land—might well think that when he was starving he would not be met with the maxim—"From him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." As an illustration of the effect of evictions, he (Mr. Bradlaugh) would relate a personal anecdote of the year 1851, when he, as a private soldier, formed one of a squadron of dragoons, and assisted in protecting an evicting party, not far from Ballincollig. It was on a bitter winter day; several evictions took place; and on that occasion they levelled the houses—they did not burn them. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary called them houses, but hon. Members opposite would not kennel their dogs in such places. Still they were homes. One of the women, whose goods were turned into the road, threw herself on the snow at the feet of the captain, praying him to allow her sick husband to die under cover of the wretched shelter. The captain had no power to interfere. The man was turned out, and died shortly afterwards. Two nights later he (Mr. Bradlaugh) was sentry at Ballincollig barracks from 1 till 3 o'clock in the morning, at the front gate of the barracks, and, hearing a moaning, turned out the guard, who discovered the woman, with a dead child in her arms, and the other dying on her breast. The Land League was not dreamt of then. What wonder that these men hated us! The misery in Ireland was the echo of our crimes and of our misconduct. Considering, in conclusion, the declaration of the Government that—

> "Bills for the improvement of Local Government in England and Scotland will be laid before you; and, should circumstances render it possible, they will be followed by a measure dealing with the same subject in Ireland,"

he would give two pieces of evidence in support of his belief that, with respect to the extension of a measure of local self-government to Ireland, the Government did not intend to make possible the introduction of such a measure. These evidences were the declaration of the Marquess of Salisbury that after 20 years of consistent and resolute government Ireland would be fit to accept any gifts, in the way of local government, which we might think fit to offer, and the further assertion of the Prime Minister that he did not exclude legislation for Ireland, but would recommend as little of it as possible, and that it should be undertaken with as little haste and with as much prudence and caution as they could command. This certainly did not look like rendering it possible for legislation on Irish local government during the present Session.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL (Paddington, S.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member who has just sat down always interests the House, and always compresses his remarks with an amount of conciseness and condensation which it would be well if all of us could imitate; but perhaps he will not think me wanting in respect to him if I suggest, as a criticism, that he has hardly been so forcible or felicitous in his contribution to the present debate as he usually is. The hon. Member alluded rather in an interrogatory fashion to the foreign policy of this country, and asked a great many questions of the Government, and he also asked one or two questions of me. He appears to think that it would be proper for me to enter at length into the foreign policy which may have been adopted by the present Government, forgetting that such a course would be most unusual and most improper on my part; for it has been my advantage to possess until a very recent date official information, whereas the House is absolutely destitute of official information on foreign policy. [*Ironical cheers from the Opposition.*] I do not quite understand that rather precipitate ironical cheering, for I should like to know how a Government can place Parliament in possession of official information on foreign policy until Parliament meets? I understand that the Government are, as rapidly as possible, collecting Papers on the subject, with the view of informing Parliament; but it is obvious that any reference by me to foreign policy before those Papers are presented would be, in the highest degree, unusual and indecorous. But, as the hon. Gentleman has challenged me, I will venture to say this much, which I should have said in any circumstances. I read with the utmost satisfaction, and with entire approval, the Instructions to Sir William White which were communicated to the House by my right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith). Those Instructions appear to me to have been framed with prudence, caution, and wisdom; and if the spirit of those instructions animate our conduct in the East of Europe, I doubt not at all that Her Majesty's Government will be able materially to assist towards the settlement of the Balkan difficulty. Then the hon. Gentleman the Member for Northampton took a most unusual and, I think, a rather unfair course. Suddenly, without the smallest notice, he pounced down upon me with regard to the operations which took place in Burmah more than a year ago, and he seemed to think that I ought to be prepared to answer a question founded on two extracts out of a most voluminous Blue Book on matters with which I was connected some considerable time ago, but which it would be extremely difficult for me to be absolutely accurate about now, considering that since that time many other matters have come before me. The hon. Member asked me why I neglected, as Secretary of State for India, to negotiate with the Burmese Embassy in Paris, and why I replied to them that I could not interfere with the Government of India? I explain to the hon. Gentleman that the Burmese Embassy went to Paris with the object of negotiating with the Government of France for a French protectorate or a French alliance in Burmah, ostensibly against their British neighbours. Consequently, it was obviously impossible for me to enter into official relations with an Embassy which was not in any way recognized by the British Government, when the whole conduct of the Burmese negotiations, which were at that time most critical, were in the hands of the Government of India. I should like to know what the hon. Member and what the House would have thought if, while Lord Dufferin was carrying on a most difficult business in regard to the negotiations before the outbreak of war, I had been carrying on negotiations on my own account with a hostile Embassy in Paris? Then the hon. Member said—"If you could not interfere with the Government of India about the negotiations, how could you send instructions to General Prendergast to advance at once?" My impression is that Lord Dufferin telegraphed to the effect that all his propositions had been peremptorily rejected by King Theebaw, and wished to know whether the Generals should advance; then, having been consulted, the Government sent the Instructions to which the hon. Member referred. I will not be absolutely positive about these matters, because they occurred some time ago, and are extremely complicated. Then the hon. Gentleman passed to the subject of Ireland, and made some remarks about the occurrences at Glenbeigh. He narrated a very interesting anecdote of circumstances of which he was personally a witness, some years ago, in connection with Irish evictions. But how very extraordinary that the hon. Gentleman should endeavour to influence the House and the country and harrow their feelings with Irish miseries and with an anecdote of what took place in 1851. I appeal to the hon. Gentleman—"What has Parliament done for the Irish tenants since 1851?" Parliament has surrounded the Irish tenants with a triple wall of protection, against nearly all that landlord oppression which undoubtedly used at that time to be exercised by landlords in certain parts of Ireland. How can the hon. Gentleman endeavour to induce the House to suppose that there is the smallest analogy between what takes place now in regard to the eviction of tenants and what took place in 1851? The hon. Gentleman is very much moved by the occurrences at Glenbeigh, and he appears to be disposed to take a favourable view of the action of the National League in regard to these occurrences. I observe that this last winter the hon. Member has been extremely active in dealing with London Socialism. The hon. Member has applied to Mr. Hyndman and Mr. Champion and his fellow-Socialists, who were also very anxious to remedy the misery of London, the most rigid and strict principles of the most robust political economy. I do not wish to complain of the hon. Member having done so. In fact, I listened with some admiration to his speech. But I wish he had pointed out to the House why he considers it necessary to apply to the misery of this great Metropolis—which far exceeds, I expect, in extent anything which you can find in Ireland—the strictest and hardest principles of political economy, and why, when he deals with Glenbeigh, he follows the illustrious example of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) in banishing political economy in the case of Ireland to the planets? It would have been extremely interesting had he explained the exact difference which prevents political economy operating in Ireland and enforces it in the Metropolis. The hon. Gentleman did not seem to me to have much fault to find with the government or condition of Ireland, except as regards these evictions at Glenbeigh. On that point my own opinion is that if the landlords of Ireland, who are so cruelly abused, and who, by some persons, are held up as the most execrable of mankind, had desired to have a case put before Parliament, in which their attitude and their treatment of their tenants should have stood a closer and more microscopic examination, and out of which they could have come more favourably to themselves, I do not think they could have found a case more suited to their purpose than the case of Glenbeigh. That is my distinct opinion, after having heard all that has been said in the House, and having read all that has been written in the newspapers on the subject. This must be said for the landlords of Ireland—that during this last winter, as a body, and really, as far as I know, without much exception, they have done their duty; they have put themselves behind the Government; they have supported, as far as they could, the maintenance of law and order; and, in spite of all the injury that Parliament has done them by recent legislation—in spite of the sharp chasm which Parliament has dug between them and their tenants—the great majority of them have united with their tenants, have come and met their tenants, have eased the position of their tenants, and have endeavoured, with their tenants, to carry each other through a time of great difficulty and trial. I was always certain that the landlords of Ireland would adopt that position, and I purposely refrained when I was on that Bench, on every occasion, in spite of the remarks of Gentlemen opposite, from making the smallest appeal to the landlords of Ireland, because I was confident that this course would be adopted. With very few exceptions, indeed, I venture to say the landlords of Ireland have acted a generous, a humane, and a patriotic part. If I were to criticize the Queen's Speech at all in the passage relating to Ireland—it might be hypercritical, perhaps—but I should say the paragraph has been drawn with rather too heavy and dark a brush. You must judge of Ireland at the present moment, comparatively, by remembering carefully all she has gone through during recent years. Ireland, it appears to me, to use the language of metaphor, resembles what is often seen after an immense conflagration, when great quantities of property have been destroyed. Although the conflagration has been put out, there remains a great amount of heat among the ruins, so that it is impossible for days that either the firemen or the Salvage Corps can go to work, and for some time after such a conflagration the flames will break out afresh here and there. But the conflagration has been put out, and in the course of time from these ruins and from these ashes a more solid and stately structure will arise. That represents the state of Ireland pretty clearly at the present moment. I see nothing unsatisfactory—always speaking comparatively — nothing specially alarming, in the case of Ireland at present. There is, no doubt, a great amount of popular excitement, and a good deal of disorder, and a good deal of violent speaking. There is, in parts, resistance to legal process. But the great feature, and the hopeful feature, is that, in spite of all the prophecies we have heard from hon. Gentlemen opposite that there was going to be such a desperate outbreak this year of what is euphemistically called "the wild justice of revenge," Ireland is practically free from crime at this present moment. That it is so I cannot attribute to the credit of hon. Gentlemen opposite. I cannot think the attitude they have adopted was calculated to repress or diminish crime in Ireland. But the great and main fact, and one which the House may well take notice of and found hope upon, is that crime in Ireland has been reduced to its normal level, and even below its normal level. My right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland has been criticized severely in various quarters, and in quarters where he might have looked for the most cordial consideration and support. I think myself my right hon. Friend is being rewarded for the great sacrifice — one of the greatest sacrifices ever made by any public man —when he accepted the post of Irish Secretary. [*Ironical cheers from Home Rulers.*] In spite of the ridicule with which hon. Gentlemen opposite seem inclined to meet these remarks, I firmly believe that my right hon. Friend's second administration of Ireland will, if by good fortune it is continued for some time longer, turn out to be more successful and more creditable even than was his first administration. If I might once again employ the language of metaphor in order to deal with all the criticisms poured upon the government of my right hon. Friend—criticisms from those opposite because he has acted in such a way, criticisms from certain people in certain quarters because he has not acted in such a way—I should say this much, that Ireland appears to me at the present moment to be something like a high-spirited and mettlesome horse which has been extremely badly ridden for some time. There is a certain school of professors of political equitation, principally represented by *The Times* newspaper, who seem to think that the best way to ride a horse of that kind is to be continually jobbing him in the mouth, continually hitting him on the head with the whip, and continually digging him in the side with the spurs. This school of professors persist passionately in the advocacy of these measures, although they see rider after rider laid on his back in the ditch. My right hon. Friend appears to have adopted a better and more scientific method—what I should like to call the firm seat and the light hand, with an occasional gentle pressure with the knees in order to remind your friend that, although you admire his high qualities, and desire to be on the best terms with him, you are perfectly able to guide and control him. This is my right hon. Friend's method, and I hope he will not be taunted out of it by any remarks made from any quarter, whether nominally friendly or openly hostile. Perhaps I may be allowed to make a remark about the Plan of Campaign. I frankly admit—and I hope I shall not shock the House—that I was never much alarmed by this great Plan of Campaign. I always thought it was a singular and strange proceeding; that it attracted a great deal more attention than it ought to have done on account of its singularity and its strangeness; that it has prevailed on a comparatively small scale in Ireland; and that the instances where it has been taken up have been made the most of in the Press. But over by far the greater part of Ireland rents have been fairly paid and legal obligations have been fairly acknowledged. That was my opinion of the Plan of Campaign; and I never was much frightened of the effects which the Plan of Campaign would have on the general government of Ireland. Of course, no man who combines the possession of common sense with the habit of speaking the truth can have the smallest doubt, or difficulty, or hesitation in declaring that the Plan of Campaign is hopelessly immoral and hopelessly illegal; and this much is absolutely certain—that if the Plan of Campaign was not hopelessly immoral from a political point of view, and not hopelessly illegal, it would not have had the smallest merit in the eyes of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Of course, if Irish juries are in so curious a frame of mind at the present moment as to decline to give effect to the judgment of the Law Courts with respect to the Plan of Campaign, the Government will at once ask Parliament for such measures as may be necessary for strengthening and expediting criminal procedure in that country. Parliament will immediately grant them such powers, and in that action Parliament will be supported by the country. Immediately after that action the Plan of Campaign and the Campaigners will disappear either into voluntary or compulsory retirement. Therefore, hon. Gentlemen opposite will not, I hope, take it ill of me if I do not attach much importance to the Plan of Campaign. With regard to the great question of the Union, it is not alluded to in the Queen's Speech. I am glad of it for many reasons. Sir, the great struggle for the maintenance or repeal of the Union, as far as Ireland is concerned, is absolutely over. No doubt it has left behind it in Ireland certain difficulties. It has left behind it the difficulty of great popular excitement, and I agree entirely with my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) in his most able and brilliant speech on Friday night, when he implored hon. Gentlemen opposite to place more confidence in their own agrarian remedies which they applied when they were in power. I entirely believe that if the Land Act of 1881 and the Land Act of 1885 are allowed time to work they will prove to be a most powerful narcotic for popular excitement in Ireland. But, Sir, the struggle over the Union has also left a great Parliamentary difficulty behind. I have, however, the utmost confidence that the strength, that the resolution and the ingenuity of the House of Commons will be competent to deal with it. But, as far as Ireland is concerned, I look upon the battle of the Union as over. I suspect that if I could take hon. Gentlemen opposite to a quiet room, where no one could ever repeat what passed between us, I feel perfectly certain that they would confide the fact that they entirely agreed with me in that view. Now, Sir, I pass to another aspect of the Union, on which the House will, perhaps, allow me to make a remark or two. The battle of the Union may be over in Ireland, but it is not over in England. The battle of the Union has still to be fought out in England. There are various ways of maintaining the Union. I mean from my point of view, and not from that of hon. Gentlemen opposite. There is a certain school of Unionists who, I think, are at the present moment imitating the conduct of the old Ephesians, who thought they could resist and check the progress of the new religion and new social system by perambulating the streets for hours, crying out, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." And there are some persons at the present time who, by constantly clamouring and talking of the Union, and denouncing anyone whom they think at the moment is endangering the Union, think that they can maintain the Union for all time. That would not be the method that I would recommend to hon. Members on this side of the House. Hon. Members on this side of the House profess to be anxious to maintain the Legislative Union between England and Ireland. Opposite to them sits the Party of Repeal. They are your opponents now; but if you fail to retain your hold on the English people they and their policy of repeal will be your successors. I believe that the right way to maintain the Union is to identify the Government of the Union—the Party of the Union—in the minds of the English people with good government, with efficient administration, and with wise and progressive legislation; but if, unfortunately, it should happen that the Government and Party of the Union should become identified in the minds of the English people with the reverse of those three factors, or should fall short of the standard to which the English people in these respects are looking, then I greatly fear that before long—possibly sooner than some may expect—down will go your Government, down will go your Party, and, with them, down will go that Union to which you profess to be so devoted. I notice a little tendency—and I am anxious to say this while there is time—I notice a little tendency in the Party of the Union to attach too much importance to precarious Parliamentary alliances, which are as transient and uncertain as the shifting wind, and perhaps to leave out of sight, and not attach enough importance to the vital question of all, that it is only by the excellence and merit of your policy that you can keep the English people at the back of the Party of the Union. I frankly confess that when I was in the Government I made it my constant thought and desire to make things as easy as possible for the Liberal Unionists; to induce the Government to produce such measures as they might conscientiously support; to pursue a policy which would be in accordance with their general principles; and to make such electoral arrangements as might enable them to preserve their seats; but I frankly admit that I regarded the Liberal Unionists as a useful kind of crutch; and I looked forward to the time, and no distant time, when the Tory Party might walk alone, strong in its own strength, and conscious of its own merits; and it was always to the Tory Party, and solely to the Tory Party, that I looked for the maintenance of the Union. If the Tory Party want to know the danger of their position outside their own ranks, they have only to watch carefully the negotiations which the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir William Harcourt) is conducting at the Round Table with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), who is acting, as far as I am aware, with the knowledge, and not without the consent, of the noble Lord opposite (the Marquess of Hartington). So greatly is the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham enamoured of the progress of the negotiations, with such hope and confidence does he regard them, that he is not satisfied with the Round Table; he proposes that it should be a rounder and a larger table, at which Lord Salisbury is to meet the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), and the noble Marquess opposite is to meet the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), and there, after sweet converse, devise a scheme for the future government of Ireland. I do not know what are the feelings of hon. Members on this side of the House; but I know that my own feeling with regard to these proceedings of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham is that he is pursuing an erroneous and mistaken course. Hon. Members on this tide of the House will, I think, never follow a line of policy which, by any reasonable construction, can create in Dublin anything in the nature of an Irish Parliament. That is the clear and broad position of the Tory Party. That is the position from which under no pretence of the extension of local self-government shall we depart; and it would be well for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham, who is now indulging in such extraordinary gyrations, to lay to heart and keep well in mind that whatever schemes of Home Rule for Ireland may commend themselves to him, they are not, under any circumstances, likely to commend themselves to Members on this side of the House. I hope the House will pardon me for having made those remarks in regard to Ireland. I now desire to glance at another subject. I noticed, with great satisfaction, that it is the intention of the Government to press forward the proposals for reform in the Procedure of the House of Commons. I make no remark on the proposals now, further than this—that I notice, with equal satisfaction, that they are precisely in the same form as when I left the Cabinet. I see below me, in the corner, a right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Chaplin) who has spent much time during the autumn in perambulating the country, and alarming the country with the most fearful assertions and insinuations as to the awfully drastic form of restrictions on debate which I was pressing the Government to bring forward. I hope he will now admit that his alarm is entirely unfounded; that his assertions were perfectly baseless; and that the proposals for restricting debate are not one whit stronger, or more dangerous to Parliamentary freedom, than what he himself is perfectly prepared to agree to. I do not think, however, there would be much use in making that acknowledgment, for I imagine that certain persons on this side of the House would still assert that, of all dangerous Radicals who ever existed on the face of the earth, the Member for Paddington is the most dangerous. I pass on to glance for a moment at the programme of legislation contained in the Gracious Speech; and on that I will only say that I have observed, and possibly others have observed, a striking similarity—a strong family resemblance—between the programme in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech and the programme which appeared in a certain speech made in Kent not long ago, and which speech at the time it was made was declared by the Government organs in the Press to have no Ministerial authority of any sort or kind. All I can say is that the programme in the Queen's Speech appears to me to be an ample and abundant programme. Of course, it is impossible to judge of the merits of that programme merely by the titles of the Bills; but I have every hope myself that those Bills when produced will be found to contain much that is good, and much that is wise; and I am sure that if there should be portions of those measures which fall short of what the country requires, the Government will be only too anxious to defer to, and to be guided by, the wisdom of Parliament. I pass now to another part of the Queen's Speech which more closely concerns me—the paragraph which states that the Estimates will be laid before the House, and that they have been framed with due regard to economy and efficiency. It is a curious thing that this last statement, with regard to the Estimates being framed with due regard to economy and efficiency, had almost fallen into disuse and desuetude. It is very rarely used nowadays. I suppose it is the strong Conservative proclivities of the present Government that had rescued it almost from oblivion. But I own I cannot help regarding it, as far as I am concerned, as something very like the manœuvre of waving a red flag in the face of a bull, for if the Estimates are really framed with due regard to economy and efficiency they must have been greatly altered since I left the Cabinet. It is quite possible that there may have been some alteration, because I observe that Lord Salisbury, speaking in "another place," was good enough to say that I, in common with all other public men—and, of course, he included himself in the number, as being one of the most public men in the country—was deeply impressed with what he called the "rapid and most injurious increase of Public Expenditure." Well, Sir, really I believe I may confess to the House that this is the first indication I have ever received from Lord Salisbury that he was of that opinion. I look upon it as a distinct advance; and I am not at all disinclined to take the credit of his conversion to myself. At any rate, I take these words "most injurious," and I commend them to the attention of the House of Commons. When the Head of the Government admits in his place in Parliament that the rise in Expenditure has been "most injurious," it is certain that he is prepared to co-operate with Parliament in the effort to reduce Public Expenditure. The hon. Member for North Islington (Mr. Bartley) made a speech on the subject of economy on Friday night to which I listened with much attention. I pass over the amiable and generous suggestion he threw out that in the action I had taken I had been mainly guided by personal motives, and I turn to the more practical, useful, and material portions of his speech. The hon. Member seemed to think that Parliament can do a great deal in this matter of economy, and he appealed to Parliament to do this, that, and the other. The hon. Gentleman has certainly the advantage of me in years of natural life; but I think I have the advantage of him in years of Parliamentary life. And I can assure him that Parliament is impotent — absolutely impotent to promote economy unless the Government lead the way. I ask my hon. Friend and those who think with him to consider this. We may be of opinion that the Expenditure of this country is abnormal and excessive; but how are we to give effect to that opinion? Are we to move an Amendment to the Address? Are we to move a Resolution in the House to that effect? Why, that would be a Resolution or an Amendment hostile to the Government, which the Government would be bound to treat as a hostile Motion, and which, if carried, would terminate the existence of the Government. And, Sir, neither the hon. Member nor I would be prepared to initiate or to take part in any proceedings of this character. Therefore, as far as regards getting Parliament to pronounce an opinion on the Expenditure of the country, that mode of action is out of our power. Well, we are thrown back upon the ordinary proceeding in Committee of Supply. What takes place? A Minister comes comes down with the Army or Navy Estimates. He makes a long statement, probably of an optimistic character, which, as a rule, is listened to by a thin House; and the Members who do listen are so exhausted at the end of the statement that they are quite incapable of discussing the contents of that statement. Then, suppose that either the hon. Member for Islington or I adduce a number of facts tending to show great extravagance on the part of the Department, what takes place? In those statements of ours there would probably be something that was inaccurate, as well as things that were accurate. The Minister gets up; he fastens upon their inaccuracies; he proves them to be such with every appearance of virtuous indignation, and he sits down amid a burst of Ministerial cheers, uniformly overlooking all that was accurate or valuable in the facts submitted to him. The next morning the papers would have something to this effect:—The First Lord of the Admiralty, or the Secretary of State for War, as the case might be, satisfactorily and finally disposed of the frivolous and absurd charges brought before the Committee by the right hon. Member for Paddington. That would be the result of our efforts to promote economy. So the Expenditure goes gaily on. I want to show that I am right in saying that unless the Government leads the way Parliament is absolutely impotent. I have a suggestion to make to my right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury, which he may be able to consider. It is that the discussion of the Army and the Navy Estimates—and, indeed, the discussion of Ministerial Statements connected with the Estimates generally—would be immensely improved, and the House would be enormously assisted, if the Minister in charge of Estimates, instead of making a long speech, which is only the reading of a written document prepared by the Department, were to circulate with the Estimates, or some days before the discussion of them, the written statement which he would otherwise read in the House. Then, Sir, Members would come down to the discussion of the Estimates, having had ample time and opportunity to get up the facts, and fully prepared to initiate and sustain a useful discussion of great public questions. I commend this suggestion to the consideration of my right hon. Friend. It is a course which I have for some time wished to see adopted, and I really think it would be an enormous convenience and saving of time. My right hon. Friend was good enough the other day to say in answer to me—and to say it in a speech of generosity and kindness, for which I desire to thank him—that he would welcome any assistance from me in the direction of economy, and would place all information at my disposal or that of the House, and would give the House every facility, either by way of special discussion or Committee or Commission, for arriving at the true reason of this great increase of Expenditure. Encouraged by that invitation of my right hon. Friend, I make another suggestion, which, if it please, and is agreeable to the House, he and the Government may consider. The fact of the increase of £6,000,000 in the Army and Navy Estimates, as compared with three years ago, is not disputed; and I would suggest that, in order to meet the apprehensions of the House and of the public, my right hon. Friend should be content to produce the Estimates, should take the first Votes in each, and should then allow them to go to a Committee of the House of Commons, to be thoroughly gone through by a powerful and properly constituted body, who would have the power to send for persons and records, to take evidence, and to get all necessary information. I believe that that is a course which the House would be inclined to support, which the public would approve, and which would have the enormous advantage that it would relieve the Government from the responsibility for the increase, which responsibility they ought not to bear, because it is an increase which they inherit, and it is not an increase for which they are personally responsible. If my right hon. Friend would refer the Army and the Navy Estimates to a Committee of this kind, if the idea should find favour with the House, I have no doubt the House would from time to time grant the Government such Votes on Account as might be necessary for carrying on the business of the country, and possibly the Government would be willing not to make progress with the Estimates until the Committee had examined them and reported upon them. Of course, it would be quite impossible for the Government to undertake to abide by all the recommendations of the Committee this year, because an enormous amount of expenditure has been already ordered and incurred; orders have been given for stores and materials, and they cannot be altered now. But the Government might enter into a general engagement to be guided in framing the Estimates for next year by the general recommendations of the Committee. I cannot help hoping that my right hon. Friend and his Colleagues will consider that suggestion. If that course should be adopted it would relieve my mind of an immense difficulty, and would save me the trouble and the disagreeable duty of worrying and attacking the Government upon minor points. I should be prepared to lay all my case before such a Committee as a Parliamentary arbitrator, and to abide by the decisions to which Parliament might come. Well, Sir, I only desire, as a matter of personal explanation, to allude for a moment to the question of the coaling stations, and because I was unable to do it the other night. There seems to be a great deal of misapprehension about this question of the coaling stations. I never resigned upon the question of the coaling stations—never. In conversation with my right hon. Friend—and long conversations we had—we went through the Army Estimates item by item, and my right hon. Friend was of opinion that not one of those items could be reduced. At the end of a conversation, when I asked him whether it was quite impossible to make the smallest reduction in the Army Estimates, he said there was only one item, of £400,000, on which a reduction could be made, and its reduction he would never consent to, as it was the Vote for fortifying the coaling stations. In the correspondence with Lord Salisbury I mentioned—although I saw no prospect of its being agreed to—that this was an item in which a reduction might be possible if the policy of the Government could be reconciled with the reduction; and on that intimation Lord Salisbury, who is a master of the art of tactics—I do not in the least complain, but he at once, by the cleverness of his reply, identified my resignation with the question of the coaling stations. Really, I never resigned upon the coaling stations. I resigned upon retrenchment — whether there was to be retrenchment or there was not to be. I considered that I was absolutely pledged to retrenchment, and that unless the Government went in for it it was impossible for me to be Chancellor of the Exchequer. I do not wish to say much about the coaling stations; but I may take the opportunity of saying that if we are to adopt a policy of expenditure upon the fortification of coaling stations, we shall be showing conclusively the utter baselessness of the well-known proverb that "a burnt child dreads the fire." The House may not be aware that this year we come to the practical termination of the enormous Terminable Annuities — no less than £5,000,000 a-year—which were used by Lord Palmerston to raise loans for the fortification of coaling stations.

Mr. CHILDERS (Edinburgh, S.): Not so large an annuity, but one to produce a certain number of millions.

Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: There were other loans included; but the main portion of the annuities which practically come to an end this year were for the loans for fortifications; and it is not too much to say that of that money which was expended upon fortifications years and years ago, and which you have just paid off, two-thirds or three-fourths of it was absolutely thrown into the gutter and wasted. I think it is quite probable that if the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and when he had that great dispute with Lord Palmerston in which Lord Palmerston said he would sooner lose Mr. Gladstone than lose Portsmouth Harbour—if he had stuck to his guns, and had stood out against Lord Palmerston, the country might have been saved the outlay of many millions. As to the coaling stations, all I have to say is that, if you can show me that the moneys will not be wasted, that the engineers know how to construct scientific fortifications, and that you will arm them when they are constructed and maintain them in an efficient state, I shall have nothing to say against the policy; but I approach the question with the utmost apprehension and scepticism, because of the previous experience of this country on the question, which certainly hon. Gentlemen ought not to exclude from their consideration. It is a great question, well worthy of the consideration of the House, whether the policy of the defence of the British Empire may not follow upon the lines of foreign policy which we adopt towards other nations—not by any means a policy of cowardice, but a policy of the careful and prudent avoidance of all unnecessary entanglements and all unnecessary quarrels. Again, I would venture to repose the policy of the defence of the Empire, if it is to be followed up with courage and resolution, on the patriotism and loyalty of a free and contented people, animated not so much by the strength of their fortifications as by their undying historic memories. And, in the third place, I would prefer to repose the defence of the British Empire upon a careful, thrifty, and frugal husbanding in time of peace of those national resources, in order that in time of war they may be exuberantly displayed in all their irresistible might. I am not at all clear that these general remarks do not indicate a safer and more economical policy for the defence of the Empire than that of throwing ourselves hysterically into the embrace of engineers, or of lying down pusillanimously in a cemetery of earthworks. All I venture to deprecate is legislating or spending money in a hurry, and under the influence of panic or clamour. It is supposed that the working classes take no interest in this question—that any line against National Expenditure is not popular, because the working people do not pay taxes. A lot of people come to me and say—"Oh, you have taken a most unpopular line; the working classes do not care; they pay no taxes." It seems necessary to point out, what has been pointed out before, that this question of Expenditure concerns not only what the right hon. Gentleman opposite erroneously calls the classes, but also deeply concerns the masses, because the right hon. Gentleman must bear this in mind—that out of every shilling's worth of tea which the workman purchases he pays 6*d.* to the Chancellor of the Exchequer; that out of every shilling's worth of tobacco he pays 10*d.*, and out of every shilling's worth of beer he pays 2*d.* Now, I would ask my right hon. Friends on this side of the House who are prepared to defend a policy of the larger Expenditure—Are you going to put this question of the fortification of the coaling stations or the increase of the Army and Navy—are you going to test its popularity by the imposition of new taxes? Will you propose to meet this £6,000,000 by a re-imposition of the Sugar Duties? That would be a very practical way of testing it. Will you raise the Tea Duties, or, by what probably ought to be done, will you propose to test the fidelity of your friends, the licensed victuallers, and ask them to contribute to these fortifications of the Empire by an increase, and a very proper increase, of the Beer Duty? These are practical questions which I invite my right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury to answer. It is no use turning round on me and saying—"The whole country desires this expenditure, and you are wrong," or that economy is old-fashioned, and out of date, unless the Chancellor of the Exchequer is prepared to get up in his place at the Table and put such expenditure on the taxpayers of the country. My right hon. Friend and his Colleagues would be the last persons to propose for one moment that this expenditure should be placed on the Income Tax, and I am sure they would not contemplate for one moment a permanent maintenance of the Income Tax at 8*d.* in the pound in time of peace. These are questions which I respectfully submit to the attention of the Government and Parliament. These great questions of public economy are not to be disposed of by mere *ad captandum* statements, or by general denunciation of all persons who wish to bring the Expenditure of the country within normal limits. This is a matter which the Government must seriously consider. I feel perfectly certain that the attention of the people is being concentrated on this great question of Expenditure; it is interesting the people; and I rejoice greatly that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian refused, and very properly refused, the other night to identify himself with it, for fear of making it a Party question. He appealed to those on this side of the House, and I hope he did not appeal in vain—he appealed to the Conservative Party, whose best traditions are connected with public economy—to take up this question and support the Government, so that the Government, with the support of both sides of the House, may lead the way to a more reasonable expenditure of public money, and a revision of taxation. I may be allowed to make one final remark which is personal to myself. I know there are many hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House, whose opinion and whose esteem I greatly value, who are greatly incensed against me for having taken the course I have done—for having resigned my place in the Government. They are severe in their criticism, sharp in their censure, and righteous in their wrath, when they consider my action. I can only say that I confidently believe that the progress of events will probably modify that judgment. It is not the first time that it has been my evil fortune to wrestle with the Tory Party. I remember only about four years ago that so greatly did I displease the Tory Party that there was hardly one Conservative Member who would give me at that time so much as a nod of recognition. Why was that? I had proclaimed—I admit with much frankness—that I thought the Tory Party was going wrong on a great principle. I have once more proclaimed—this time by action—my opinion that the Tory Party is going wrong on the great question of Expenditure, and again there appear all the charges of disloyalty, treachery, and such like, to which I am accustomed, and to which I do not listen. I appeal on that subject to the tribunal of time. Any little political influence which I may possess—any little political strength which may have been given to me—has not hitherto been drawn, for any practical or permanent purpose, from within the walls of this House, or from within that circle whose centre is the Treasury Bench. No, Sir; it has come from outside, and I appeal on this question to Cæsar—to the just and generous judgment of the people. I know that I have sought for nothing — absolutely nothing—except to protect and promote their most material interests, and on this great question of economy and retrenchment I patiently wait for the judgment of the people.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA (Monaghan, S.) said, he wanted to say a few words about the Plan of Campaign, and to explain how it operated with regard to his estate. He hoped the hon. Member for South-East Cork (Mr. Lane) was in the House, as he should not like to say anything derogatory or otherwise about him behind his back, although that hon. Gentleman had not scrupled to attack him when, being 500 miles away, he was not in a position to reply to the reckless slanders of which the hon. Member was the mouthpiece, until those slanders had done their work, and had spread amongst his neighbours, whose good-will he valued. This was a very serious affair for him; but he would not ask the House to take anything upon his own *ex-parte* statement. He would refer to the words of the hon. Member for South-East Cork, as reported in *The Cork Herald*, and it would then be for the House and the country to judge whether the language used against him was justified or not. On the 7th of November last a public meeting was called at Youghal, which was addressed by the hon. Gentleman, and a report of which appeared in the Cork papers of the following day. He (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) had no derogatory or censorious remark to make about that meeting, or its professed object. The chair was occupied by the respected parish priest, and a Government reporter occupied a seat on the platform. It must have been a treat to the latter to hear two Home Rule Members—for there were two—attacking another behind his back, carefully avoiding to give the latter an opportunity of reply. He understood that a great number of the people of the town and neighbourhood knew what was to take place at the meeting; and as the man to be attacked could not reply the attack was expected to be the more spirited, and the attendance was consequently greater on that account. The borough of Youghal had recently been disfranchised, which borough had been represented in Parliament for a number of years by himself (Sir Joseph M'Kenna).

Mr. SPEAKER said, he was very sorry to interfere; but they were now discussing the Address to the Throne, whilst the hon. Gentleman appeared to be entering into a personal explanation of some altercation he, unfortunately, had with some other Member of the House. He could not allow that to be in Order.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he would not pursue that line of observation, but would proceed to explain what had been done with respect to the Plan of Campaign, as far as he was himself concerned. The hon. Member for South-East Cork, at the meeting to which he had alluded, stated that every tenant, with one or two exceptions, on the M'Kenna estate had within the past week been served with writs of ejectment. That statement was not correct. With one or two exceptions, writs had not been served at all. The hon. Member then told the people that he had been investigating the affairs of the M'Kenna estate; and he advised the tenants to show a bold and firm front against the treatment which they were receiving from a person whom he did not hesitate to call their heartless and inhumane landlord; he told them to discuss among themselves what was a fair and reasonable reduction; when they had decided upon that, to pledge themselves to stand by one another in insisting upon it as a general reduction; and then to go to the landlord or his agent and tell him that they would not pay until they were allowed 30, 40, or 50 per cent reduction, or whatever was agreed to. There was no foundation whatever for the statement which the hon. Member made about his treatment of his tenants. He (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) purchased the Cork estate 20 years ago, with the several tenants on it, who were on it now, and on the rents as fixed between his predecessors and the tenants. He had paid 20 years', and 22 years' in some cases, purchase for the holdings, so that there was no land-jobbing or speculation in the matter. He had devoted the savings of many years of hard work to purchase the estate; and at the time he made the purchase, the tenants, one and all, expressed themselves satisfied that the rents they had undertaken to pay were moderate. He had discharged his duties to them ever since in a considerate and generous spirit, never having raised the rent on any one of them. The total acreage was 1,400 acres. The total rental receivable was £595 1*s.* 10*d.*, out of which was a tithe-rent charge payable by him of £80, and a quit rent of £10. The Ordnance valuation was £533 14*s.* when he bought it; but some slight reductions had since been made, a few tenants having permitted dilapidations. The total amount receivable by him—if everyone paid his rent, which no one could expect in all circumstances—would give him about 4½ per cent on his money, and would be less than Griffith's valuation. The statements which the hon. Member for South-East Cork made with respect to him were in every material circumstance unfounded, and he challenged the hon. Member to prove them before a Committee of that House. He did not deny that in other places hardships had to be undergone by both tenants and landlords; but the application on his estate of the Plan of Campaign was without a single instance of cruelty or inhumanity on his part to justify it, and it was an outrage not merely upon a Member of the House, but a Member of the Party to which those Gentlemen professed to belong; the Plan of Campaign had not been adopted by the Members of the Irish Party as a body. A half-dozen Gentlemen, to whom he imputed no unpatriotic, unjust, or dishonourable motive, had come to the conclusion that in certain cases a strong course should be adopted. But nothing alleged to have been done in Ireland approached the degree of baseness with which the Plan of Campaign had been applied in his case. He hoped some day the hon. Members to whom he alluded would express their regret for having attacked a landlord who for 10 years had never issued a writ of ejectment. The only case in which during 20 years such a writ had been issued on the estate was in the case of a tenant who owed four years and said he would not pay one year.

MR. LANE (Cork Co., E.): Perhaps the House will allow me to say that the tenants of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down did not adopt the Plan of Campaign at my instigation, but upon their own account, and under the presidency of their own parish priest, without the slightest compulsion on the part of anyone else. I am perfectly guiltless of any complicity with the tenants of the hon. Member in inducing them to adopt the Plan of Campaign against him. I understood, however, that they did so on his refusal to grant them a small reduction of 20 per cent upon their half-year's rent.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Mayo, S.): I think the pantomime to which the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) treated the House on Friday night was entertaining; but, if we subtract from it the slanders upon the Irish Nationalist Members, I really do not think it added much to the information of the House. Hon. Members have from time to time dilated on the resistance of the Irish people to the law, and it is very sad to think of the long struggle that has taken place in Ireland, in resistance to the law. Three hundred years ago the poet Spenser, although a sharer in the plunder of Ireland, was so horrified at the atrocities he witnessed around him that he expressed himself to this effect—he feared much that Providence was preserving the Irish nation to be a punishment to England for the crimes and cruelties she had perpetrated in Ireland. Later on, Sir John Davies, the Attorney General of James I., complained bitterly that English law was withheld from the Irish people; and he added that the object appeared to be the extermination of the natives by the settlers, without affording them the protection of the law. This principle of extermination has continued generation after generation in Ireland, and it prevails to this day. About 50 years ago, when the state of things which existed in Ireland was very similar to that which is prevailing there now, an upright, fair-minded, and honourable English gentleman—Mr. Poulett Scrope—was travelling in Ireland. He was, I believe, a Member of this House at the time, and he wrote a letter describing what he had seen to the Prime Minister of that day—Lord Melbourne. His words are so applicable to what is happening now that I think I may, with advantage, quote an extract from that letter. Mr. Poulett Scrope wrote—

> "Is there no point of oppression at which resistance to the law becomes a duty? We have the recent authority of the head of the law for the principle—a principle as old as it is true—that allegiance is only due where protection is afforded. Does the law protect the Irish peasant? Not from starvation. It does not protect him from being thrust out of his home and little holding into absolute destitution to perish on the highway. It does not preserve him from this fate at command of an absentee landlord. The law affords the Irish peasant no protection from a fate so horrible. Hundreds are at present exposed to it; millions know they are liable to it. Can the law justly require their allegiance? No. The peasantry of Ireland feel that the law places their lives at the mercy of the few whom it invests with sovereign power over the land of their native country; with power to sweep them all, at will, off its surface."

Such was the state of Ireland, as observed by this Gentleman, in 1834. Ten years afterwards, without altering a syllable of this letter, he addressed a copy of it to another Prime Minister—Sir Robert Peel—matters being still unchanged. When I read further, the House will be astonished to find how much things to-day resemble those of 53 and 43 years ago. At the time Mr. Poulett Scrope wrote to Lord Melbourne, the Irish tenants had banded themselves together, and resistance to the law was carried on by an Association known as the Whiteboy Association. The Whiteboys did not stick at trifles. They soon came to think as little of the lives of their oppressors as their oppressors thought of theirs, and small blame to them, many would say. Hear what Mr. Poulett Scrope wrote of the Whiteboys—

> "They feel that the system of clearing estates, which has been so many years in progress, is a question of life and death to them. Therefore, they combine against it. Therefore, however little minds may wonder at the past, they show no more repugnance to the shedding of blood in open day, in the presence of assenting thousands in execution of sentences of self-organized tribunals, looked upon by them as the sole safeguard of their lives, than does a soldier hired to fight for his country's safety on the field of battle. It is to their own Whiteboy law they consider their allegiance due. Let those who know Ireland deny the fact if they can. The peasantry of Ireland do more or less obtain from the Whiteboy Association that essential protection to their existence which the established law of the country refuses to afford. The Whiteboy system is the practical and efficient check upon the ejectment system. It cannot be denied that, but for the salutary terror inspired by the Whiteboys, the clearance of estates would proceed with a rapidity, and to an extent, that must occasion the most horrible sufferings to hundreds of thousands of the ejected tenantry. It is easy to satisfy the mind of an interested person that what the law allows cannot be wrong. Yes. But for the salutary fear of the Whiteboy system, ejectments would desolate Ireland."

Is it not wonderful how exactly these words describe what is to-day passing before our eyes? So little has the government of Ireland altered that, with only the substitution for the death penalties of the Whiteboy system of the bloodless resistance of the National League and the Plan of Campaign, every word fits exactly. I was a little amused—I do not know whether other hon. Members, too, were also amused—at the tender professions of love for Ireland by the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) on Thursday evening. Professions of love for Ireland from a Tory statesman are certainly a heavy draft upon the credulity of the Irish people. One would not imagine from the personal appearance of the right hon. Gentleman that he was inclined to romance. His principal characteristic is that of a practical business man; but he does romance with regard to Ireland, and I think it would be much more becoming on the part of the right hon. Gentleman if he would approach the question in something like a business style. His latest connection with Irish politics—his 24 hours' visit to Ireland—would not, perhaps, lead us to expect a business-like policy from the right hon. Gentleman now in regard to the Irish Question. I feel bound to take strong exception to one remark which fell from the right hon. Gentleman. He denies to the Irish Members the right of interfering in the Irish Land Question. To say that we, who, above all men, ought to be most interested in the affairs of our country —we for whom I may say every inch of the soil of Ireland is made sacred—mingled as it is with the dust of countless generations of our ancestors—to say that we have no right to interfere in the affairs of Ireland is, to say the least of it, a most audacious assertion. The Plan of Campaign has been attacked in unmeasured language in this House; but I have not heard any hon. Member urge a single substantial argument against it. We are told that the Plan of Campaign is immoral and dishonest; but no hon. Member gives a single reason for his assertion. I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that the Irish people, in point of morality, are inferior to no nation in the world; and any political question they take up will, from a moral point of view, bear investigation as closely as that of any other people upon the face of the earth. All the immorality imputed to the Irish people is based on their resistance to law and contract. Then, Sir, let us try to understand in what way this test of law and contract is applied to the morality of the Irish people; and let us see how the Plan of Campaign is concerned in the Irish Land Question. The root of the Land Question in Ireland turns on the hostile legislation of the English Government, which has destroyed the manufactures of Ireland and her trade, and every other means by which the people could live. The hostile legislation of the English Government towards Ireland has been the foundation of the land troubles in Ireland. The people are left nothing to fall back upon, and have but one means of subsistence — namely, the land. Having reduced the people to this one means of subsistence, the land itself was handed over to a tribe of land thieves from England and Scotland. In giving these men possession of the land of Ireland, the Government also gave them the power of conferring upon themselves every possible advantage, and of surrounding the possession of land by the natives with every possible disadvantage. They became the makers of the laws; and the result of their legislation on the Land Question was to give themselves immediate possession of every improvement made by the tenantry upon the land. They were enabled to confiscate every improvement of the tenant, and to raise the rent at will, so that, in a brief period, the rents in Ireland have been absolutely quintupled. The position of the Irish tenantry has been this—that no matter what the industry of the tenant farmers of Ireland may have been, the landlords were always raising the rents, until they became beyond the power of the tenants to pay. The Irish landlords being in that position, and being able to raise the rents beyond the capacity of the tenants to pay them, were able to keep the tenants with a load of arrears upon them. This system has continued in Ireland down to the present day. In fact, the Glenbeigh of to-day is a mere illustration of this system of rent-raising and of arrears hanging over the people for ever. The rents on the unfortunate tenants in Glenbeigh have been raised by 70 to 100 per cent above the Poor Law valuation. They have been paying it as long as they could scrape the money together by any possibility, in order to keep the roofs over their heads. They have for generations paid these enormous rents; but, in spite of all, the arrears have swelled, and have been hanging over their heads like the sword of Damocles. The landlords have in this way established for themselves a cheap system for the practice of generosity by consenting to accept a year's rent, or half-a-year's rent, out of arrears piled up in this manner.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN resumed: I warn the House that it is impossible to legislate for Ireland with any prospect of success until you first cease from judging the Irish people by the law and contract test of morality. The test they have been accustomed to look up to is the Divine Law of the Ten Commandments. English laws forbade to the Irish people the practice of their religion; forbade them education; placed a price of £5 on the head of the priest and of the school teacher. I should like to know what connection there is between such laws and the Divine Law? How can the Irish peasant be expected to have respect for laws of this kind? The class of people for whom the Land Laws have been made by the English Government have constantly confiscated to themselves every improvement these unfortunate people have made on the land. The law is made for the people; it is not the people who are made for the law. Although we have never ceased to have Judges in Ireland, such as Baron Palles, at Sligo, and Justice Johnson, in Dublin, who have denounced the people in unmeasured terms for their disobedience to the law, it must not be forgotten that the law itself had been framed in a spirit contrary to morality and the Divine Law. The policy which has been developed in Kerry by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was an unexpected commentary upon the policy enunciated by the Prime Minister of 20 years of resolute government in Ireland. The Chief Secretary for Ireland went over last September leaving us all under the impression that he was instantly to carry out that Cromwellian policy. But he had hardly landed in Ireland when we found him playing the part of fairy godmother in Kerry. We do not object to what the right hon. Gentleman did in Kerry; but, on the contrary, we wished to see the good work extended to all Ireland. Hence the inauguration of the Plan of Campaign; and if it had not been resorted to, I believe that evictions, such as those which have taken place at Glenbeigh, would have occurred in every corner of Ireland. No English landlord can pretend to ignore the consequences of the terrible depression in the prices of agricultural produce, and every English landlord must have felt the consequences of it. I believe that, to-day, land is even of less value in England than in Ireland. If we want to form any opinion on that subject, we have only to refer to the evidence given before the Commission on the Depression of Trade, and the causes of that depression. The evidence of well-known gentlemen, before that Commission, shows that the tenants have been paying the rent out of capital for some years past, and not out of what the land produced; and if no protection is provided for English agriculturists, before many years have elapsed the farmers will be completely bankrupt, and their capital expended. To us Irish Representatives, who are bound to sympathize with our own people, the Bill introduced into this House last Session by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) showed the wonderful foresight of my hon. Friend; and, had that Bill not been rejected by the House, it would have relieved Ireland from much disturbance, and have made the Plan of Campaign unnecessary. Every hon. Member present in the House last Session knows that the object of that Bill was to submit the question in regard to what relief ought to be justly provided for the tenants to the Land Courts of Ireland, and requiring the tenants to pay 50 per cent of their rent in order to enable them to enter the Court. Yet the right hon. Gentleman who now occupies the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer stated at Liverpool, the other day, that the object of that Bill was to reduce rents by 50 per cent. For a right hon. Gentleman occupying so prominent a position in the Government to make such an unfounded statement as that is an attempt to hoodwink the English public which I will not stoop to characterize. Some hon. Gentlemen, in attacking the Plan of Campaign, have asked why the Irish tenants should assume to themselves the right of saying what rent they should pay? But the Irish landlords have assumed to themselves for many generations the right of saying what rent the tenants should pay, and I think that one party to the bargain has just as much right to have a word in the bargain as the other. But the tenants have not assumed to themselves the right to say what they should pay, nor was that done in the Bill of the hon. Member for the City of Cork. No one can accuse the tenants of unfairness in attempting to settle the rent for themselves, when the landlords and their friends in this House rejected the proposal to submit the question to a disinterested tribunal—namely, the Land Court. Let us test the system carried out under the Plan of Campaign by the action of the Land Courts. Now, I do not suppose that the average demand made by the tenants under the Plan of Campaign would exceed 25 per cent all round — certainly 30 per cent at the most. But during the month of December the Judges of the Land Commission in Ireland decided several cases in which application had been made for the fixing of judicial rents. Upon the estate of the hon. and gallant Member for Winchester (Colonel Tottenham)—a gentleman who has been posing for a considerable time before English audiences as a victim of the National League—the Land Court has reduced the rents by 49 to 65 per cent. The reductions made by the Land Court on this estate show that the rents exacted were 136 per cent above fair rents. Yet, if it had been suggested by those who are connected with the Plan of Campaign that a reduction should be made by 25 or 30 per cent, the hon. and gallant Member would have complained loudly; and yet the rents upon this estate have been reduced by 49 and 65 per cent. At Sligo, on the 21st of December, the Land Commissioners were engaged in hearing 48 applications by the tenants on 12 different estates, and they made reductions averaging 40 per cent. At Longford, on the 22nd of December, the Land Commissioners dealt with applications from 45 tenants on 11 different estates, and made reductions averaging 41 per cent. These facts, I contend, show that the reductions demanded by the Plan of Campaign have been exceedingly fair and moderate. I think there are evident signs that the people of this country are at last beginning to interest themselves somewhat more than was formerly the case in the Irish Question. Under the new Franchise Bill the democracy of England have obtained power, and with power they must also accept responsibility. Nowadays no Government can exist in this country against the will of the democracy. The democracy is responsible for every Government that exists. They may be excused for having placed a Tory Government in power at the last Election; probably it was because they had come into their new inheritance so very recently, and they had not had time to familiarize themselves with their duties and their responsibilities. Now that they are becoming better acquainted with those duties and responsibilities, I think they will henceforward take a more active and conscientious interest in the government of the country. I believe that the people of this country are being rapidly educated and the public conscience is being stirred up by the state of things in Ireland; and when another Election comes I am convinced that the democracy of Great Britain will give a very different answer to that which was extracted from them last year, notwithstanding the fact that we were told it was to be a final mandate. The next mandate from the English democracy, which is not likely to be long delayed, will, I think, show a very different result.

MR. ABRAHAM (Limerick, W.): I have obtruded myself upon the debate for the purpose of giving the House my own personal testimony as to the working of the Plan of Campaign. I think it is desirable that the English Members, and the English people generally, should be made acquainted with the way in which this Plan of Campaign has been working. On one estate in the county of Limerick some of the tenants approached their landlord, and asked for a reduction of rent to the extent of 25 per cent. The landlord made an offer of a reduction of 20 per cent, and the tenants met together to consider whether that offer ought to be accepted by them. They naturally sought for counsel and advice from the Members who represented them in this House; and, accordingly, I and my Colleague in the representation of the county (Mr. Finucane) waited upon the tenants, and discussed the question as to whether the reduction offered would meet the difficulties of the present time. On meeting together, the tenants chose as their chairman the parish priest of the locality; and it was agreed that the minority should be bound by the majority. Nine only were in favour of persisting in the demand for a reduction of 25 per cent; but the vast majority, numbering some 75, decided to accept the offer of 20 per cent. Upon that decision being arrived at, the rent was paid; and not only so, but it produced another salutary effect. Some trouble had originated in the locality previous to the attempted settlement; and, owing to the intimidation and threatening language resorted to, a number of arrests had been made. But so great was the impression produced by the adoption of the Plan of Campaign that at the next meeting of the Petty Sessions the magistrates were able to dismiss all the prisoners, because peace and harmony had been restored in the district. It has been stated here to-night that the condition of Ireland is satisfactory. We are told, in the Queen's Speech, that crime is found in its normal condition; and I assert that the reason why crime is at so low an ebb is that the people of Ireland have ceased to have recourse to the wild justice of revenge. They have found a better way of making their grievances known—namely, by Constitutional action, by meeting together and relying on united action and the justice of their cause. They also are aware that the feeling of this great country is with them in their sufferings and trials. Last Session a short Bill was introduced into this House by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) to enable the Irish tenants to tide over their present difficulties. That Bill was laughed to scorn. We were told that there was an abundant harvest, and that the Irish people were able to pay their rents. The Bill of the hon. Member was rejected; but the Chief Secretary for Ireland has told us that when he came face to face with the circumstances of Ireland, he found it absolutely necessary to bring pressure to bear on the landlords in order to induce them to treat their tenants fairly. Wherever they have done so, peace and harmony have prevailed. Why, Sir, the testimony with regard to the depreciation of the value of agricultural produce does not come alone from the Irish Representatives. I hold in my hand the opinion of a gentleman which I am sure will not be disregarded by this House, and will certainly not be undervalued. I refer to Mr. Horton, the late Valuer of the Land Court, who says he is able to state without fear of contradiction that when the judicial rents were fixed on the then existing value, no one anticipated the great fall of prices which has since taken place, and that it will be found that wheat, grain, butter, and various other articles of produce have fallen 50 per cent. Any impartial observer, he says, must come to the conclusion that judicial rents fixed under such circumstances cannot continue to be paid, and leave the farmers enough to live upon. "The farmers," adds this gentleman, "are so impoverished that they cannot pay their rents." This is the testimony of one who cannot be said to sympathize with any desire to withhold the payment of rent. If this gentleman sees that large reductions must be made in the tenants' rents, why is it that we, who have simply endeavoured to induce the landlords to be wise, are taunted with inaugurating an immoral policy? Allow me to state that, as a Protestant, I am in favour of the Plan of Campaign, and that the course we are pursuing has the sanction of the Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel. We feel that we are adopting a course which is justified both in the sight of man, and also in the sight of a higher tribunal to which we must all give an account. It is a matter of wonder how hon. Members who sit on these Benches can have the patience to listen to some of the remarks which have been made with regard to them. It is because our case is just; because we have confidence in the justice of the English people; because the present Government is a Government acting solely in support of the Irish landlords as far as Irish administration is concerned; it is because we feel that this Government cannot long stand in face of the feeling which has been evoked in the country, and because we believe that the democracy will be generous enough to give to a poor population of 5,000,000 that justice which 30,000,000 can give to themselves—that we can afford to pass by with silence and contempt the language which has been used towards us. We are face to face with an important crisis in Ireland. We know that our people are looking to our action here with the utmost confidence; they are determined that no crime shall stain the soil of Ireland, but that, by Constitutional methods, they will win what they demand. We have always desired that our cause shall not be stained by a single crime or outrage, and we feel confident that acting in that spirit we shall continue to advance, relying on the justice of our cause and the generosity and kindness of the great English nation.

Mr. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe): Other hon. Members besides myself have listened with pleasure to the remarks of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), with regard to economy; but, if I mistake not, the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), as long ago as 1878, in the Committee on Public Business, made certain suggestions which were practically the same as those of the noble Lord. A Resolution to a similar effect was brought forward in the House last year by an hon. Member, who then represented one of the divisions of Edinburgh. We must all rejoice that the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington has joined our ranks; and, for my own part, I would appeal to other Members on the opposite Benches likewise to join us in what is really not a Party matter. Many of us have heard with satisfaction the remarks which fell from the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) with respect to what is going on in Burmah. It was my lot to be a faithful follower of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) when he was Prime Minister, and I listened attentively to the remarks which fell from him when he was in Office in the month of February last year in reference to the expenses of the Burmese Expedition; but on that occasion I felt myself compelled to go into the Lobby against the right hon. Gentleman on the question of the Burmese policy of the Government, and I am satisfied that when the Liberal Party returns to power any Liberal Government that represents fully and freely the opinion of the whole Party will find that such expeditions as that to Burmah are not supported by the country, and the expense connected with them ought not to be sanctioned. But our minds are now full of another subject. We are all of us thinking of Ireland. I venture to say that on that subject the measure proposed by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian still holds the field against the various suggestions that have been made from different quarters, both in this House and in the country. I think we have some reason to be surprised and disappointed that in what the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down described, and most truly, as a grave crisis in the history of the country, Her Majesty's Government should come to us with an Address in which the only reference to Ireland is confined to a single sentence recommending reform of criminal procedure. Her Majesty's Government, however, do not seem to have made up their own minds even upon that matter, because the expression put in the mouth of Her Majesty is this—

> "The condition of Ireland still requires your anxious attention. Grave crimes have happily been rarer during the last few months than during a similar period in the preceding year. But the relations between the owners and occupiers of land, which in the early part of the autumn exhibited signs of improvement, have since been seriously disturbed in some districts by organized attempts to incite the latter class to combine against the fulfilment of their legal obligations. The efforts of my Government to cope with this evil have been seriously impeded by difficulties incident to the method at present prescribed by Statute for dealing with such offences. Your early attention will be called to proposals for reforms in legal procedure which seem necessary to secure the prompt and efficient administration of the criminal law."

Surely, if their minds were made up on the subject, they might have used a stronger and more decisive expression than "seem necessary" before inviting the House of Commons to proceed to make an alteration of the Criminal Law. I should have thought that they should have stated, precisely and definitely, that the proposed reform was actually necessary in order to secure the better administration of the law. One may translate that sentence which has been put into the mouth of Her Majesty pretty much in this way—that Her Majesty's Government come before the House of Commons and the people of this country with no other remedy at present for the Irish difficulty than a better way of helping the Irish landlords to collect their rents. I think it is desirable that we should analyze a little more this expression "legal obligations," which is used in Her Majesty's Speech. There have been many discussions in and out of Parliament upon Ireland during the last 50 years; but in all of them the great point which the speakers have tried to enforce was the vital and fundamental difference between the agrarian question in Ireland and in this country. On the 9th of June, 1845, the late Lord Derby, who had then been called to the Upper House by the title of Lord Stanley (as his son has been recently), spoke on this matter at great length. He was for many years the Leader of the Tory Party; and his utterances, therefore, will surely carry the greatest weight with hon. Members on the other side of the House. Lord Stanley pointed out that there were many distinctions between agrarian matters in this country and in Ireland. He showed how, in England, there were many freeholds, whereas in Ireland there were very few. He pointed out how, in England, the landlords mostly resided on their estates and took an interest in them, while in Ireland the landlords were generally absentees; he pointed out that in England the relations between landlord and tenant were direct, but that Ireland was cursed with a system of middlemen; that, on this side of the Channel, there has been a long hereditary connection between the owners of land and the soil itself, whereas in Ireland the tenants or their families have been in possession of the land long before many of those to whom they pay their rent become connected with it; that England is a country of large farms, whereas Ireland is a country of small holdings. Those differences exist at the present moment, just as they did in 1845, when Lord Stanley called attention to them, and they lie at the root of the Irish Land Question. There was one matter referred to in the speech of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) upon which I desire to say a word. The hon. Member described to the House a scene, of which he was a witness, when he occupied the position of a private soldier. Some hon. Members may say this occurred a good many years ago; but similar scenes are occurring in Ireland at the present day. The hon. Member pointed out that the cabin from which a man was evicted had been built by the tenant, and that he had been born in the place. This reveals the fatal and fundamental distinction to which the Devon, the Richmond, and the Bessborough Commissioners called attention in their Reports—namely, that the creation of all the buildings and improvements in the land of Ireland, which are valuable, is due to the industry of the tenants. That is proved by the operation of the Land Act of 1881. The right hon. Gentleman the late Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Heneage) suggested, when the Land Bill was under consideration, that English-managed estates should be exempted from the operation of the Act. That proposition was resisted by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) and the Cabinet, and rejected; but in "another place" a somewhat similar proposition was made, and a clause was introduced into the Land Act, the effect of which was to provide that any owner who could prove that the improvements upon a particular holding had been made by himself and by means of his capital should be excluded, to a certain extent, from the operation of the Act. I am informed that the applications under that clause of the Land Act have been practically *nil;* and, therefore, it may be assumed that almost everywhere in Ireland the rental value of the holdings has been created by the toil of the tenants. It seems to me the significance of this matter is hardly appreciated in this country. We think of the Irish holdings as small, and the houses as mere mud cabins. But that is a very inadequate view of the matter. In September last I was speaking to a man who, two years ago, was evicted from his holding; and upon that holding of 50 acres the house in which he lived, the buildings attached to it, the roads, gates, fences, drainage, even the planting of the trees, and everything of that kind, had been done by himself or his father within the last 40 years; and I venture to say that in this country a similar dwelling-house and out-buildings, and other improvements, would cost at least £700 or £800. Such a thing could not happen in England. But this is not an isolated case, and I cannot too strongly emphasize the immense influence of circumstances such as I have mentioned in destroying any analogy which has been attempted to be drawn between England and Ireland in the matter of the just payment of rent. It entirely destroys the argument of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), the other night, when he asked whether a landlord in England could be found who was generous enough to forego two-thirds of the rent? My answer is, that there is not a landlord in England who owes the property for which he claims rent to the toil of his tenants, and not the outlay of his capital. In England these improvements are due entirely to the outlay of capital on the part of the owner. The Chief Secretary argued that it was legal to burn down the roofs and to destroy the houses of the poor people in Glenbeigh, and he said that if the landlord had simply evicted them they would have gone back again. Some hon. Member made the remark—" Quite right too." Then the right hon. Gentleman continued—

> " An hon. Member says, ' Quite right too.' In his opinion, then, poverty is to give a right to a person to live in a house that does not belong to him; but are you to apply that maxim not only to the West of Ireland, but to other parts of Ireland, and to England and Scotland as well ? "

Now, I venture to say that that is a most unfair illustration and a most unsound argument. No doubt, it is very difficult for the right hon. Gentleman, who, I believe, is a most kind-hearted landlord in Gloucestershire and Wiltshire, to understand the position of these poor people. No doubt, the whole of his out-buildings and farmsteads are kept in most excellent order, entirely at his own expense; all his gates are kept hanging on their hinges; all his fences are well maintained, and he and his predecessors have made a vast outlay of capital upon the estates during the last 30 or 40 years. The right hon. Gentleman is in a very different position from most English landlords if that is not the case. But nothing of the kind occurs in Ireland. The rent in Ireland, I venture to say, arises from the outlay of capital on the part of the tenant from the sweat of his brow and the result of his toil; and the word " rent," therefore, does not mean the same thing in the two countries. I come now to another point. There are two classes of tenancies in Ireland. From the most recent Report of the Land Commission, I see that there are 170,000 tenants who have had the advantage of having their rents fixed by the Land Court, or by agreement; but there are between 450,000 and 500,000 tenants who have not had the advantage of any decision of the Land Court with respect to their rents. In these cases the rents have not been fixed in any way by the operations of the Land Act of 1881, and I think it is desirable that we should know how these rents, in the case of the larger number of tenancies, have been fixed. We have seen that the value of the holdings has arisen from the toil of the tenant; let us look, then, for a moment at the manner in which the rents have been fixed. I take the Report of the Bessborough Commission as an authority which will not be disputed. In that Report the Commissioners described the condition of a tenant—

> " Not to come to terms with his landlord means for him to leave his home, to leave his employment, to forfeit the inheritance of his fathers, and to some extent the investment of his toil, and to sink at once to a lower plane of physical comfort and social rank. It is no matter to him of the chaffer of the market, but almost of life and death. The farmer bargains with his landlord under sentence of losing his living if the bargain goes off.
>
> ' You take my life when you do take the means
> By which I live.'
>
> We grant that it would be inexpedient to interfere with freedom of contract between landlord and tenant if freedom of contract really existed; but freedom of contract in the case of the majority of tenants, large and small, does not exist."

That is the language of three Irish landlords and an Irish Judge, and the words entirely cut away any moral sanction from the phrase "legal obligations" used in Her Majesty's Speech. Where there is no freedom of contract, there cannot be said to be any moral obligation on the part of those who have been coerced. The figure of the rent has, in fact, been fixed on the one hand by the rapacity—in some cases by the need, I admit, of the Irish landlord, because, in many instances, he is sunk in the morass of embarrassment—it is fixed on the one hand by the rapacity and need of the landlords, and on the other by the actual hunger—almost to starvation point—of the tenant. It may be asked, why do not the 450,000 tenants outside the Land Court enter it and bring themselves under the operation of the Land Act? And, on this point, Englishmen have need to become acquainted with the facts before coming to a hasty conclusion. We know, in the first place, that leaseholders are excluded by the terms of the Land Act itself, and their case is a cruel one. "Leases," say the Bessborough Commission—

> " have been imposed on tenants against their will, and when, from their legally helpless condition, they could not refuse."

That is a strong statement for a Royal Commission to make upon such a matter. It would appear that there are more than 100,000 tenants, out of the number of tenants who are outside the Land Act, who are in that position of hardship. But the fact that there are still so many tenants who have not the advantage of judicial rents is not only due to this law. There is abundant and overwhelming proof that the utmost hostility is entertained by the landlords against the tenants who desire to enter the Land Court. In October last I became acquainted with the circumstances of a property between Tralee and Listowel. There was one holding, in the middle of many others, the tenant of which obtained a judicial rent. He happened to be in the possession of money, and, therefore, was independent and cared nothing for his landlord. The result of his appeal to the Land Court was that the rent was reduced from £30 to £12, while all the tenants around him still remained rack-rented. Only last week, in Enniskillen, the agent of Lord Massey received a large number of notices from tenants anxious to have judicial rents fixed by the Land Court; and he retaliated at once by serving something like 100 notices of ejectment on the unfortunate tenants. I now come to the 170,000 tenants who, up to August last, had their rents fixed in one way or another. What is their position? During the first years of the existence of the Land Court, the reduction of rent was so insignificant that to perpetuate such reduced rents for 15 years was a grievance of which there was much bitter complaint, even among the 170,000 tenants whose judicial rents had been fixed. The hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. Dillon), in a forcible speech which he made last year on the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), gave the House some striking instances of rack-renting. I cannot mention the name of the hon. Member for Mayo without paying him a tribute in this House for the courage and ability with which he has enunciated his views. I think that a somewhat unfair and unworthy sneer fell from the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), the other night, with respect to the hon. Member for Mayo. The hon. Member for Mayo always has the courage of his convictions; and, as far as I have come across him, his honour, truthfulness, and everything which proceeds from him, make him a man whose qualities may justly arouse our sincere admiration. Since August other reductions have been made. The other day the Land Commissioners went through a list of cases at Manorhamilton, in Leitrim County. The name of the landlord in every instance was that of Colonel Loftus Tottenham. In five instances the rents were reduced from £89 to £37. In other years Colonel Tottenham had been annually charging the five tenants to whom this reduction applies 178 per cent too much, if the reduced rent is a fair rent. There are some other cases reported from Ireland in reference to the estates of Colonel King-Harman. In that case, the rents upon four holdings were reduced from £42 to £19. I am told that these are the names which are borne by the hon. and gallant Member for Winchester and the hon. and gallant Member who sits for the Thanet Division of Kent. If that be so, I think it concerns them and some other hon. Members of this House who are in a similar position to give some explanation. I have here also some figures in regard to the County of Longford. Upon one estate the facts appear to be very remarkable indeed, for I find that upon 25 holdings the total rent was reduced from £232 to £73; and that in one instance it was reduced from £6 10*s*. to £1 12*s*. I quite agree with Lord Salisbury that there has been "organized embezzlement" in Ireland; but it has not been on the part of the tenants. Nor is the organized embezzlement on the part of the Land League; but on the part of the landlords, who have behaved in this manner towards their tenants. No doubt I may be told that the rent of the 170,000 tenants which has been fixed by the Land Court ought to be held sacred, as their case is different from those of the tenants who have not gone into Court. The sacred character of these rents was held up to us from the Treasury Bench last August, and I remember the Prime Minister saying that if any mistake was made by the Sub-Commissioners the English taxpayer would have to bear the loss and not the Irish landlord. The hon. Member for Cork proved to demonstration that in regard to many of the tenants who had gone into Court, their case was much worse than if they had remained outside. In the case of those who went into the Land Court in 1882, 1883, and 1884, the reduction was of such an infinitesimal character that the fixing of it for 15 years was a greater wrong than the relief the tenants were afforded. I do not, however, rely on anything stated by the hon. Member for Cork in this matter, or on anything that was stated by anyone on this side of the House. I prefer to fall back upon the words of a great Irish landlord who holds a high position in the service of Her Majesty, and who wrote a letter on the 31st of October last which contains this sentence—

> "Her Majesty's Government have, by their action in appointing a Royal Commission, to some extent re-opened the question of rent."

He backed up his opinion by making a reduction of 4*s.* in the pound upon the rents on his own estates in the County of Kerry. There is, as will be seen, a qualification in that letter. I believe it is one of the customs of this House that when a Messenger from the House of Lords approaches the door, the Door-keeper is required to close the entrance to this chamber. Now, I venture to say that this, which is an assertion of the Privileges of this House, would be inoperative if the door were left open for only three inches, and the Door-keeper received no orders from the Sergeant-at-Arms to close it effectively. I look upon the words of the letter to which I have referred, "to some extent," in the same light. "The Government, by appointing a Royal Commission, entirely abandoned the sacredness of judicial rents. These words were written by Lord Lansdowne, a nobleman whom Lord Salisbury, in his dire extremity, towards the beginning of January, telegraphed 3,000 miles away to come and help him. In giving an abatement of the judicial rents, Lord Lansdowne was only doing what has been going on all over Ireland. Judicial rents, fixed under the Land Act, in this time of pressure have become unfair. Sir, I have endeavoured to show to the House that the property of which we have heard so much has been created by the tenants; that the rent has been fixed by one side only; that a large portion of those outside the Land Court are precluded by law from entering it; that obstacles are placed in the way of the tenants which prevent them from obtaining relief. Wherever rents have been adjudicated upon, rack-renting in Ireland has been proved up to the hilt. Under these circumstances, I maintain that the legal obligations we are asked to enforce by the Criminal Law are obligations to which the moral law gives no sanction. I am quite willing to agree to the appeal of the Chief Secretary the other night—that we should discuss the law as we find it. But what I contend is, that the law, as it now stands, is unjust. The rights of property, reasonably understood, form a great security for the rights of the people; and if you do anything to sap the rights of property you will strike a great blow against the security of the rights of the people. All we want is that property should be understood in its right sense; and I think that property in this case rather lies with the tenant than with the landlord. It would be very much better if we heard a little more of the rights of humanity. We hear a great deal about the maintenance of the Union; and I am sure all of us on this side of the House will respond to all that has been said to-night by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) upon the subject. There has been a great deal of going up and down shouting about the maintenance of the Union; but the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) towards the conclusion of his speech on Friday last were somewhat significant. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that it was no use to maintain the Union unless you maintain the law. We say the law must be made just before you maintain it. The noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), who has been treated a little disrespectfully this evening—for he has been called a crutch, to be thrown aside whenever no longer needed—the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale, who, I believe, in the opinion of himself and his supporters, holds the fate of the Government in his hands, recommends all who are interested in this Irish Question to read Mr. Dicey's book. I have read that book with very great interest, and I think that one of the books which will contribute most to the solution of the Irish problem will be that book, because it contains all that can be said on the side of those who are posing as Unionists, and that is very little indeed. I should like to ask whether Her Majesty's Government and the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) stand by these words of Mr. Dicey?—

> "If the Union is to be maintained with advantage to any part of the United Kingdom, the people of the United Kingdom must make the most strenuous, firm, and continuous effort—lasting, it may well be, for 20 years or more—to enforce, throughout every portion of the United Kingdom, obedience to the law of the land. This effort"—

and I particularly call the attention of hon. Members to this passage—

> "This effort can only be justified by the equally strenuous determination (which must involve an infinity of trouble) to give ear to every Irish complaint, and to see that the laws which the Irish people obey are laws of justice, and, what is much the same thing, laws which, in the long run, the people of Ireland will feel to be just."

If the Government and the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) apply themselves to carry out the proposition which Mr. Dicey there tries to enforce, they will have to move in a very different direction to that they have indicated in the Queen's Speech. Now, Sir, the agrarian question is only part of this Irish problem, as anyone who has only looked even at its fringe will readily admit. I suppose there will be another opportunity within the next few weeks—namely, when Her Majesty's Government lay their proposals for the reform of the Criminal Law before the House—to discuss the administration of Criminal Law in Ireland; and, therefore, I do not propose to dwell upon that subject. I, however, pledge myself to make good, if I then have the chance, my words that the state of things which has lately existed in Ireland would not be tolerated for a single week in England. A very astounding remark fell from the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) during his speech on Friday last. The right hon. Gentleman appears to have been somewhat nettled by the very remarkable speech which was delivered at the Connaught Winter Assizes by Chief Baron Palles. The Chief Secretary for Ireland remarked that the Chief Baron appeared to have fallen into a mistake on that occasion. Well, now, Sir, I am not sure it conduces to the administration or enforcement of law and order in Ireland that the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland should be found to say in his place in the House of Commons that a great Irish Judge has fallen into a mistake. I would like to point out that, if the Chief Baron fell into a mistake at Sligo with regard to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol, is it not possible that another Irish Judge sitting in Dublin has fallen into a mistake with regard to the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon)? Is it calculated to teach the Irish people to respect what Judges say—that the Member of the Cabinet responsible for Irish government should tell us in the House of Commons that an Irish Judge has been making mistakes? Sir, if the law with regard to the agrarian question were put upon a proper basis, we should only have begun with the Irish problem. The demand for self-government in Ireland is much more ancient than the agrarian difficulty, and it is much more deeply rooted than any question about rent. It rests upon the most indestructible feeling that animates any of us—the love of liberty. We all know that the agrarian question, so far as evictions and small holdings are concerned, is mainly the creation of this century. It is largely due, as Mr. O'Connell showed in this House in 1846, to Acts of Parliament passed between 1815 and 1830, and to the political circumstances which favoured the creation of small holdings. The demand for self-government rests upon another basis. I entirely agree with the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) as to the tone and temper in which we should discuss this matter. I do not think that clever speeches from criminal lawyers on the other side, made up very largely of cuttings from the speeches of Irish Members below the Gangway in very different times to these, add much to the prospect of a solution of the Irish problem. The attitude of the Liberal Party in this matter is perfectly clear and unhesitating. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) alluded very significantly, and with great force, to the great volume of public opinion of which sometimes we hear the faint echo in this House, but which does not penetrate into those palatial chambers in Pall Mall. We had a representative conference of the Liberal Party at Leeds in November last. Men were gathered from all parts of the country, and it was my honour to move a resolution, which I venture to quote in this House. That resolution was—

> "That the best interests, both of Great Britain and Ireland, imperatively require that the great effort to give a better Government to Ireland which was begun by Mr. Gladstone should be firmly persevered in until a desirable settlement is arrived at; that such settlement must meet the wishes of the Irish electors, as expressed by their Constitutional Representatives in Parliament; and that the only plan which will satisfy either the justice or the policy of the case is that of an Irish Legislative Body for the management of what Parliament should decide to be distinctively Irish affairs."

That resolution was drawn with great care, and I think that within it are to be found the elements of a desirable settlement of the Irish Question, and that without the lines of that resolution no permanent settlement can be arrived at. I think that, by adopting measures in harmony with that declaration, and by that course only, shall we be doing what lies in our power to bring about the realization of that prayer with which we begin our proceedings every day—namely, that the result of our deliberations may lead to the uniting and knitting together of the hearts and estates of all within this Realm.

MR. LYELL (Orkney and Shetland) said, he was anxious to say a few words on this debate, being a Scottish landlord, who, within the last few weeks, had taken the trouble to go over to Ireland to try and judge for himself of the position of the Irish small tenantry; and, as far as in him lay, to understand the apparently irreconcilable differences which pervaded the discussion of the Irish Question in Parliament and throughout this country. For this purpose he visited the West and South of Ireland, and not only found much to interest him, but much to instruct him. Coming, as he did, from a district where he was pretty well acquainted with the ordinary system of land tenure and cultivation, to a land where all the arrangements were entirely different, the first thing that mainly impressed him was the absolute difference between the notions of the natural sequence of law and order which prevailed in Ireland and in this country. The Chief Secretary on Friday expressed very well the feeling of this side of the Channel, when he declared that law was for the protection of the many against the few. But the first notion that impressed itself upon him (Mr. Lyell) in Kerry and the West of Ireland was, that the law was regarded by the great bulk of the people for the protection of the few as against the many. The law of the land there was not followed by order, but by disorder, and any addition to the law with the view of promoting order would rather tend in the opposite direction. In fact, the state of feeling among the Irish people had given rise to the common notion that anyone who broke the law was doing a useful and patriotic deed; and if he should be so fortunate as to get into gaol on account of his law-breaking, he became a hero in the eyes of the Irish people, whether he had done rightly or wrongly. And this was more particularly the case if the law-breaking had reference to a question of land tenure or the payment of rent. The law was regarded as an engine for upholding a system of police rule centring in Dublin, of which the chief function in the country districts was to bring home to the minds of the small tenants the rights of the landlord as defined by law, but which did not bring home to the land-owning classes the duties they owed to the tenantry. He had twice visited Glenbeigh during the course of the evictions; and, regarding the character of the land and the extraordinary rents charged for it, he would say that if any Scottish farmers were to be asked to pay anything like these rents they would scorn the idea. It was notorious that the money paid as rent was derived from the wages of labour in other districts of the country, and in the harvest fields of England and Scotland. With the increase of machinery in agricultural operations, however, and still more from the general depression in agriculture, those sources of additional income were cut away from them, and now they had only their own holdings to depend upon. It was only natural, therefore, that the rental which they had unguardedly agreed to pay should be in arrear, as it was perfectly impossible to extract it from the land. Glenbeigh was an instance of inconsiderateness on the part of the landowner in allowing a population far in excess of the capabilities of the land to obtain a footing on it; and of the utmost carelessness and cupidity on the part of the mortgagee, who had advanced a large sum of money to the owners on what was absolutely insufficient security, and the tenantry were now paying the penalty. He must say his sympathies, when he saw them, were entirely with the people. In reading over the reports of the denunciations that were levelled against the mortgagee and the owner, he could not think that the terms used were too harsh in condemning a system which led to the wanton and brutal outrage of evicting a number of those wretched peasants in the winter season, and leaving them on the roadside. It was utterly impossible to earn rent there; and the whole system cried out to this country against the use of the forces of the Crown and the law to support what was quite contrary to the most elementary principles of ordinary justice and humanity. If a farmer in Scotland or England gave up his holding at the end of his lease, he was entitled to get from the incoming tenant, or the owner, the value of such improvements as he had made, and such conditions were supposed, in a broad way, to be included in the Land Act of 1881; but the tenant in Ireland could only obtain value for the improvements he had made by public auction from the incoming tenant. Under these circumstances, the tenant found that he could obtain no money equivalent to the improvements he had made. A man who took a holding from which a tenant had been evicted, and on which the tenant's improvements had been confiscated, was called a "land grabber," and was ostracized by all his neighbours. These evictions were not only contrary to our ideas of right and humanity, but were also discrediting the law. How could they wonder that the law was discredited, and that disorder followed its enforcement? For his own part, he believed that the law and the agents of the law, in the shape of a large military police force, were kept up in the interests of the landlord class, with the result that the people were becoming thoroughly demoralized. The other organization for the promotion of order—the National League—was doing a useful work for maintaining peace in the country, and it was in the places where it was least in operation that they found those Moonlight outrages committed which were universally deplored. He thoroughly endorsed the opinion expressed by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) in one of the debates of last Session, when he said that if the administration of order were left in the hands of an Irish Executive they would be able to deal effectively with any outrages that occurred. With regard to the question of over-congestion of the people on the land, he had seen that this was the case in the West of Ireland; and he thoroughly endorsed the opinion of the Chief Secretary that this question was one of the most urgent and one of the most difficult that the Administration could undertake; but, for his own part, he did not believe that any Administration framed as the present one was could solve it. There was no doubt that the population there was far in excess of what it ought to be; that was admitted on all hands. The removal of a portion of the people was absolutely necessary; but it was a question which could only be effectively dealt with by a Body which was in sympathy and in harmony with the feelings of the people, and which thoroughly understood the conditions of the case. He felt sure that if more hon. Members would follow his example and go once to Ireland with the desire of impartially examining into the whole question, it would not be difficult to arrive at a settlement which would be final, which would reasonably satisfy the Irish people, which would be honourable to this country, and which would secure the union of the two countries in a bond of peace, amity, and increased prosperity.

Lord ERNEST HAMILTON (Tyrone, N.) said, that they had heard in the course of that debate several expressions of indignation at the action of the landlords in Ireland in evicting their tenants. He did not dispute the existence of the evictions, but he denied that they were attributable to tyranny or cruelty on the part of the landlords as had been alleged. The landlords in Ireland had, on the contrary, been doing their utmost to avoid the necessity of evictions, and it was hon. Members opposite who had done everything in their power to encourage evictions. They would all remember that during the debate last autumn on the Tenant Relief Bill they had heard most gloomy forebodings from the hon. Member for Cork. What had turned out to be the case? Instead of the wholesale evictions which had been prophesied, they found the landlords giving great reductions. Although several Irish Members had spoken in that debate, there had been very little said about the Glenbeigh evictions; in fact, most of the hon. Members opposite had avoided the topic. What was the reason for this? Hon. Members opposite had told their constituents in Ireland that these evictions were the deathblow of Irish landlordism, and that they would proclaim to the English people the tyranny of the Irish landlords. The reason of their reticence now was that full publicity had been given to the facts of these evictions, and that it was seen that, so far from landlords and their agents being rack-renters, they had acted with a forbearance almost unprecedented; and that these evictions had been caused, not by the landlords, but by the operations of hon. Members on the opposite Bench. In reading the accounts of these cases in the papers, it was impossible not to feel pity and commiseration for the unfortunate people; but, at the same time, it was impossible to avoid some feeling of contempt for people who were such absolute slaves as to allow themselves to be duped in order to please a party of unscrupulous agitators. It had been abundantly made manifest that the agent on this estate had shown indulgence to the verge of abandoning the property. Certainly, the landlord and agent on this estate contrasted very favourably with certain Irish Members opposite, who were landlords, and almost all of whom exacted the uttermost farthing from their tenantry. The hon. Member for Cornwall (Mr. Conybeare) had taken an active part in the proceedings at Glenbeigh. It might be well if the hon. Member purchased the estate, which he could obtain very cheaply, and set an example of what a modern landlord should be. Some of the advice he had given to the tenants was remarkable. He had suggested that bailiffs should be brained, and that jurors should commit perjury.

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid), rising to a point of Order, asked whether the noble Lord was in Order in charging an hon. Member with inciting the Irish people to commit perjury?

MR. SPEAKER said, he understood that the noble Lord was arguing that on the interpretation of a series of speeches they amounted to a recommendation to that course.

LORD ERNEST HAMILTON said, the hon. Member for Cornwall (Mr. Conybeare) had stated that in the past juries had violated their oaths rather than convict under certain laws that they considered unjust, and he said that was a precedent they should remember. Not a single hon. Member had suggested what he would have done if he had been the landlord of the Glenbeigh estate. Some people seemed to think that Irish landlords took a cruel and vindictive delight in evicting their tenants. But the Irish landlord had everything to lose and nothing to gain by eviction. He lost the goodwill of his tenant and the rent of his farm, for no one would take it when vacant. No landlord, therefore, would think of resorting to eviction unless driven to it. He had listened to the speech of the hon. Member for Darlington (Mr. T. Fry), and had been impressed with its evident sincerity; but that hon. Member declared that he had no sympathy with any tenant who could pay and combined not to do so. He said that from his visit to Glenbeigh he felt convinced that the tenants could not pay. But that there were combinations on certain estates where the tenants could pay was admitted by the speeches of the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. Dillon); and if there were such cases, how were the landlords to tell whether it was inability or combination that led to the refusal to pay rent? Speeches delivered in various parts of Ireland by the leaders of the Plan of Campaign showed that those leaders were desirous of pushing on evictions, which served them in various ways. Evictions stirred up ill-feeling against the landlords, afforded fuel for agitation, filled their ranks with reckless men, and secured money from America—money which was not always devoted to the purposes for which it was contributed. What had taken place on the Clanricarde property was very characteristic. The tenants demanded a reduction of 25 per cent, and the landlord subsequently wrote offering 20 per cent. A settlement was about to be arrived at when the hon. Member for Mayo came down from Dublin, and though he had not been there for five years, and could not, therefore, know anything of his own knowledge of the circumstances of the estate, he advised that 40 per cent should be demanded. There was no pretence that in this case the tenants could not pay. The estate had been selected because of the known stubbornness of the Clanricarde tenantry. The hon. Member for Mayo had recently challenged the administrators of the law in Ireland to produce one case in which he had advised tenants to refuse to accept a reasonable reduction. The Woodford case, he held, might be cited conclusively in answer to the hon. Member's challenge. If, at a future time, there should be scenes at Woodford like those which had been witnessed at Glenbeigh, who, he asked, would be to blame—the landlord, or the hon. Member for Mayo? The Nationalist Members were of opinion that landlordism was the great obstacle in the way of separation; and they had, therefore, determined to cut off the supplies of the landlords in order, if possible, to exterminate them. The destruction was sought to be accomplished by a No Rent Manifesto, or by inducing the tenants to ask for impossible reductions of rent. Was it not apparent to everybody that in a case like that of Glenbeigh, where the tenants had not paid rent for five and nine years, something more than a reduction of rent was necessary? The landowning class was credited by hon. Members opposite with the wish to rob and crush the tenants. He could assure the Members to whom he was referring that many of those sitting on his own side of the House would gladly join with them in any rational movement for the improvement of the tenants' condition if there were the slightest indications that their desire to benefit the tenants was sincere. It was, however, impossible to find any such indications; instead of benefiting the tenants they wished to lower them in order to injure the landlords. Hon. Members opposite never tried to improve the conditions of farming, or to teach the tenants how to make the most of their wretched holdings. Even an insolvent tenant was seldom allowed to sell his interest in his farm; he was compelled to wait in order that he might resist eviction. The boast of the hon. Member for Mayo that at this moment 400 farms in Kerry were derelict, no tenant daring to set his foot upon them, showed to what a state the interference of hon. Members opposite had reduced the country. He thought that if all the parties concerned were to co-operate, much might be done to raise the tenants —even those at Glenbeigh—to positions of comparative affluence. At present, the different parties were directing their energies to one another's injury, and the landlord was unwilling to improve his property, because experience taught him that if he were to spend every farthing of his income upon it he would still be held up to odium as a rack-renter, and his tenants would still be induced to withhold their rents. If the landlords, the parish priests, and the Nationalists combined to effect it, the condition of the tenants might be improved; but as long as this war between the landlords and the Nationalists continued their condition might get worse and worse. The National League might succeed in ruining some hundreds of landlords; but they would ruin hundreds of thousands of tenants. He would remind the Government that there were other measures besides coercive and repressive measures by which the National League could be met and defeated. There was the compulsory measure of which hon. Members opposite were in great terror, which would cause every tenant to become an owner. This was the vulnerable point in the armour of the Nationalists. When every tenant should have become the owner of his holding—from that moment the National League would die a natural death. The patriotism of Irishmen was ruled by worldly considerations, and as soon as tenants should find that no gain could result from agitation they would cease to pour their contributions into the pockets of hon. Members opposite.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE (Bradford, Central) said, in rising to take part in this somewhat discursive debate, he desired to refer to the very able speech of the noble Lord the Member for Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) on the subject of economy, and in doing so he would endeavour to observe the wise spirit of conciliation and absence of Party recrimination that characterized the remarks of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). He fully admitted, for his part, that the present rate of Expenditure was due to the concurrent action of both sides of the House; and that it could only be alleviated and reversed by a concurrent movement on both sides of the House in an opposite direction. Looking at the changes of Government that had taken place in the last two or three years, and that might take place in the next two years, nothing, in his opinion, could be more detrimental to the interests of the public, and of the Services, than that there should be Party division on the subject, and that there should be violent fluctuations in economy and expenditure. The Liberal record during the last three or four years had not been so satisfactory that they could afford to throw stones at the present Government; and he must admit that any immediate considerable reduction beyond the very modest sum to which the noble Lord was prepared to limit his demands was rendered impossible by the obligations contracted by the late Government either in the autumn of 1885 or in the middle of last year. Any movement in the direction of economy must be slow, but he hoped it would be permanent. He hoped, also, that both sides of the House would concur in making the effort. The noble Lord had done an immense service to the country, and to his own Party, by sacrificing himself on the altar of economy in the Military Departments. He thought also that the noble Lord was fully justified in dealing with the Estimates in gross—in calling the attention of the two great spending Departments to the fact that their Estimates, compared with three or four years ago, had greatly increased; and in demanding from them a return to more moderate expenditure without specifying any particular items. The right hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith) had challenged the noble Lord to meet the Government on the details, and had promised to justify each one of them. He knew from experience extending over 20 years that such a course must be delusive. Very plausible arguments could always be adduced to support every item in the Estimates taken separately; and yet in the aggregate it might not be wise, or right, or justifiable that all the items should be taken together and at one time. The Expenditure during the last three years had increased by upwards of £6,000,000. That was due to a variety of demands from the two great spending Departments—the demand for iron-clads, armed cruisers, torpedo-boats, protection to coaling stations, protection of mercantile and military harbours, and provision of armaments. For all those, as he had said, plausible and excellent arguments could be found. The question, however, was not whether these things were necessary or desirable, but whether the expenditure on all of them should be undertaken at the same time. It seemed to him that that was a point that could not be well discussed on the Army and Navy Estimates. It could only be discussed in principle, and at the instance of the Government itself. And, therefore, in his opinion, the noble Lord was quite right in calling upon the Departments to marshal their demands in their proper order. It was only the Departments that could form an opinion as to which of the various items were the most important. An illustration of the difficulty of dealing with large items of Naval Expenditure was furnished by the unsuccessful efforts he made last year to reduce the outlay by the cost of two large iron-clads, which were estimated at nearly £1,000,000 each, entailing a charge on the next four years of about £500,000 each year. Never, he thought, was a stronger case made out. It was shown that the French Government had laid down two vessels of the same kind, and that they then abandoned their intention of building them, and, indeed, of building any more iron-clads. It was also shown that the present and the late Chief Constructors were opposed to the designs of these vessels; and yet, although he did not ask for the absolute rejection of the Vote, but only for the postponement of the expenditure until the matter had received further consideration, he failed entirely, and he was out-voted on a Division by a rush of Members who had not heard the debate. He had never known any good to result from a general discussion of the items of the Army or the Navy Estimates, and any attempt to effect economy in this way was absolutely hopeless. It could be effected only through the action of the Treasury upon the great spending Departments. As to the course suggested by the noble Lord of remitting the Estimates to a Committee, if it were to be adopted every year it would lead to an increase of expenditure rather than the reverse, because it would relieve the heads of Departments from responsibility by devolving it upon the Committee, upon whom the pressure of the spending interests would be stronger than they could resist. At the same time, it was worthy of consideration whether once in a way, and especially at a time when the House was in a mood for economy, the suggested course might not be adopted with advantage; but it should be regarded as an exceptional course, to be resorted to only once in 10 or 15 years. After all, Naval and Military Expenditure must be determined by foreign policy. With what the noble Lord said on that head he cordially concurred. If we were really to pursue a spirited foreign policy in the East, and to be ready to go into conflict with the great Military Powers of Europe, then our Military Expenditure was not only not excessive, but it was not enough. But he believed that the country would adapt the expression of Prince Bismarck to our case, and would say that in such a policy as that we ought not to risk the life of a single Englishman or the loss of a single Sovereign. As to Egypt, there were few who did not at this time deplore that we ever entered upon an Egyptian campaign, and who did not regret that we found ourselves in the occupation of Egypt. Few would now say that we had derived any real advantage from that occupation. He even doubted whether the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian was right in saying that the Egyptians had benefited by it. In his belief, the only parties who had gained were the bondholders, and they were not entitled to sympathy. The occupation of Egypt was the main cause of the large increase of Military Expenditure the last few years, for, as the result of our occupation, there was the greatest ill-feeling in France towards this country. The French did not believe that we were sincere in our announced intention to withdraw. If we could make France and the other Great Powers of Europe understand that we intended to leave at no distant day, and if we could invite their co-operation so as to make it more easy for us to leave, we might get rid of the hostile feeling there was against us, and the main cause for this large expenditure would be disposed of. Referring to Ireland, if he rightly understood the speech of the Chief Secretary, the Government in no case had refused to give the aid of the police or the military to any process of eviction when they had been finally called upon to do so; but, when asked to lend these forces, they had brought moral pressure to bear upon landlords with the view of effecting arrangements between them and their tenants. The Chief Secretary said that suggestions were made to creditors to induce them to be merciful to their debtors. That was a roundabout way of saying that pressure was put upon landlords to induce them to abate their rents. For his part, he had no fault to find with the Chief Secretary in this respect. In the circumstances in which he found himself he was thoroughly justified in adopting the course he did adopt. He had done only what any humane statesman would have done in his position, and little or no hostile criticism would be directed against him from the Opposition side of the House on that account. But it would be interesting to hear from the right hon. Gentleman a little further explanation of the exact nature of the pressure he brought to bear on the landlords. He believed he was right in assuming that one of the landlords dealt with in that way was Lord Clanricarde, who, up to a late date, had declined to make any abatement in his rents. It was said that the agent of the estate—Mr. Joyce—in his evidence before Lord Cowper's Land Commission, had stated that he had advised Lord Clanricarde that the rents ought to be abated, and that if they were abated that part of the country would be quiet; but Lord Clanricarde still declined to offer any abatement. Later in the autumn pressure was brought to bear upon him by the Chief Secretary, and then, tardily, he made some reductions. It would be interesting to know the nature of the correspondence which passed between the Chief Secretary and Lord Clanricarde. It might throw a good deal of light on the whole situation, and show what was the argument which induced Lord Clanricarde to make that tardy abatement. It might show whether it was made on account of the great depression and fall in prices, or on account of the condition of Ireland. He (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) believed it was on the ground of the great fall of prices; and this was important as regarded both the past and the future. In July last the Government denied that there was any emergency; they denied that there had been any such fall in prices as would justify the passing of any temporary measure; and, therefore, asked the House to reject the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). The Chief Secretary, at the same time, admitted that if there were a considerable number of tenants who could not pay their judicial rents, Parliament ought at once to relieve them from the possibility of eviction until their case could be further considered. As, however, he did not at that time believe that prices had fallen beyond the expectation of the Land Commissioners, he invited Parliament to reject the Bill; but, after a too short holiday, he went to Ireland, and found the circumstances of the case and the depression in agriculture such as necessitated and compelled a course of action quite different from that which he had contemplated. Thereupon he began to put that pressure upon landlords of which the Opposition certainly did not disapprove. Personally, he voted for the temporary Bill with great hesitation, feeling that it was a serious matter to interfere with the operation of the Land Act of 1881, and that nothing but a strong case could justify their doing so. He still believed that it was a great and important measure; but, after listening last Session to the case of the hon. Member for Cork, he was bound to admit that the fall in prices had been so great as to justify the temporary measure then proposed. He certainly thought it would be very unjust that the whole of the loss due to the fall of prices after the rents were judicially fixed should fall on the tenants alone. It was on that account that he felt it right to vote for the Bill which was brought in by the hon. Member for Cork, and he thought some measure in that direction was still necessary to the peace of Ireland. The action of the Government and of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, in rejecting the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork in July last, had practically thrown upon them the responsibility of the trouble that had arisen in Ireland during the past few months; indeed, it appeared to be admitted now by the Chief Secretary from the action he had taken in Ireland, and the pressure he had brought to bear upon the landlords, that a mistake was made in July last in throwing out that Bill. The position of things at that time was very similar to what it was in 1880, when the House of Lords rejected the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, and when in the winter that followed there were evictions on the one hand, and crime and outrages on the other. In the present case, the pressure by the Government on the landlords and the Plan of Campaign were the consequence of the rejection of the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork. As to the Plan of Campaign, if the Chief Secretary's description of it was right—namely, that it was intended to give to the tenants of Ireland the possession of their tenancies without paying rent—he should heartily condemn it. No one condemned more strongly than he did the issue of the "No Rent" Manifesto in 1881; and he should take the same course with regard to the Plan of Campaign if such were its object. But it must not be supposed that on that account he condemned absolutely all combinations of tenants under all circumstances in Ireland. He would take a case in illustration. On Lord Dillon's property in Ireland there were several thousands of small tenants occupying from one to 10 acres each; and those tenants suffered greatly, not merely from agricultural depression, but also from the difficulty of obtaining employment away from their holdings. He believed he was right in saying that up to a very late period Lord Dillon had declined to make any abatement in the rent. What were the tenants to do in such circumstances? Singly they were helpless against the landlord, living in England, and managing his property through an agent. Was it strange, then, that they should be advised that by union and combination they might become strong? Was it surprising that these poor tenants should take this advice and combine for their mutual interests? They did combine, and they made an offer to the landlord by which they resolved to stand or fall together. The result was that Lord Dillon came to terms with the tenants; an abatement of 20 per cent was made over the whole estate; the decrees that had been issued against about 70 of the tenants were withdrawn; and peace, instead of disorder, now reigned on the property. He doubted whether any hon. Member of that House would condemn combination under such conditions as those to which he had just referred. Looking at the question from a purely legal point of view, however, he was obliged to admit that those poor men were all engaged—according to the law of the country—in a criminal conspiracy for which they might have been indicted; and those who advised them were parties to the conspiracy. He knew something about the law of conspiracy, because, some years ago, he had to consider it carefully with reference to trade unions, whose combinations were then illegal, although so far as those organizations were concerned the law had since been altered. He did not hesitate to say that the Law of Conspiracy was the most dangerous, difficult, and elastic part of our law, and could be twisted by a Judge so as to include almost any act. He recollected one case in which it was held that, although it was perfectly legal for one man to refuse to pay Church rates, and to put the clergyman to legal remedies of distress, yet that a combination of two or more persons to do the same thing was an illegal conspiracy. He had no doubt that the Welsh farmers who, by joint action, were now trying to get a reduction of the tithe, were guilty of conspiracy, and might be indicted. The Law of Conspiracy was wholly Judge-made law. He believed there was no similar law in any other country in Europe. It might be that in some cases it was desirable that this law should be maintained; but it was not a law which, on the whole, commended itself to the public feeling of this country. The application of this law was, however, controlled by the healthy action of juries, which very often refused to convict. If the Welsh farmers, or the tenants of Lord Dillon, were put upon their trial, few men in this country would find them guilty of conspiracy. In ordinary times he should condemn morally combinations to reduce judicial rents; but under the circumstances of the moment, looking to the admitted necessity for the reduction of rents, he was forced to the conclusion that combination such as he had described, when carried out with moderation, was not unjustifiable, even if it infringed the Law of Conspiracy. The question, then, before the House was, what ought to be done with the present state of things in Ireland? He feared from the speech of the Chief Secretary that the Government had resolved to adopt the old plan of measures of coercion on the one hand, and of concession on the other. It was known that Lord Cowper's Commission had already come to the conclusion that judicial rents could not be sustained; and he was certain that when the evidence of that Commission was in the hands of the Government, they would see the absolute necessity of making some changes in the Land Act of 1881. What had occurred, and was occurring, in Ireland, was the direct result of the neglect of Parliament, and of the Government, to apply a remedy at the time it was required. Matters would only be made worse by pursuing further a course of criminal proceedings, and by endeavouring to bolster them up by changes of law and coercive measures. If there was any lesson that had been more clearly taught than another by the past 86 years in Ireland, it was the failure of the mixed policy of coercion and concession. Coercive measures had invariably blighted the remedies and frustrated the desires and intentions of Parliament. The Chief Secretary had stated that the Union could not be preserved unless law was maintained. He himself believed that the Union could not be preserved in its present position, even if the law was maintained. But there was an earlier condition—a condition precedent even to the maintenance of the law—and that was that the law itself should be just, and that remedies for admitted evils should be applied without delay, and in answer to the demands of the Irish people—demands constitutionally expressed by their 86 Members.

Mr. CURZON (Lancashire, Southport) said, he was desirous of expressing his confidence in the Government; and if that expression of feeling came from one who had not before spoken in the House, yet he hoped the House would extend to him that patience it had always shown on similar occasions. The right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down seemed to be in the position of one who was anxious to make out something against Her Majesty's Government, or, at all events, something in favour of their opponents; but he laboured under the initial difficulty of lacking materials—he was trying to make bricks without straw. At the end of the right hon. Gentleman's speech, he (Mr. Curzon) was left in total doubt whether the right hon. Gentleman was more in agreement, or disagreement, with

Her Majesty's Government. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Government contemplated measures of coercion. Now, coercion they knew was a nickname adopted by hon. Members on the other side of the House for any measure for the suppression of crime. But, understanding by coercion attempts made by the Legislature to detect and punish crime, the very essence of which was that they were exceptional and temporary, he believed he was right in saying that the Government had no intention of introducing coercion. The measures to be introduced by the Government—as he gathered from the Queen's Speech—were measures for the amendment of the Criminal Law, and they would be neither exceptional nor temporary, but permanent and possibly universal. Therefore, the argument as to coercion fell to the ground. With the leave of the House he would allude to observations which had fallen from some hon. Members that night. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh), who opened the discussion that evening, in the analytical examination to which he subjected Her Majesty's Speech, made some remarks on foreign policy, and pointed out an apparent discrepancy between the terms of that Speech and a passage in a letter from Lord Salisbury, which was read the other night by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), and he asked how they were to be reconciled. The Queen's Speech said that the Government did not apprehend any disturbance of European peace; but Lord Salisbury's letter had said that the chances were in favour of war. Now, a sufficient explanation of that discrepancy, if indeed it existed, might be found in the difference of dates. The letter was written on December 22, and the Speech was delivered on January 27, and they all knew that the face and form of European politics changed with Protean swiftness. But, as a matter of fact, no such discrepancy existed at all. It was evident that the hon. Member had not read that portion of the Speech which he affected to quote. Lord Salisbury said—

> "The outlook on the Continent was very black, and it was not too much to say that the chances were in favour of war at an early date."

That, presumably, referred to the chances of war between France and Germany. But in the Queen's Speech they read—

> "The affairs of South-Eastern Europe are still in an unsettled condition; but I do not apprehend that any disturbance of European peace will result from the unadjusted controversies which have arisen in that region."

That was clearly limited to the Balkan Peninsula, and therefore it was perfectly obvious that there was no such discrepancy as the hon. Member for Northampton supposed, and in bringing the matter before the House he had acted both with precipitancy and ignorance. He would like, however, to have suggested to the hon. Member, if he had been now present, that there was another authority possessed of superior information to the Government—information enjoyed by no other Government in Europe—upon the chances of war in Europe; an authority with which, no doubt, the hon. Member was acquainted—namely, the editor of *The Daily News;* and, if rumour was right, behind the editor of *The Daily News* loomed the commanding and inscrutable personality of the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). Therefore he ventured to say the hon. Member for Northampton might have derived the information he desired from the domestic circle of which he formed one of the most important Members. The hon. Member for Northampton blamed the unwise and irritating policy of the Government, and said that, in his opinion, it was likely to lead to war; yet not a single fact was advanced or reason stated for that opinion. The hon. Member wished to know whether the Government desired peace or war? He must have a very poor opinion of Governments in general if he thought any Government desired war. Turning to other speeches, the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington had said that he had spent a good deal of time in wrestling with the Conservative Party. He (Mr. Curzon) had no desire to wrestle with the noble Lord, because he knew perfectly well that the result would be the fate which befell Jacob in his historic contest with the Angel. But, much as he admired and entirely as he agreed with a great part of the speech of the noble Lord, he must say there was one expression in it which gave pain to both sides of the House. It was when he described Gentlemen sitting on the opposite side, who were known as

Liberal Unionists, by the somewhat undesirable metaphor of "a political crutch" on which the Tory Party was obliged to lean in order to support its tottering steps. Then the noble Lord said he looked forward to the time when the Tory Party would cast off this fortuitous aid and walk alone. The term "crutch" was not one which was complimentary to the Gentlemen referred to, nor did it truly represent either their relations to the Conservative Party or their position in the State. What he thought was more serious was that it was not complimentary to the Conservative Party, because it implied that they were in the condition of the halt and maimed, and could not walk alone. But he did not think there was any harm in confessing that the Liberal Unionists were to them as a staff. Then, so far from looking forward to the time when the Conservative Party should be anxious to walk alone, he hoped that many of the hon. Gentlemen opposite would walk, not temporarily, but permanently with them. He was quite certain they did not suffer by contact with the Conservatives, and he did not think the Conservatives had suffered by contact with them. Already there had been evident certain improvements in the political demeanour of that Party, which he thought he might attribute to Conservative influences; and he thought that they might be capable of still further amelioration. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), in his speech the other night, re-awakened those old principles of economy which used to be the cherished watchwords of his Party, but which had recently fallen into such sad disrepute. As the right hon. Gentleman was uttering these remarks, the House must have regretted very much that the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Peter Rylands) was not in his place to witness the triumph of his lifetime. The right hon. Gentleman passed on to criticize the structure of the Government. He severely blamed the structure of the present Government, and spoke in terms of condemnation of the divorce between the functions of the First Lord of the Treasury and Prime Minister, and of the concentration of the Offices of Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister in a single man. He said there had been no instance of the former for a period of 170 years; and that to the latter there were formidable objections, to which he knew of no compensating advantages. But the question was not one of abstract right or Constitutional precedent, but of simple expediency. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the "wanton rupture of an old-established and invariable practice." Had the other side of the House never perpetrated such a wanton rupture? Had not its occupants committed a more wanton rupture of a practice, if not as old established, at any rate more invariable — a practice, moreover, which had been the fixed tradition of this country, the fixed principle of the opposite Party, and the fixed policy of the right hon. Gentleman. The charge of the transgression of Constitutional principles hardly came well from a quarter which had been guilty of greater violations. [An hon. MEMBER: What violation?] Why, Home Rule. He did not think the argument about the concentration of Offices came with an altogether good grace from the Leader of the Opposition. It was not long ago since he filled the two Offices of Chancellor of the Exchequer and First Lord of the Treasury, and was Prime Minister as well—Lord Salisbury was two in one, but the right hon. Gentleman was three in one. Then the right hon. Gentleman said there was no compensating advantage in the present combination of the Offices of Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister. But the advantage was that at a time of European crisis and danger the Seals of the Foreign Office were in the hands of Lord Salisbury. He would next turn to a subject of more pressing interest—namely, Ireland. They had been told that the Plan of Campaign had been blessed by an Archbishop. It had also been praised by the hon. Member for Northampton. It was probably the first time in his life that the hon. Member had found himself in the same boat with an Archbishop. Hon. Members opposite boasted that it was they who had organized the Plan of Campaign. He must confess that he did not think that the patronage of Irish Members lent a movement any especial sanctity. The Plan of Campaign had also had the honour of the advocacy of an English Member. It had received the Constitutional and moderate support of the hon. Member for the Camborne Division of Cornwall

(Mr. Conybeare). The hon. Member might, perhaps, give them a speech similar to the one he recently delivered in Ireland. [Mr. CONYBEARE: Hear, hear!] The hon. Member cheered; and, therefore, he (Mr. Curzon) would tell the House his humble impression of that speech. As he read it he could not help thinking that he must have been in church—a somewhat extraordinary connection, he admitted—but in church on the first day of Lent, when the Commination Service was read from the desk. For, if hon. Members compared the Service and the speech, they would find an almost precisely similar volume of imprecation in each. He hoped, also, that the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) would give expression to his opinion on this subject. From a cause which they all deplored, the hon. Member had not, as yet, pronounced upon the question. But the hon. Member for East Mayo, in addressing an audience at Enniscorthy, had said that the Leader of the Home Rule Party in that House had abstained from expressing his views from motives of public policy; and that never since he took his stand on an Irish platform for Irish nationality had he served the Irish people more effectually, with greater spirit, or with more self-denial, than he was then doing. Those words were rather singular, for the inference naturally suggested by them, and by what they had since heard, was that Mr. Parnell was prostrated on a bed of sickness from motives of public policy, and that he served his Party most effectually when he was absent from the scene of action. That was, he thought, a legitimate conclusion to draw. The other night the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition had delivered some remarks about the Plan of Campaign. Hitherto the right hon. Gentleman had observed a curious silence on the subject, and, though appealed to on the point, gave no reply. There were a good many hon. Members who hoped that when the right hon. Gentleman rose to speak the other night he would utter something definite upon this point; and yet his language appeared to be either an exculpation of the Plan of Campaign, or to approximate to an exculpation so closely that there was not more than the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. But at the very time the right hon. Gentleman was speaking two of his former Colleagues were also speaking on the same subject. One of them furiously denounced the Plan of Campaign, and the other said that he abominated every form of illegality. Yet, at the same time, the right hon. Gentleman opposite was trying to throw the rags of respectability round the naked form of the scheme which the best of his old Colleagues denounced. If the right hon. Gentleman were in the House, he (Mr. Curzon) would take the liberty of repeating the question put to him the other day, as to whether he did or did not approve of the Plan of Campaign? He was aware that there were some hon. Members on the opposite Benches who had said they were not called upon to pronounce an opinion upon the Plan of Campaign until the Law Courts had given their verdict. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had just given that excuse, and it had also been given by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Stirling (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), although, when they remembered the latter announced to the country that he had "found salvation," they might have expected him to give a better leading to the public conscience. In answer to this argument, he would say that it was very much the same as if a man were to claim to be excused from giving his opinion about the legality or illegality of theft until a particular jury of his countrymen had pronounced a verdict upon a particular thief. In justification of the Plan of Campaign, they had been told that it was a consequence of the rejection by the House of the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork. No doubt it was a practical consequence, and it had been consequent in point of time. The Plan of Campaign was the second move in a well-thought-out and well-organized game of hon. Members opposite, in which the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork was the first move. It was within the knowledge of almost all hon. Members that the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork was introduced in order that it might be thrown out. [*Cheers, and cries of* "No!"] That Bill was introduced in order that it might be thrown out, and the Plan of Campaign had been set up in order that it might be put down. He would admit that the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork was nominally introduced for the benefit of the tenants, and he would not deny the sincerity with which hon. Members opposite advocated it. But the Plan of Campaign had not even been nominally introduced with that object. The Plan of Campaign had been introduced simply as an attack upon landlordism, and as a challenge to the Government of this country. That the Plan of Campaign was the logical or the inevitable consequence of the rejection of the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork he entirely denied. Could anyone say that if the Bill had not been rejected they would never have heard of the Plan of Campaign? It was perfectly notorious that the majority of cases in which the Plan of Campaign had been applied, or attempted to be applied, were cases which would not have been touched by the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork had it been passed. The two chief provisions of the hon. Member's Bill were—first, a limitation of the application of the Bill to tenants under the Irish Land Act of 1881; and, secondly, a limitation of the relief of abatement of rent to those who had paid half of their year's rent for 1886 and half the antecedent arrears. It was within the knowledge of the House that, in the majority of the cases where the Plan of Campaign had been applied, very few of the cases came within the first limitation, and hardly any under the second. In the Glenbeigh case the tenants were not legal tenants at all, but squatters who had retaken forcible possession of their holdings; they would not come under the first limitation, and there was not a single tenant who would have come under the second by paying half his rent for 1886 and half the arrears. He thought he had clearly established that there was no connection whatever between the rejection of the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork and the Plan of Campaign. While they had heard in that House from some hon. Members on the other side faint disapproval of the Plan of Campaign, and from others, including the Leader of the Opposition, what sounded like faint praise of it, he believed there was but one opinion of it throughout the country, and that was an absolute chorus and tempest of indignant condemnation. If the Plan of Campaign were a challenge to the Government, he hoped they would take it up, not in the interest of the landlords—though some pity might be felt even for them—but in the superior interests of the principles of property, order, and law. In this matter, he believed, public opinion was decidedly ahead of Parliamentary opinion. In that House opinion was largely formed by nice calculations of votes and the prospects of the Lobbies; but public opinion was uninfluenced by anything of that kind. It looked at things from a broader standpoint and with much clearer vision, and had pronounced in an unmistakable voice that the conspiracy should be stamped out. Hon. Members opposite had spoken in feeling terms of the miseries which Irish tenants suffered, and of the cruelties to which they were subjected; but he was tempted to ask why these hon. Members were silent during the domination of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian, when scenes of infinitely greater and more horrible cruelty were being perpetrated day and night in all parts of Ireland. They had heard about the barbarities of the crowbar, and the smoking thatch; but, in his opinion, there were worse barbarities still—namely, those of the loaded gun, the mutilated animals, and the murdered women and men. Irish Members raised a great clamour about the former; but through the latter they sat as silent as stones. Nothing showed more clearly the hollowness of this agitation than the conduct of hon. Members now and their former attitude. In face of this Plan of Campaign, which had been so cleverly organized, was it not permissible that Conservative Members should have their Plan of Campaign also? In that House, and on every platform in the country, they would have their Plan of Campaign to meet that of hon. Members opposite; but it would be a Plan of Campaign without any suspicion of violence, or illegality, or intrigue. On that side of the House they would lose no opportunity of meeting their opponents in discussion, and of endeavouring to substitute sense for sentimentalism—of meeting their arguments by arguments, and of confronting their statements with facts. That, he believed, was the Plan of Campaign which ought to be, and would be, adopted by Conservative Members of Parliament, and it was one the success of which with the public opinion of the country could not for a moment be doubted.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to congratulate the hon. Member who has just sat down on the speech to which the House has been listening. We have seldom heard a more clever and, certainly, seldom a more lively, maiden speech. He has spoken more in dispraise than in praise, and has made a series of attacks on hon. Members on this side of the House. He commenced by attacking my hon. Colleague (Mr. Bradlaugh). He said my hon. Friend showed his ignorance by insisting that there was some difference in the tone of the letter with regard to foreign politics that the noble Lord read at Paddington and the tone of the Address. This, he said, was a mistake, because in the letter Lord Salisbury had merely said the outlook was black, whilst in the Speech he said there was not likely to be a disturbance in the South-East of Europe. We can well understand that Lord Salisbury thinks, rightly or wrongly, that there will soon be a great conflagration in Europe, but thinks it will not break out in the South-East of Europe, but on the Rhine. We are confirmed in that, not merely by the statement of the noble Lord the Member for Paddington, but by his remarks as to his own impression of what took place in the Cabinet. He thinks that these large armaments Lord Salisbury is asking of us are mainly due to a belief that before long there will be a great war, and to the fact that Lord Salisbury wishes to play a great part in it. That Lord Salisbury does want to play a great part there is no doubt. [“No, no!”] No? Then does he want to play a little part in it? I regard Lord Salisbury as the great perturbator of the peace of Europe. When Prince Bismarck and everyone was trying to calm down the Balkan Provinces and prevent Austria and Russia going to war, what did Lord Salisbury do? Why, he made a Jingo speech at the Guildhall, in which he said that if Austria went to war she would not go alone. We know from the past career of Lord Salisbury that his opinion is that we ought invariably to meddle in European disputes. We know from the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington, his own Colleague, that at present he believes that a European war will break out, and that, therefore, we may legitimately suppose that he is most anxious and desirous of meddling in that war. Having thus attacked my hon. Colleague the junior Member for Northampton, the hon. Gentleman proceeded to attack the senior Member—myself. I will not waste the time of the House by replying to attacks on so humble an individual. Having done that, the hon. Gentleman flew at higher game, and attacked the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington. He was indignant with the noble Lord for saying that the Liberal Unionists were a “crutch.” He considered that an offensive epithet, and declared that the Liberal Unionists were not a “crutch,” but a staff to right hon. Gentlemen in Office. I confess I cannot see much difference between a “crutch” and a “staff.” The hon. Member then attacked the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). He was indignant at the right hon. Gentleman's complaining of Lord Salisbury holding the two Offices of Prime Minister and Secretary for Foreign Affairs. He said it was monstrous that the right hon. Gentleman should protest against this, even though it were a fresh precedent, seeing that he (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) had himself established a fresh precedent in bringing in a Home Rule Bill. I confess I could not follow the argument of the hon. Member there precisely. It seems to me, as a matter of fact, most undesirable that Lord Salisbury should hold these two Offices. When Lord Salisbury replied to the charge of departing from Constitutional precedent in holding the Offices of Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary at the same time, he said he was under the control of the Cabinet. Under the control of the Cabinet! Then the hon. Member attacked the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Camborne Division of Cornwall (Mr. Conybeare), and said his speech would remind every man in the House of the Commination Service on the first day of Lent. Well, it did not remind me, for the simple reason that I never happen to be in church on the first day of Lent. Having attacked these Gentlemen, and having attacked the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) for shamming an illness in order to avoid condemning the Plan of Campaign——

MR. CURZON (Lancashire, Southport): I must correct that; it is not a fair statement of what I said. What I did say was, that I sympathized with the causes which had prevented the hon. Member for Cork from expressing his opinion, but that a new light seemed to be thrown on those causes by certain passages which I quoted from a speech delivered by the hon. Gentleman.

MR. LABOUCHERE: The hon. Member implied that it was a political illness; but I will not dwell on the point further. The hon. Gentleman then passed to what we usually do pass on to in these debates—namely, to the question of Ireland. The hon. Member, as is usual on that side of the House, denounced the Plan of Campaign. In one thing I can agree with him. I think the Speech from the Throne does in no measured words denounce the Plan of Campaign, and proposes that the Plan should be met by changes in the Criminal Law—that is to say, in other words, by coercion. It seems to me, from observations I have heard from hon. Members on both sides of the House, that hon. Gentlemen are under a misconception as to what is the meaning of individual ownership in land. No individual, Sir, has any ownership in land. What an individual has is the right to use the land, and he only has that right on condition that he makes a proper use of it—that is to say, renders it productive for the common good. In England you generally have landlords who have built houses on agricultural land and have made improvements, and I can understand their having some sort of special property in that which has resulted from their expenditure. But you do not find that condition of things prevailing in Ireland. There the houses and improvements on the land are made by the tenants, and they belong entirely to the tenants; and all the right, therefore, that the landlords should have, should be to receive a ground rent for the use of the land. Well, what is this land for which these landlords have the right to receive rent? It is laid down in the Land Act of 1881. The first charge upon the land is a sufficiency to enable the tenant to live and thrive; the second charge is the rent—that is to say, any margin that remains after the tenant has lived and thrived. The tenant has a preferred charge upon the land, and the second, or deferred, charge is the rent to the landlord if any margin remains. I say the sooner that hon. Gentlemen who are landlords understand that, the better it will be for the country, and the better it will eventually be for themselves. The Land Courts were established to fix judicial rents; these judicial rents were estimated according to the margin after the tenant had lived and thrived, and they were based on the existing prices, but prices have fallen since then; the margin that existed in the judicial rent which was to go to the landlord does not exist at the present moment. Therefore, it does seem to me that as the landlord and tenant are but partners in a joint property, it is monstrous that the landlord should take advantage of there being no margin this year, and of the tenant being unable to pay his ground rent, and not only seize the land, but also the improvements effected by the tenant, and the very house he occupies. Some landlords in Ireland recognize this; but in every class there is a residuum—there is a residuum of bad landlords in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) admitted that a considerable number of landlords ought not to exact the rent which they are exacting; and the right hon. Gentleman certainly used pressure upon those landlords to prevent them getting such rents from their tenants. I am not in the least complaining of the right hon. Gentleman for having done so. He said that Members on this side of the House had complained. They do not complain of that; but they complain of this—that the right hon. Gentleman himself had, according to his own view, violated the conspiracy law by confederating with the police and the magistrates to use pressure; and that, when he had failed, he then turned round on the Irish Members—who were more clever than himself in exercising pressure on the landlords—and wanted to prosecute them for doing precisely what he had himself attempted to do. It is asserted that some tenants can pay, and I will make that concession; but there are others who cannot pay their full rent, and even those who can pay their full rent are unable to do it from the produce of the land this year. They have to take it from the little store saved through their economy, or receive it from a daughter or other relative who has gone over to America and is in receipt of good wages, or they have to procure it by depriving themselves of a piece of furniture, or something of that kind. What would have happened if the Plan of Campaign had not been undertaken? Why, no doubt there would have been a considerable number of evictions; in all human probability evictions would have led to outrages. If you had turned men out of their houses in considerable numbers—and there are a great many who would have been treated in that way if it had not been for the pressure which has been put upon the landlords—you would have inspired in many breasts a feeling which would have found vent in lawlessness and outrage. Under the circumstances, I consider that the representatives of the Irish people were perfectly right in stepping in. How did they step in? They proposed that all the tenants should subscribe to a common fund; that the subscription should be the amount of what these Representatives thought was the fair and proper rent they should pay; this rent was to be offered to the landlord; if the landlord did not accept it, it was to be kept in hand—not thrown away, but kept in hand, to be used, not to support these tenants, but really to support those evicted by the landlord. The Chief Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) asserts that there was intimidation; but the right hon. Gentleman has not cited one case, and he cannot cite a single case in which there were speeches of intimidation. The tenants were perfectly ready to come into the Plan of Campaign. They did so voluntarily when the advantages of the Plan of Campaign had been pointed out to them; and if the right hon. Gentleman can cite one case of intimidation, I shall be glad to hear of it. The fact, is that this Plan of Campaign is simply the application of trades-unionism to agriculture. The principle of trades-unionism is that men, working-men, labourers, have a right to combine to make a decent wage to themselves, the first charge upon the property that is brought into existence by their labour and by the money of the capitalist. Well, how did the Government meet this? Why, by attempting to arrest hon. Gentlemen who are concerned in this Plan of Campaign on that old, miserable, and weak law of conspiracy. The law says that one man may do a thing, but that two men in combination may not do it; that one man may do a thing, but that another may not advise him to do it. It will be remembered that this law of conspiracy was brought into operation when first trades-unionism commenced. It was attempted to crush out trades-unionism by means of it; but the artizans of England were strong enough to be able to resist it, and the result was that trades-unions were especially exempted from the law of conspiracy. The landlords of Ireland ought to be thankful for this Plan of Campaign. Take, for instance, the case of Lord Dillon. He has got 75 per cent. of his rent. [An hon. MEMBER: No, 80.] He has got 80 per cent of his rent from a large number of holdings of five and six pounds. Do hon. Gentlemen opposite mean to say that they would not be very thankful to the Members representing their districts, if they would take the trouble to collect 80 per cent of their rents and hand it over to them? Well, now, how do the Government propose to meet the state of things which is existing in Ireland at the present moment? The noble Lord the Member for Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) tells us that he would do nothing. He is perfectly satisfied with the present state of Ireland. The Chief Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) would meet the whole question by migration. [An hon. MEMBER: Or emigration.] Migration or emigration, I am not sure which. He said that would meet the case of Glenbeigh, and I think Mr. Goschen, the latest convert to Conservatism, says the same thing. We are told we must have sense and not sentimentality in this matter. Then the noble Lord the Member for Paddington tells us to take what occurred in Glenbeigh as the finest example of the generous magnanimity of Irish landlords. Do you mean to tell me that when these tenants, according to Sir Redvers Buller himself, could not pay one gale and costs, there is anything magnanimous in burning their houses over their heads. We are told by the noble Lord the Member for Paddington that in London persons are turned out of their houses, but supposing that in any part of London a number of these people had built their own houses and made roads, and that there was some ground landlord who had a small ground charge upon the land; and supposing that these men, owing to circumstances over which they had no control, could not pay their rent, what would the inhabitants of the Metropolis say if they saw proceeding through their streets a body of policemen, marching along followed by a number of bailiffs carrying crowbars and petroleum to level the houses of those tenants and burn them to the ground? Should we not regard it as monstrous? I tell you that the opinion of Europe is, that a more monstrous and iniquitous crime has seldom been committed by any country than the crime of Glenbeigh. The Chief Secretary says he does not justify it, but surely it would have been better if he had tempered law with humanity. I do not believe that my right hon. and gallant Friend near me, if he had been Chief Secretary for Ireland, would have consented to send an armed force with an expedition such as was despatched to Glenbeigh to stand by while the bailiffs destroyed the property of those unfortunate people. Lord Salisbury, as the head of the Government, has laid down what his view is of what is to take place in Ireland. And what is his view?

> "It is idle," he said, "to talk of leaving the Irish people to govern themselves. You know very well that they will not govern themselves, but that the majority will govern the minority in a way utterly inconsistent with its rights, and in a manner utterly fatal to all its industrial and commercial hopes."

That is the real Tory way of looking at the matter, for the Tories will never believe that people can govern themselves—they always think that it is necessary for some superior class to step in and govern them. The result of this is that we are to have one more of those detestable Coercion Bills thrust down the throat of the House of Commons. Surely England ought to have realized by this time that there are only two ways of dealing with Ireland. That is to say by either treating it as a Crown Colony—turning the Irish Members out of the House of Commons, and ruling the country by the sword,—or by some species of Home Rule on the lines proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone). Sir, the noble Lord the Member for Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) alluded to the Liberal Unionists. I do not think that they will very cordially thank him for the view which he expressed in regard to them. It seems they are to trust each other—we have heard a great deal about mutual confidence. None of the Liberal Unionists were returned by Liberal votes at the last Election, and they seem to hope in this House that, if they are faithful to their friends opposite, at the next Election they will again be returned by Conservative votes. The noble Lord has cleared away that delusion from the minds of the Liberal Unionists. They are a "crutch,"—they are to be thrown aside, and the Conservative Party is to run without them in the future. I hope the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (Marquess of Hartington) will take that declaration to heart. I do not believe what the noble Lord the Member for Paddington said—namely, that the noble Lord on the other side of the House (Marquess of Hartington) is the crutch of the Conservative Party. I believe he is the bit in the teeth of Gentlemen opposite. I say this, I consider it most improper that the noble Marquess should take his seat on this side of the House; his proper place is on the Benches opposite; and I am surprised that the noble Lord does not see the absolute bad taste of his sitting among the Liberals. When hon. Gentlemen opposite were casting about to find a leader, what did they do? Why, they telegraphed here, there, and everywhere to the noble Marquess, begging him to come back and help them. The noble Marquess declined to join them himself, but he lent them a Gentleman in whom he had confidence to sit on their side of the House. And what has been the result of this action on the part of the noble Marquess? We hear of all sorts of appeals being made, of conferences being held between the noble Marquess and Members of the Government. In fact, the Government do not dare to attempt a policy without coming humbly to the noble Marquess to see first if he agrees with it. The noble Marquess is the master of the position at the present moment; the noble Lord is the master of those who sit on the Treasury Bench, and it does seem to me that he would have pursued —I will not say an honest, because I believe him to be a most honest and honourable man—but I think he would have pursued a far better course if, having this power, he had accepted the responsibilities of it instead of superciliously handing them over to Mr. Goschen, and had taken the lead himself. Then, we had the leader of the other wing of the Liberal Unionists, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain). It seems to me that that right hon. Gentleman hesitated, and doubted as to what he should do. At the General Election, he told everybody that the Union was so paramount a matter that he should support the Conservative Government against any Liberal Government, until the Liberals, by seeing the Conservatives in, were coerced into giving up the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian as to Home Rule. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Chamberlain) has very considerably changed his attitude since the Election. He now informs his friends, the Conservatives, that he will desert them, as he previously deserted his own Party, if their policy is reactionary or inadequate. That is to say, unless the policy of the Government meets with his approval, he will simply vote against them and leave them to take care of themselves. The right hon. Gentleman admits he is in a difficulty—he does not like to vote for the Liberals because they are Home Rulers, and he does not like to vote for the Conservatives because they are Tories. It seems, in fact, that he is only inclined to vote for himself. He appears to be under the impression that he has elaborated, in his own mind, so wonderful a scheme for the settlement of the Irish Question, that Tories and Whigs, Liberals and Radicals, all ought to unite to say, "This is a prophet come down from Heaven. Let us accept him and vote for his proposal." His proposal is somewhat vague. He tells us he wishes to place the question of land before that of Home Rule. We do not; we are pledged to a Home Rule policy. But even on the question of land, so far as I can make out from his speech, he says he intends us to buy all the land that is absolutely worth nothing in Ireland; how it will be paid for, he says, is a secret. The "secret," however, appeared to me to be pretty well divulged, because I find that he says of his plan that it would impose no excessive burden or risk on the taxpayer of the United Kingdom. We do not want it to impose any burden on the taxpayer of the United Kingdom. We think that if there is one thing we ought to resist more than another, it is the idea that English taxpayers should bear any burden or risk in order to buy out Irish landlords. We wish to say to Ireland, "Go, govern yourselves; arrange matters with the landlords just as you like; you must settle these matters yourselves, but when we say govern yourselves we do not intend to put our hands in our pockets for the benefit of landlords, of whom we have the worst and lowest possible opinion." When the Land Question is settled on this most extraordinary plan of the right hon. Gentleman, he is prepared to look into the question of local self-government in Ireland — he would give Ireland a subordinate local authority, founded, apparently, on the model of that at Birmingham. He looks upon that model, no doubt, as one of the most perfect schemes of self-government that ever existed. The Town Council of Birmingham, however, has the charge of its police, and, as a matter of detail, the Irish Local Authority was not to have charge of the police. When this Body the right hon. Gentleman describes was established, Ireland was to receive an Executive. The right hon. Gentleman protested against refusing to give it an Executive. "We have a Mayor in Birmingham," he said; "why should they not have a Mayor in Ireland? We have a surveyor in Birmingham; why should they not have a surveyor in Ireland? We have a treasurer and other officials in Birmingham; and why should not similar appointments be made in Ireland?" He said that as the Irish people were somewhat silly and easily caught with words, and desired to have high-sounding names for their officials—"I see no reason why you should not call your Mayor a Prime Minister, and your Surveyor a Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, or what you like." This is what the right hon. Gentleman calls a national settlement. I call it a Birmingham settlement. It is a Birmingham settlement that, in my mind, will meet with the approbation of exceedingly few Members of this House. I cannot understand that it will meet with the approbation of the Gentlemen sitting round the Round Table, of whom I see one close by me at this moment. I should like to know about that Conference. I myself was sorry that it was ever held, as it seemed to me to place the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) on an equality with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone). For my own part, I do not know why we should not receive the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham. In speaking in the country I have always expressed myself anxious to receive him with open arms, provided that he would repent. I thought, however, that as the preliminary to his being received with open arms by the Liberal Party, he should be prepared to say that our Leader is his Leader, and that our Irish policy is his Irish policy. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that, perhaps, the scheme he proposes will not be accepted at once, but that, after a little time, when he has had an opportunity of talking my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian over, the country will accept this sham and bogus and bastard Parliament that he suggests. I do not think that my right hon. Friend will accept it, and I am certain that hon. Gentlemen from Ireland will not; and I remember this, that at the Leeds Conference, which was attended by my right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), it was laid down that no system of Home Rule would be acceptable to the English Liberal Party that was not acceptable to the Irish Party. I deny that the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham would be acceptable to the Irish Party; and I, therefore, deny that it would be acceptable to the mass of the Liberal Party all over the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham tells us that the Unionists are increasing. Where does he discover that? Did he discover it at Liverpool?—are Gentlemen opposite satisfied with the Liverpool election? I received a letter from a friend to-day giving me an account of a Liberal Unionist meeting which took place in his part of the country. It was termed a "mass meeting" in the newspapers. It was most orderly, and the proceedings were marked with great unanimity; but there was one thing very peculiar about this mass meeting, that it consisted of exactly six men. I venture to say that if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, or the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale, were to go into any district—I do not care which—and attempt to pass any resolution opposed to Home Rule, unless the meeting was composed of Tories, they would not be able to do it, if, indeed, they succeeded in securing a hearing. Our army is perfectly sound; there are, no doubt, a certain number of superior Gentlemen in it, and these superior Gentlemen, who have no followers, wish to impose their will upon us, but I tell them that they will not be able to do so. The noble Lord the Member for Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) told us that the battle had been won. Why, Sir, the battle has not begun yet. We mean to fight on—to fight again and again, until the Home Rule cause prevails. We have nailed our colours to the mast. We are not bound to every detail in the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian. But we recognize Home Rule as stated broadly in that Bill. We want a real, genuine, domestic Legislature for Ireland, with Acts becoming law when they have passed that Legislature, and when they have received the sanction of the Crown; and we want a real, genuine Executive, proceeding from, and dependent upon, that local Legislature. We believe that by sticking to this we shall, in the end, convince the country that we are in the right. We very nearly won at the last Election—we were within 70,000 votes of winning. Hon. Gentlemen opposite cannot believe how bad our organization was; and it must be remembered that we had Gentlemen who are now sitting on this side of the House firing into us during the whole engagement. Do not think that we are going to give up because we have been defeated once. Do hon. Gentlemen think that any of the great reforms we have secured in modern times would have been obtained, if the Party of progress had yielded the cause after one defeat? We mean to go on, because we believe that that is the sole way of promoting peace, affection, and goodwill between this country and Ireland.

VISCOUNT WOLMER (Hants, Petersfield): The House has had the advantage to-night of listening to more than one very brilliant speech, and I venture to say that that which has just fallen from the hon. Member for Northampton is not the least brilliant. I am sorry to have to disturb one of his most cherished delusions; but he has gone up and down the country saying that no Liberal Unionist was returned to Parliament by Liberal votes. I am very sorry to disturb the illusion, but I would point out to him that I am a living example to the contrary. At my election I was opposed by a Tory, and I have beaten a Tory.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Then you are the only one.

VISCOUNT WOLMER: I beg to congratulate the hon. Member on his courage, because he has been almost the only Home Rule Liberal who has had the courage to get up and back up through thick and thin the Plan of Campaign. We have waited for a declaration of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone); we hope to hear what Lord Spencer and Lord Granville will have to say in "another place"; and what did they say? Why, that they could pronounce no opinion while judicial proceedings were in progress. As if the matter had not been decided already. The Judges have pronounced the Plan of Campaign in Ireland to be illegal. ["No, no!"] Hon. Members from Ireland contradict me; but I ask them what was the ground upon which the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. Dillon) was bound over to keep the peace? Those hon. Members toss their heads. The Judges of Ireland—the law of Ireland—already count for nothing with the Nationalist Members. A deliberately pronounced legal opinion is to be met with a toss of the head. I am afraid the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) has left the House; but if he were here I should like to ask him what is his opinion about the Commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." If asked to pronounce an opinion upon that, would he say—"Oh, let us wait until a burglar I know of is tried at the Old Bailey. Then I will give you my view of that Commandment." The hon. Member for Northampton was much more courageous than that, for he backed up the Plan of Campaign through thick and thin; he has nailed his colours to the mast; and even though the policy should be abandoned by some of his friends, he, like a political Casabianca, will remain to be blown up with the burning deck. For the hon. Member to try to induce us to believe in the legality of the Plan of Campaign, and say it is nothing but trades-unionism, is to play with the intelligence of the House. It is obvious that Irish tenants, like English workmen with their employers are at liberty to combine to make what terms they like before entering into a contract with the landlords; but when once a contract is entered into they must be compelled to abide by it. Then there is another speech, that of the noble Lord the Member for Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), upon which I would make a few other observations—and I am sorry not to see the noble Lord in his place. The speech I refer to was one in which he sparred all round, and in which he had the goodness to direct many of his remarks to the Liberal Unionists. He spoke of us as a "crutch." He said he would be glad of the opportunity of throwing that "crutch" away—and he wished to see the Conservative Party stand alone, and have nothing to do with the Liberal Unionists. When he said this, I could not help carrying my memory back to the speech he delivered at Dartford. I found a copy of that speech in the Library, and with the permission of the House I will read a short extract from it. It was delivered on the 4th of October last. The noble Lord alluded to the Liberal Unionists when speaking of the great sacrifices that the Tory Members had made during the last Session. He said of their success—

> "It has also been due to the loyal, the thoroughly loyal, support which we have received from Lord Hartington, Mr. Chamberlain, and the whole Party of Liberal Unionists."

But he did not stop there, and this is the passage to which I should like to direct the attention of the House; and I hope the noble Lord the Member for Paddington will reflect upon it if he happens to glance his eye over my speech—

> "The main principle and guiding motive of our policy—and I pray you to bear this in mind—will be to maintain intact and unimpaired the union of the Unionist Party. We know how much—how almost entirely—the future of England depends on the union of the Unionist Party—how every institution which we value, all the liberties which we prize, are, for the time, bound up in the union of that Party. Everything that we do, either in domestic or in foreign affairs, will be subordinate to that cardinal principle, the union of the Unionist Party. I am

> not ashamed to state, before this great meeting, that we, the present Government, owe much of our existence, and much of our efficiency, to the Unionist Liberals."

I should like to ask the House which is Philip sober and which is Philip drunk? Was it Philip sober during the delivery of that speech at Dartford, or is it Philip sober to-night? If it was Philip sober at Dartford, what have we heard to-night but a wanton insult to the Liberal Unionists? Sir, it is a great deal more than a wanton insult. From the point of view of the noble Lord himself, it is treason, it is a betrayal of the best interests of England, which, he said, were bound up with the union of the Unionist Party. I take it that it is to-night that the noble Lord has spoken his real mind, for he is now free and unfettered, no longer connected with the Ministry. At Dartford he was a Minister, and he had to speak in a manner of which he knew his Colleagues would approve. If, then, it is to-night that he is speaking his mind, I venture to say that his speech at Dartford, if it was not a burlesque, was an organized hypocrisy. The House knows that, according to our opinion—we may be right or we may be wrong—there is no sacrifice we Liberal Unionists are not prepared to make in order to maintain the Union. But has the House considered what value the noble Lord puts on the Union? It seems to me he cannot value it above £500,000, because he says that if the Government had been willing to allow an economy of £500,000 he would not have left it. Therefore, it being a cardinal principle of the Government to maintain the Union and the union of the Unionist Party, the value he puts upon it is only £500,000. Well, Sir, I do not think that that is the way in which an English statesman should reply to the sacrifices made by men like the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. When we Unionists speak of the Union and our intention to sacrifice all to maintain that Union, we mean what we say; and it seems to me, as a Member of the Unionist Party, now that we know the extent of the sacrifice which the noble Lord is willing to make to maintain the solidarity of that Party, that we are well rid of the noble Lord as a Member of the Government. We do not want within the Unionist Party any man who puts the price of the Union at £500,000, and will say one thing in October which he will flatly contradict on the following January. Our course, Sir, is extremely clear. So long as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) makes it a cardinal part of his Irish policy to establish a Legislative Body in Dublin with a complete executive proceeding from it, Liberal Unionists will have nothing to say to him. Beyond that, we are determined to support the present Government in maintaining law and order in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) spoke the minds of Liberal Unionists when he said that our idea of the maintenance of the law meant a permanent alteration of the law of England and Ireland, and not a temporary addition to it or temporary alteration of it. Our position, I am perfectly aware, is a difficult one. It is not altogether a pleasant one. There are many of our Friends on this side of the House with whom we agree on all other political matters except this question of Irish policy, and with whom it is a great pain to us to differ; but we place, according to our own ideas, this question of the Union before every other question of current politics. It will rest with the Government whether we shall continue to support them. We cannot abandon entirely our Liberal principles, and support them in reactionary legislation. They will not, I hope, go in for reactionary legislation, Sir; but if they do, speaking for myself, I—and I know many others will do the same—shall not be able to give a vote to turn them out. [*Laughter.*] No; we wish to be perfectly plain with you. There is a third course. If they make us choose between abandoning our seats or our principles, we will abandon our seats. That, Sir, is the position of the Liberal Unionists, and I do not think that the House will consider that the position of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington is consistent with the position and the ideas of the Party to which I belong. I do not wish to follow the noble Lord through all the length of his speech. I have detained the House too long already; but I wished, on behalf of the Liberal

Unionists, to take up the challenge that the noble Lord has thrown down, and to tell him that we are the true Unionists, and not he. I wish to tell him that he is playing to the gallery—that he is not thinking of what is right or wrong, but of what may win an election at some future time. We, for our part, do not follow that course. We believe the Union is the right thing, and we are prepared to sacrifice everything—even our seats—to maintain it.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Lord George Hamilton,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) BILL.—[BILL 1.]

(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Jackson.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

MR. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman opposite whether he regards this as the commencement of a series of reforms in regard to the legal administration of Ireland? There is no matter of more importance as affecting that country than reform of its judicial procedure and its extremely costly judicial administration. The extravagance of the Irish judiciary and the legal branches of its administration is in excess not only of anything in England or Scotland, but I think it would be difficult for the right hon. Gentleman to find a parallel for it in any part of the world. I should like to hear from him something as to the views of the present Government on the matter. The views of the late Government and of Sir George Trevelyan, are thoroughly well known to the House. I should be glad if the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland would let us know something of his own views to-night. I would call his attention to one particular branch of Irish expenditure in connection with the administration of law. The late Government attempted to deal with it; it is with reference to the amounts paid to the Law Officers of the Crown for their services in their legal capacities. I refer particularly to the salary of the Attorney General for Ireland, which was fixed by the late Administration at £4,000 a-year. The matter formed the subject of a long discussion between the late Irish Administration and the Treasury; and the decision of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer was that while the then Attorney General for Ireland could not be displaced, and was allowed to retain the salary of £5,000 a-year, in future appointments it should be understood that the salaries should be reduced from £5,000 to £4,000, in addition to fees. [Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH dissented.] The right hon. Gentleman opposite shakes his head; but if my memory serves me right, the decision of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer was that, in future, the salary of the Attorney General for Ireland should be £4,000 a-year and fees. I have reason to remember this, because the then Lord Lieutenant (Lord Aberdeen) objected to it, and it was reconsidered; and then the Government deliberately, and, as they thought, finally, settled the question, deciding that £4,000 a-year, in addition to fees, was handsome remuneration for an Irish Attorney General. I should like to ask whether the Attorney General for Ireland is receiving at present £4,000 or £5,000 a-year? I throw out this point as a small part of an enormous saving which might be effected in the cost of Irish legal administration, and which could be effected if expenditure on these matters in Ireland were put in the same position as in this country. By this Bill we are wiping out one Judge in Ireland; but I think we could go further than that in the direction of retrenchment without injury to Irish legal administration. I cordially support the second reading of the Bill.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): There is much in what the right hon. Member has said with which I am disposed to sympathize; but I think he has taken too much a Treasury view of the matter. I entirely agree in considering that this Bill is only a step—and a small step—in the work of Irish legal reform. I think there is a great deal required to be done, both in the way of economy and efficiency, in this field; and certainly I shall do my best, if it be my lot to remain long enough in Office, to attain these ends. But I will remind the right hon. Gentleman that the right hon. Gentleman who sits near him (Mr. Childers) introduced a measure in 1885 for the general reform of the Irish judiciary; but the measure did not get a very favourable reception from the House—in fact, so unfavourable was the reception that it did not succeed in passing a second reading. That is the main reason why, in bringing forward the present Bill, I have attempted to take but a small step first. Though a step, it will be generally, if not almost universally, admitted that the Bill is a good and necessary step as far as it goes, and I will endeavour to proceed with the matter in the future as soon as a reasonable opportunity offers. With regard to the second point made by the right hon. Gentleman. I would say that my own recollection of the position in which the subject was left by the last Government does not at all tally with his. The right hon. Gentleman is correct in saying that the Treasury desired to reduce the salary of the Irish Attorney General to £4,000 a-year; but the Irish Government never consented to that reduction, and when the present Government came into Office they found that the Irish Government had not only strongly protested against the change, but had simply declined to agree to it. I thought there was great force in the contention of the Irish Government; therefore we left the matter in abeyance. The present Attorney General for Ireland receives precisely the same salary as his Predecessor; and though I am far from saying that the question as between the Treasury and the Irish Government ought not to be further considered, still the course to be taken is by no means so clear as the right hon. Gentleman supposes. I am not prepared to say that, in all cases, the Attorney General for Ireland would be adequately paid at £4,000 a-year.

Mr. CHILDERS (Edinburgh, S.): The right hon. Gentleman opposite the Chief Secretary for Ireland has referred to a Bill, introduced in 1885, dealing very largely with the arrangements and salaries of Judges and officials in the Irish Courts of Justice. That Bill was brought in by the then Liberal Government after conference with the Irish Executive, and had their entire approval. Some opposition, no doubt, was shown to the measure when it came into this House; but the reason why it did not go to a second reading was that the Government had been defeated on another question, and had resigned. It was one of the Bills on the Paper for discussion, and one which, had we succeeded in our Budget, would, together with other legislative proposals, have been pushed forward. The right hon. Gentleman has stated very excellent reasons why a large measure for amending the arrangements of the Irish Courts of Justice should be carried through Parliament. In supporting, therefore, his view that the present Bill ought to be passed at once, I do so on the distinct understanding that the acceptance of a small part of the measure of 1885 leaves the rest of the question entirely open, and that we expect to have, I do not say the identical Bill of 1885, but, a large and complete reform of the Irish Courts of Justice. With regard to the salary of the Attorney General for Ireland; having listened to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman on the subject, I would remind him that when the salary of a public officer is paid out of a Vote of this House it is settled by the Treasury and no Act of Parliament is necessary; and where the Treasury has passed a Minute to that effect with the consent of the Prime Minister or the Chancellor of the Exchequer, their decision is final. I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say not that the decision in this case should be reversed, but that the decision is not complete; but I would point out that if the circumstances have been accurately described on both sides to-night the decision is complete. Of course it can be reversed by a fresh Minute giving reasons, but this is liable to be moved for in Parliament. Probably, however, the right hon. Gentleman was not prepared for the question being raised to-night; and he will, perhaps, look into it, at the same time pardoning me for stating, with some amount of Treasury experience, what is the rule in these cases.

Mr. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.): I am bound to say that I do not look upon this Bill as one of very great importance. It may, perhaps, be held to be an indication of that policy of economy which, if it had been adopted before by Her

Majesty's Government, might have saved them the loss of a Colleague; but, in other respects, it is distinctly objectionable. It begins by saying that certain things shall be done which may have the effect of saving about £1,500 a-year, and it leaves altogether untouched the enormous waste of public money which takes place, owing to the present remuneration of the Attorney General and Solicitor General for Ireland. In the good old times of the Crimes Act, and even while the present Crimes Act is in existence, I believe the position of the Attorney General for Ireland to have been and to be, with the single exception of that of the Lord Chancellor of England, the most lucrative position in the Government; and I am sure that if any real economy were intended by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, he would have put into the Bill a clause for reducing the salary of the Attorney General for Ireland, and abolishing the system of payment by results. I do not wish to weary the House with any discussion of the general question; but it is worthy of note that in the month of November last year the Attorney General for Ireland gave an opinion that, in certain cases intimately connected with the Plan of Campaign, it would be impossible for the Government to interfere, for the landlords were well advised that the Executive would do nothing. I trust I am not at all exceeding the limits of relevancy, although I understand that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is a little anxious on the subject. This opinion, which cost a large sum of money, was finally repudiated; and with regard to this subject I may say that the proceedings ultimately taken in reference to the Plan of Campaign do not seem to have been relevant to the Plan of Campaign itself. I will come now to the consideration of this question of the Supreme Court of Judicature, which Court, I trust, will be very shortly reformed. Clause 2 of the Bill deals with the consolidation of certain Common Law Divisions; and, instead of boldly and openly directing an immediate consolidation of those Divisions, the clause proposes to give power to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, at any time after the passing of this Act, by Order in Council, to direct the fusion and amalgamation of the Common Pleas Division with the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court; and the same with regard to the Exchequer Division after there shall occur a vacancy in the office of Chief Baron of the Exchequer. I presume I shall be in Order in referring briefly to the constitution of the Court of Queen's Bench. It is most unfortunate that three Judges of that Court are men who have been promoted from the other Divisions. I understood the theory of the law to be that when once a person became Judge he was to be above all favour; that he was to accept nothing from either Party; and that everything should be done by him impartially as between the Crown and the people. In this Division—exclusively the Criminal Division—three of the Judges have been promoted, and they have been the three who have made themselves most objectionable, not alone to the people of Ireland, but also, I must say, to professional men in Ireland. I can imagine the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland would have no burning desire now to give the Chief Baron of the Exchequer a criminal jurisdiction. The right hon. Gentleman has had a clear intimation of the manner in which that Judge would exercise his jurisdiction in certain matters which have already come before him; and, therefore, I understand perfectly that it is absurd to expect that any Member of the present Government intimately connected with the late proceedings in Ireland would not object to giving the Exchequer Division criminal jurisdiction. I do not think that any of the three Judges of the Common Pleas Division can in any way be termed a strong friend of the people, and I shall certainly move in Committee an alteration directing the immediate amalgamation of these two Common Law Divisions. I also ask the right hon. Baronet now whether he has any intention of introducing a clause which will limit the emoluments of the Attorney General and Solicitor General for Ireland to a sum more commensurate with their services? Subject to these qualifications, I do not see any reason to object to the second reading of the Bill; but, on the other hand, there is no necessity for rushing the Bill through the House. I am sure that the Consolidation Clause will not be availed of by the right hon. Gentleman in the present state of affairs;

and, therefore, I think it right to ask that sufficient time shall be allowed, before the Bill is taken in Committee, to enable us to consider it with a view to its amendment.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): The Motion for the second reading of this Bill has afforded Irish Members an opportunity of offering their sincere condolence with the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland for the somewhat hard measure he has received. There has been a vacancy in the office ever since the present Government came into power, now nearly 12 months ago, and the Queen's Bench Division in Ireland has been regarded as the almost certain reward of the principal Law Officers of the Government in power. I am aware that the present Government have good reason for their action, for the Attorney General for Ireland, in the past few months, has considerably helped to increase their embarrassments. My hon. Friend the Member for South Kilkenny (Mr. Chance) has referred to the celebrated opinions obtained by the right hon. Baronet from the Attorney General for Ireland, and we well remember the feeling in Ireland when it was known that the Plan of Campaign had received the legal endorsement of that right hon. and learned Gentleman. We say now that his opinion has considerably added to the difficulties of the Government in Ireland, and no doubt, also, to the embarrassment of the situation there; but sitting on these Benches, and having the circumstances of the case before us, I think it is only proper for us to say that we think it a somewhat severe mode of censure for the Government to adopt the course of depriving the right hon. and learned Gentleman of an important and distinguished office, which I think the whole of his Colleagues and the Irish Bar generally believed was almost certain to fall upon him. With regard to the principle of the Bill I have no complaint to make; but I say that the Bill itself does not go far enough. The proposal, so far as it goes, is one which I think will be received with approval by everyone in Ireland. Everyone who is conversant with the Irish judicial system knows that, in the first place, the work of a Judge in Ireland is not sufficient to keep him engaged during a fourth part of the year; and, in the next place, although the Irish Judges have probably less to do than any other officials in this country or in Ireland, the work they do get through is, perhaps, worse done than that under any political system in Europe. It is well known that although the Common Law Divisions of the High Court of Justice, during many months of the year, rise after a few hours' work, cases of importance are postponed from month to month, and I may say from year to year, in consequence of the judicial system, which does not permit the Common Law Courts to be fully constituted for more than a few weeks during each sitting. I approve the provisions of this Bill, therefore, so far as it tends to consolidate the Common Law Divisions; but I say that when these Divisions have been consolidated in the manner proposed, the amount of work which the Judges have to do will place three-fourths of them in the possession of sinecures—that is to say, they will be practically idle. Under the present system they enjoy offices of emolument and dignity; they are highly paid for the discharge of their offices; and they are left, to all intents and purposes, with nothing to do. Under the new system the work will be divided, and they will have still less to do; and, therefore, I say that the proper complement of this Bill would be to cut down the Judicial Bench in Ireland to one-half of its present strength, and it would then be quite strong enough to get through all its work. Unless this is done, we think the measure of the Government will be inadequate; whereas, if they make proper proposals in the direction indicated, they will be received with favour by the Irish people. There is one other subject to which I desire to refer before closing my remarks, and I now refer to the effect of making the Irish Judges Privy Councillors. We are aware that, under the present arrangement, they are both Privy Councillors and Judges; the effect of which is that on one day in the Privy Council they may direct the initiation of a prosecution, and on the next sit in Court to try the individual directed to be prosecuted. I have only referred to this subject for the purpose of asking the Government whether they will use the opportunity which this Bill gives them for remedying this evil state of affairs by providing that the Irish Privy Councillors shall be Privy Councillors, and the Irish Judges, Judges only?

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): Sir, I am very glad there is to be a commencement made in the direction of economy in the Irish judiciary. On this side of the House we shall give it every support. I only hope this is a small beginning of reform which is extremely wanted. It is perfectly true, as stated by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Maurice Healy), that the staff of the Irish judicial establishment is enormously beyond the work it has to do; and I believe that the salaries of the Irish Judges are enormously high, considering the relations they bear to the incomes of the Bar. We have had very useful lessons on economy read to us from those Benches, and I hope they will be applied, and that without distinction of Party, to this question of the Irish judicial establishment. I know—and I venture to say the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) knows very well—the strength of the legal trades-union in Dublin. It is one under which successive Irish Governments have suffered. Its members are the masters of the Castle, and until that is thoroughly understood we shall get no sound and good reform, either in the judiciary or in some other matters. If anybody will only take the trouble of summing up the amount which is spent upon the limited numbers of those who constitute the Irish Bar, he would find that the emoluments in which they must necessarily share would make the mouth of the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Henry Matthews) water, either in his present or in his former profession. Now, a Committee was appointed by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), when he was an economical Member of the present Administration, to look into the abuses in, and the unnecessary waste upon, the Public Service; and I venture to say that the richest of all the fields which will be found in the form of abuses will be found in the Irish legal establishment. Assuring the Government of every possible support in the commencement of a reform of this character, I would like to ask the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson), with reference to what has passed between my right hon. Friend the Member for East Wolverhampton (Mr. Henry Fowler) and the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Minute of the Treasury on the subject of the salary of the Irish Attorney General? I was not in the House when the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) spoke; but I understand he advanced the rather singular argument that the Irish Government had not accepted the decision of the Treasury. [SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The late Irish Government.] Now, if every Department was at liberty to say it did not accept the decision of the Treasury, you would have uncommonly little control over the Expenditure of the country. I am sure I should have been very glad, when I was at the Home Office, if I could have refused to accept the decision of the Treasury with regard to the salaries of that Department. To say that the Irish Government never accepted the decision of the Treasury, is opening up a vista of unlimited extravagance such as I never heard of. I do not wonder at the resignation of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington, if this doctrine is to be laid down by a Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant who was once Chancellor of the Exchequer.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: What I meant to convey was this—that the question was not settled. According to the best of my recollection, the Question was the subject of correspondence between the two Departments: the Treasury took one view, and the Irish Government another. When we came into Office, we found the Attorney General vacating Office receiving the salary which the Irish Government thought he ought to receive.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: My memory is quite clear on the subject. The right hon. Gentleman says that the final Minute of the Treasury has not been made on the subject. No doubt, if the final decision of the Treasury has not been given, the position of the right hon. Gentleman is quite correct; but if there was a final Minute of the Treasury on the subject, it was, of course, decisive. All I wish to ask the Secretary to the Treasury is, as I said before, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Minute of the Treasury? There could not be a Minute of the Treasury until the correspondence was finished. If my right hon. Friend the Member for East Wolverhampton is correct, there was a Minute of the Treasury on the subject; and I wish to know whether the hon. Gentleman will lay that Minute on the Table?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): If I can ascertain clearly what it is the right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt) wants, I shall be very glad to comply with his request. My own recollection of the circumstances rather leads me to the conclusion that to say there was a Minute passed, would not convey a correct description to the House. I think my right hon. Friend (Mr. Henry H. Fowler) will remember that the Question was the subject of correspondence between the Treasury and the Irish Government; and I believe my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) was quite right in saying that, in the end, the salary was maintained at the same rate; the Irish Government, I will not say declining, but being unable to accept the view of the Treasury. I believe there is also a letter from the Treasury, in which they express the opinion that the view of the Treasury must be taken to be final; but I will look into the matter, and I shall be very happy to do what I can to meet the wishes of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt.)

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford, W.): I would really recommend the Government to enter as soon as possible upon economical courses, for we all know that the longer Governments remain in Office the more extravagant their expenditure becomes. While the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) is in this communicative mood, I would suggest that a Return be given to the House of the fees which have been paid to the Irish Attorney General. In almost every other public Department there is a possibility of knowing what the charges are; but in regard to the Legal Offices of the Crown there is always a great deal of mystification. In past times no one has known what Bench officials have got; but at last we have reached the richest preserves of extravagance, and I sincerely hope that before this Bill passes through Committee we shall be informed what the salaries and emoluments of the Offices of the Irish Attorney General and the Irish Solicitor General are really worth. It is not alone the money question I look at; but my impression is that the high emoluments given to the Irish officials have been intended as bribes.

MR. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the House to the fact that there is no mention in the Bill of the Office of the Attorney General for Ireland. Therefore, it is not permissible to continue a discussion which is not relevant to the principle of the Bill.

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): Mr. Speaker, I think that this Bill, as far as it goes, will commend itself to every Member of the House, with the exception of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the junior Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Holmes). This Bill cannot be altogether satisfactory to him, and, at the same time, we have a right to maintain that it is hardly satisfactory to our Party, because it does not go far enough. It will effect a saving of £800 a-year in the Irish Estimates; but, as a matter of fact, when there is an amendment of the Judicature Act, we have a right to expect that the reform should be of a thorough character, especially as the present Government came into Office with the profession of economy on their lips, which, somehow or other, they do not seem anxious to fulfil. There are many Judges in Ireland who practically have no functions to discharge, while they receive large salaries—as large salaries as those paid to Judges in England. The Lord Chancellor of Ireland receives £8,000 a-year for doing very little; one Judge receives £5,000 a-year, and the lowest salary paid—that to the Puisne Judges—is £3,800 a-year. Everybody knows that these sums represent in Ireland twice as much as they do in England; and every person knows, also, that English barristers accepting seats on the Bench do so at a pecuniary sacrifice. When barristers in England are promoted to the Bench, it almost invariably happens that they have been making by private practice considerably greater annual incomes than they will receive as Puisne Judges. As Judges they receive £5,000 a-year, or considerably less than they have made, as a rule, in following their profession at the Bar. In Ireland, however, the case is exactly the reverse. I venture to say there is not a single barrister in Ireland who is, at the present time, making £3,000 a-year; while in England there are men at the Bar making £15,000 a-year—£3,000 a-year would be an enormous salary in Ireland. I believe £1,500 a-year is regarded in the Four Courts as quite a princely salary; and the result is that the high salaries paid to Judges are nothing more than bribes to Members of the Bar for their political services; such has always been regarded as the case in Ireland. That the Lord Chancellor should get £8,000 a-year is a relic of the corruption of the Union. It is one of the many legal abuses which exist at the present time, and is a matter of disgrace and discredit to the Irish Executive. The Supreme Court of Ireland could be cut down to less than half its present numbers, and, at the same time, the legal work of Ireland could be satisfactorily performed. I was recently speaking to an Australian lawyer, and he told me the Judges in Australia have worked as long as 12 and 14 hours a-day. That, of course, is excessive; but there are Judges in Ireland who will not work two hours a-day, and yet for such services they receive from £3,800 to £5,000 a-year. I maintain that that is a scandal; and I say that if the Government wish to set an example of economy, there is no more suitable field to start upon than that of the judiciary in Ireland. I should be in favour of the Government appointing no other Judges in Ireland until the present number has been reduced to one-half what it is, and then I should be in favour of cutting the salaries of the Judges down to about one-half. There is not a Judge in Ireland who is worth more than £2,000 a-year. Considering the condition of Ireland and the class of lawyers in the country, £2,000 a-year would be equal to the deserts of any of the Irish lawyers. If the Government intend to adopt a policy of retrenchment in this particular direction, I think I may safely assure them of every support from the quarter of the House in which I sit.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be committed for To-morrow."—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

MR. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.): As an Amendment, I move that the Bill be committed for this day fortnight. The Bill will have to be considerably altered. Its title is a wide one, and a great many subjects would be relevant to it. I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to give me at least a fortnight to consider the Bill. There is no urgent necessity to press it on. The Queen's Bench Division will now, of course, have a great deal of work to do in reference to the criminal prosecutions pending; and as to the civil work of the country, I assure the right hon. Gentleman there is no pressure. There may be a few cases to be tried by jury, but they can be taken before one Judge. There is no urgent necessity for the sitting of Judges as a Divisional Court.

Amendment proposed, to leave out "To-morrow," and insert "this day fortnight."—(*Mr. Chance.*)

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: That is the most extraordinary statement I ever heard in this House. [MR. CHANCE: It is nevertheless true.] I said, in introducing this Bill, that if it was delayed either on the ground of objection or in regard to its scope—if there was any attempt to tack to it other reforms—it would be impossible for the Government to proceed with it, and that we should be compelled, much against our will, to fill up the vacant office. We ask the House to take this little step in judicial reform; but if hon. Members treat the Bill in the manner which the hon. Member (Mr. Chance) has just suggested, our object of economy will be defeated, and they will have defeated it. I am quite willing to postpone the Committee stage until Thursday; but I decline to postpone it longer. This is a small measure. As I said last week, it is a measure which, as far as it goes, everyone agrees with. It is a measure which, if it is to be passed at all, it is essential should be passed at once.

MR. CHANCE: With the permission of the House I will withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Motion *withdrawn.*

Bill *committed* for *Thursday.*

MOTIONS.

——o——

BALLOT ACT (1872) AMENDMENT BILL.

MOTION FOR LEAVE. FIRST READING.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend 'The Ballot Act, 1872.'"—(*Colonel Saunderson.*)

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): What is the object of the Bill? [A pause.] Unless the hon. and gallant Gentleman has the courtesy to explain the object of the measure, I shall be obliged to move the adjournment of the debate.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): I have no objection to state the principle of the Bill. The Bill is intended to alter the Ballot Act, so as to prevent what sometimes now occurs at Elections—that is, voters being brought up to the poll and declared to be illiterate, although they are perfectly capable of reading the names of the candidates on the ballot paper; in order that pressure may be brought to bear upon them by those who know them and are in a position to influence them in the votes they give. I had intended that the Bill should apply to Ireland only; but I believe it may, with advantage, apply to the United Kingdom at large. I cannot speak from personal knowledge as to England and Scotland, but I can speak with such knowledge of Ireland. Being aware, as I am, that in Ireland voters are brought up to the poll who are perfectly competent to decide as to the vote they give, and yet are caused to declare themselves illiterate, so that others may discover how they vote, I have felt it necessary, in order to carry out the purpose of the Ballot Act, which is to enable a voter to record his vote without fear of any undue influence, to bring in this Bill. Unless some Bill of this kind is brought in and carried, elections, in Ireland certainly, will never be conducted in accordance with the principle which I believe this House wishes to enforce, and that is that a man shall give his vote free from any outside influence and control.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): I should imagine it would be perfectly competent to put down the practices which the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite has described by means of the Corrupt Practices Act.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I shall not oppose the introduction of the Bill; but I shall be bound to do so on the second reading.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel Saunderson, Colonel Waring, and Mr. Macartney.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 138.]

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Jackson, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order, under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same, relating to the Follistown Drainage District in the County of Meath, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Jackson and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 127.]

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE (EXTENSION TO WOMEN) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Woodall, Bill to extend the Parliamentary Franchise to duly qualified Women, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Woodall, Mr. Houldsworth, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. M'Laren, Sir Robert Fowler, Mr. Howorth, Mr. Maclure, and Mr. Stansfeld.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 128.]

BOROUGH FUNDS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Woodall, Bill to amend an Act of the 35th and 36th years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter ninety-one, intituled "An Act to authorise the application of Funds of Municipal Corporations and other governing bodies in certain cases," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Woodall, Mr. Kenrick, Mr. Picton, Mr. Howard Vincent, and Mr. Woodhead.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 129.]

COAL MINES, &c., REGULATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Secretary Matthews, Bill to consolidate, with amendments, the Coal Mines Acts, 1872 and 1886, and "The Stratified Ironstone Mines (Gunpowder) Act, 1881," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Secretary Matthews and Mr. Stuart-Wortley.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 130.]

CRIMINAL LAW (SCOTLAND) PROCEDURE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Secretary Matthews, Bill to simplify and amend Procedure in the Superior Criminal Law Courts of Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Secretary Matthews, Mr. Secretary Balfour, The Lord Advocate, and the Solicitor General for Scotland.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 131.]

FIRST OFFENDERS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Howard Vincent, Bill to permit the conditional release of First Offenders in certain cases, *ordered* to be brought in by

Mr. Howard Vincent, Lord Randolph Spencer Churchill, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Hoare, Mr. Addison, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Lawson, and Mr. Molloy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 132.]

AGRICULTURAL TENANTS RELIEF BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Seale-Hayne, Bill for the relief of Agricultural Tenants, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Seale-Hayne and Sir Bernhard Samuelson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 133.]

DEACONS (CHURCH OF ENGLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Gedge, Bill to amend the Acts 41 Geo. 3. c. 63, and 1 and 2 Vic. c. 106, so far as they relate to Deacons of the Church of England, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Gedge, Viscount Folkestone, Mr. Hoare, and Mr. MacInnes.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 134.]

HYDE PARK CORNER (NEW STREETS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. David Plunket, Bill to provide for the maintenance of the New Streets at Hyde Park Corner, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. David Plunket and Mr. Jackson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 135.]

PUBLIC PARKS AND WORKS (METROPOLIS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. David Plunket, Bill for the transfer to the Metropolitan Board of Works and the maintenance of certain Public Parks and Works in the Metropolis, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. David Plunket and Mr. Jackson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 136.]

LODGERS' GOODS PROTECTION ACT (1871) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Bill to amend "The Lodgers' Goods Protection Act, 1871," *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Howard Vincent, and Mr. Gent-Davis.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 137.]

PUBLIC PETITIONS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, to whom shall be referred all Petitions presented to the House, with the exception of such as relate to Private Bills; and that such Committee do classify and prepare abstracts of the same, in such form and manner as shall appear to them best suited to convey to the House all requisite information respecting their contents, and do report the same from time to time to the House; and that the reports of the Committee do set forth the number of signatures to each Petition only in respect to those signatures to which addresses are affixed:—And that such Committee have power to direct the printing in *ex extenso* of such Petitions, or of such parts of Petitions, as shall appear to require it:—And that such Committee have power to report their opinion and observations thereupon to the House.

The Committee was accordingly *nominated* of,—Sir CHARLES FORSTER, Mr. WILLIAM LOWTHER, Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK, Mr. HUGH ELLIOT, Colonel BRIDGEMAN, Mr. DONALD CRAWFORD, Mr. MULHOLLAND, Viscount LYMINGTON, Mr. WIGGIN, Mr. M'LAGAN, Mr. MORGAN HOWARD, Mr. HENRY TOLLEMACHE, Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR, and Mr. JAMES A. CAMPBELL.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

PRINTING.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the Printing executed by Order of this House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for Printing, Returns and Papers presented in pursuance of Motions made by Members of this House:—The Committee was accordingly *nominated* of,—Sir JOSEPH PEASE, Mr. STANSFELD, Mr. RAIKES, Mr. WHITBREAD, Sir GEORGE RUSSELL, Mr. PARNELL, Colonel TOTTENHAM, Mr. SEXTON, Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER, and Mr. JACKSON.

Ordered, That three be the quorum.—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas.*)

KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS (HOUSE OF COMMONS).

Ordered, That a Committee be appointed to control the arrangements of the Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms in the department of the Serjeant at Arms attending this House:—The Committee was accordingly *nominated* of,—Mr. A. H. ACLAND, Mr. AGG-GARDNER, Mr. BIGGAR, Mr. WILLIAM CORBET, Baron DIMSDALE, Mr. FENWICK, Mr. FLOWER, General GOLDSWORTHY, Colonel HAMBRO, Mr. HERBERT, Viscount LEWISHAM, Mr. MARJORIBANKS, Baron DE ROTHSCHILD, Mr. SHEIL, and Mr. YERBURGH.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas.*)

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (CORNWALL) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Conybeare, Bill to prohibit the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sundays in the county of Cornwall, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Borlase, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. C. T. Dyke Acland, Mr. Bickford-Smith, and Mr. Courtney.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 139.]

MINERS' WAGES PAYMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Conybeare, Bill to amend the Law relating to the payment of Wages of Miners, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, Mr. Borlase, and Mr. Clancy.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 140.]

WATER COMPANIES (REGULATION OF POWERS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Fulton, Bill to limit the powers of the Water Companies to cut off the tenants' water supply where the rate is paid by the landlord, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Fulton, Captain Colomb, and Mr. C. R. Spencer.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 141.]

MERCHANDISE MARKS ACT (1862) AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend "The Merchandise Marks Act, 1862."

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Baron Henry De Worms and Mr. Attorney General.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 142.]

ROD FISHING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Laing Brown, Bill to amend the Law relating to Rod Fishing in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Laing Brown, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Donald Crawford, and Mr. Angus Sutherland.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 143.]

SITES FOR CHURCHES, &c. (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Byrne, Bill to facilitate the acquiring of Sites for Churches and Schools, and for Residences for Clergymen and School Teachers in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Byrne, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Jordan, and Colonel Nolan.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 144.]

SANITATION OF HOUSES (METROPOLIS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Dixon-Hartland, Bill for better Sanitation of Houses in the Metropolis, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Dixon-Hartland and Mr. Tomlinson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 145.]

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 1*st February*, 1887.

MINUTES.]—Public Bill—*First Reading* — Solicitors (Ireland) * (12).

STATE-DIRECTED EMIGRATION.

PETITION PRESENTED.

Lord DENMAN, in presenting a Petition signed by 11 gentlemen, in favour of State-directed Emigration, said, he would take that opportunity of expressing his deep regret that their Lordships had not seen their way to pass the second reading of the Women's Suffrage Bill, which he had introduced. He was, further, sorry that the House was not in possession of the objections to the measure; but he understood that it would come up again on the 2nd of August. He had, on other occasions, brought forward the measure as late as that date, and hoped to be in his place this year, when he trusted they might see the same Government in power, and all the objections removed. He also cherished the hope that if a measure for the same object should pass the other House, their Lordships might subject it to any necessary revision, and make it exactly like the Bill he had presented to their Lordships.

SOLICITORS (IRELAND) BILL [H L.].

A Bill to amend the laws for the regulation of the profession of solicitors in Ireland—Was *presented* by The Lord FitzGerald; read 1ª. (No. 12.)

House adjourned at half past Four o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 1*st February*, 1887.

MINUTES.]—Select Committees—Standing Orders, *nominated;* Selection, *nominated.*

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Mining Leases (Cornwall and Devon) * [146]; Stannaries Act (1869) Amendment * [147].

Withdrawn—Felonious Use of Firearms * [119]

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

PARLIAMENT—STANDING ORDERS.

Ordered, That the Select Committee on Standing Orders do consist of Twelve Members:—The Committee was accordingly *nominated* of,—Mr. Barclay, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Halsey, Mr. William Lowther, Sir John Mowbray, Colonel Nolan, Sir Lyon Playfair, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Stansfeld, and Mr. Whitbread.—(*Sir John Mowbray.*)

PARLIAMENT—SELECTION.

Ordered, That the Committee of Selection do consist of Nine Members:—The Committee was accordingly *nominated* of,—Dr. Cameron, Mr. Cubitt, Sir Archibald Orr Ewing, Sir Robert Fowler, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Sir Hussey Vivian, Mr. Whitbread, and the Chairman of the Select Committee on Standing Orders.—(*Sir John Mowbray.*)

BELFAST MAIN DRAINAGE BILL.

Petition and Order of Leave [1st February, 1886] read; Bill read the first and second time; and (the Bill having been reported and considered in the last Session of Parliament),

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be ordered to be read the third time."—(*Mr. Dodds.*)

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I notice that this Motion, in reference to an important Irish Bill, is made by a Member of the House entirely unconnected with Ireland; and I notice, also, what has been observed upon previous stages of the Bill, that the Motion is made in the absence of both Members for Belfast, immediately concerned in the promotion of the measure. In a former Session, it will be remembered, the House inserted a clause assimilating the municipal franchise in Belfast to the Parliamentary franchise; and, speaking here as the Representative of 60,000 of the inhabitants of Belfast, I wish to say that I cannot assent to any Motion which will advance the Bill until an undertaking is given by those who promoted it that no attempt will be made in the House of Lords to remove that Franchise Clause. If that clause should be removed, I shall consider it my duty to oppose the Bill when it is returned to the House of Commons. Since the Bill was last before the House, important reasons have been made public why the Corporation of Belfast, upon its present restricted electorate, should not be entrusted with the manipulation of £500,000 of the public money; and, in the absence of Members responsible for the introduction of the Bill, I ask that further progress of it may be postponed until this day week.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to point out to the hon. Member that the present Motion is in pursuance of a Resolution of the House, in order that the Bill may be replaced in the same position as it occupied in the last Session. The Motion now is only that the Bill be ordered to be read a third time; and the Motion for third reading will come up on Friday, when the hon. Member will have an opportunity of making any observations upon that stage. Two days' interval must elapse between the present Order and the Motion for third reading.

MR. SEXTON: I am obliged, Sir, to be absent this week upon official business connected with the Shrievalty of Dublin; and I, therefore, hope that a day may be named when I shall be able to be present, say Friday week.

MR. SPEAKER: It is impossible at this stage to fix any other day. The Bill will be set down for the third reading on Friday next, and the House will then deal with it.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be read the third time on *Friday.*

QUESTIONS.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—JURORS IN CRIMINAL CASES.

MR. STANSFELD (Halifax) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, in criminal cases in Ireland, the Crown Solicitor, in directing jurors to stand by, acts upon his own discretion only or upon instructions given to him; if such instructions are given to him are they of a general character, dealing with all prosecutions, or are they of a special character dealing only with particular cases or classes of cases; if of a general character will the right hon. Gentleman cause them to be laid upon the Table of the House forthwith; and, if of a special character, are such instructions given by the Attorney General or by some other person; and, if so, by whom?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to answer this Question, as it is connected with my Department. A Crown Solicitor, in directing jurors to stand by, acts under general directions applicable to all prosecutions. These directions have been in existence for a great number of years, and form part of the instructions given him on entering on the duties of his office. There is no objection to laying the directions on the Table of the House; but, as they are not long, it might, perhaps, be the more convenient course if

I were to read them now. They are as follow:—

> "The Clerks of the Crown for the several counties shall procure from the Sheriff and furnish to the respective Crown Solicitors some time before the day appointed for the commencement of each Assizes a true list of the jury summoned: and for the purpose of duly exercising the right of the Crown to direct jurors to stand by, and, if need be, to challenge for cause, the Crown Solicitor shall make due inquiries in reference to the persons summoned; and when in any case he shall have sufficient reason to believe that any person coming to be sworn as a juror is open to challenge for affinity to the person on trial, partiality, bodily or mental infirmity rendering him unfit to serve as a juror, or other sufficient ground on which a challenge, if made, could be sustained, he shall direct such juror to stand by; and he shall also, in the exercise of a due discretion, direct to stand by all such persons as he shall have reason to believe are likely to be hindered from giving an impartial verdict, by favour towards the accused, fear of the consequences to their persons, property, or trade, or other improper motive, although same may not amount to a legal ground of challenge, or may not admit of legal proof; and in the discharge of this duty the Crown Solicitor will not interfere unless the circumstances of the case require it, and will then act with due care and caution, but also with promptness and decision, and, if time permit, should consult the leading Crown counsel in the case. In all cases of peculiar local excitement in any particular town or district of the county it will be prudent, if the panel permit, to set aside all persons returned from such locality; and in all cases every vintner, publican, and retailer of spirituous and malt liquors shall, as a matter of course, be ordered to stand by."

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): Might I ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman a Question arising out of the answer which he has given? One of the grounds, as I understand, for ordering a juror to stand by, is affinity to the person accused? [The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND: Yes.] Well, I should like to know, in face of the fact that at the recent Sligo trials all Catholics in a great many cases were ordered to stand aside, and the jury was made, by the challenges of the Crown, to consist exclusively of Protestants, whether the interpretation put on that portion of the instructions by the Government is that every Catholic juror is prevented, by affinity to every Catholic prisoner, from taking part in his trial?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND: I can certainly say that it is not so looked upon by me; and I know that it is not so looked upon by the Crown Solicitor.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): May I ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman if these instructions rest upon statutory authority; or, if not, on what authority do they rest?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND: The instructions do not rest on statutory authority. The instructions are issued for the purpose of telling the Crown Solicitor what his duties are to be upon his taking office. As I have said, I am not responsible for their issue, and they have been in existence certainly for 20 years.

COMMISSION ON AGRICULTURE, 1881-2—MAINTENANCE OF THE INDOOR POOR.

MR. E. HUBBARD (Bucks, N.) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether Her Majesty's Ministers will consider the most practicable means of carrying into Law the following recommendations of the Commission on Agriculture, 1881-2—namely, that the cost of the maintenance of the indoor poor be defrayed by a rate upon the personal as well as the real property of the counties, or of areas wider than the existing unions; and that, without disturbing existing contracts of tenancy, all rates should, in future, be borne equally by owners and occupiers?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): The question of how property, other than real property, can be brought into contribution for Poor Law and other purposes is seriously occupying the attention of the Government; but they certainly cannot commit themselves to the particular mode suggested by the recommendation of the Commission. With regard to the division of rates, my hon. Friend will understand that, as this necessarily forms a question for consideration in connection with the Bill for the Reform of Local Government, I am unable, at present, to give him any information on the subject.

POST OFFICE—PARCELS POST BETWEEN FRANCE AND EGYPT.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury) asked the Postmaster General, If he will lay upon the Table of the House the necessary Papers to explain why the Governments of England and France, each of whom has connected its Parcels Post with most of the civilized countries of Europe, have failed, after several years of negotiation, to establish the same system between France and England?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): A Parcel Post Convention between Great Britain and France was signed at Paris on the 18th of June last, but still awaits the approval of the French Chambers. The Foreign Office is still in correspondence with Her Majesty's Ambassador at Paris on the subject. In the meantime, it would not be usual to lay Papers on the Table of the House.

THE NORTHERN PACIFIC — EVACUATION OF PORT HAMILTON.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is the fact that Port Hamilton is to be shortly evacuated by Her Majesty's Forces; and, if so, what arrangements have been made with the Chinese or any other Government regarding its future custody?

MR. F. S. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye) and MR. YOUNG (Christchurch) had the following Questions on the Paper:—

To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it is true that Port Hamilton has been evacuated?

To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Port Hamilton has been given up to the Corean Government; and, if so, whether any and what conditions were attached to such transfer; and, whether Her Majesty's Government acted under naval advice in the matter?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): With the permission of the hon. Member for Christchurch, I will answer his Question at the same time; and I am also requested by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to answer that of the hon. Member for the Eye Division of Suffolk. Port Hamilton will shortly be evacuated by Her Majesty's Forces. No arrangements have been made respecting its future custody; but it is understood that a Corean official will be present at the time of the departure of the British ships. No conditions have been made with the Corean Government; but Her Majesty's Government did not determine to retire from Port Hamilton till they had received a guarantee that no part of Corea, including Port Hamilton, will be occupied by any Foreign Power. Her Majesty's Government acted under naval advice when they decided to leave Port Hamilton. Papers on the subject will shortly be presented to Parliament.

EGYPT — OPENING OF TRADE WITH THE SOUDAN.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the Government propose to give effect to the resolution taken last July to raise the blockade maintained at Suakin and on the Nile against trade with the Soudan; and, if so, when orders for raising it are likely to be issued?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): I am not aware that any resolution was taken by Her Majesty's Government last July to allow trade with the Soudan to be re-opened; but Her Majesty's Government have been very desirous that this should be done, so soon as it should appear that its effect would be beneficial. Since last July the approach of a hostile force to the Egyptian outposts on the Nile rendered a postponement necessary; but since October trade has been gradually reviving in the neighbourhood of Suakin, and Her Majesty's Government have now assented to the proposal of the Government of Egypt to allow trade to be re-opened in the Nile Valley—of course, excluding traffic in arms and ammunition—and orders to this effect will, no doubt, be immediately issued by the Egyptian authorities.

MR. BRYCE said, that the right hon. Gentleman had not answered that part of the Question relative to the blockade of Suakin.

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: I am glad to state that since October a trade in the neighbourhood of Suakin has been springing up, and at certain points markets have been established. It is intended that, under proper restrictions, trading shall be allowed also from Suakin.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT — CULTIVATION OF HOPS.

MR. BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye) asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of

Lancaster, Whether he has any objection to causing the issue of a Return showing the acreage of land which has ceased to be cultivated for hops since June last?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Lord JOHN MANNERS) (Leicestershire, E.): The reduced acreage under hops will, of course, be shown in the Agricultural Returns for this year. A special intermediate Return would, I fear, be inconvenient and expensive; but I will ask the Land Commissioners, who are, I understand, likely to make inquiries into the operation of the Extraordinary Tithe Act, whether they will be able to furnish the information asked for.

THE PARKS (REGENT'S PARK)—DISMISSAL OF A CONSTABLE.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether a park constable named Sullivan, employed at the Regent's Park, was dismissed from his position about two months ago; what are the facts connected with his dismissal; whether the man's character was excellent, and his efficiency unquestioned; whether he has been a total abstainer for years; whether a Petition, numerously and influentially signed, was forwarded to, and received by, the First Commissioner of Works; and, whether this was acknowledged?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): Sullivan was appointed by me in November, 1885, to be a constable in Regent's Park, subject, in the usual way, to six months' probation. The reports of his conduct during that time were unsatisfactory; but I gave him a further term of three months' probation. At the end of this term, his reports being rather worse than before, it was impossible for me to confirm his appointment. It is true that a Petition was subsequently presented on his behalf, and it was very carefully considered by me; but I felt obliged to adhere to my decision.

PUBLIC HEALTH—THE SUTTON CEMETERY.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Government have, since the last Session, taken any steps to inform themselves as to the proposed site for a cemetery at Sutton; what was the nature of the information obtained; and, what the Government propose to do in the matter?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) (who replied) said: I presume the hon. Member refers to the site situated between the Banstead and Brighton roads. The Sutton Burial Board applied to the Local Government Board to approve of the appropriation of that site for the purpose of a cemetery. After a public inquiry by one of their Inspectors, the Board felt themselves unable to give the approval asked for, and they have so informed the Burial Board.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS FROM GWEEDORE.

MR. O'HEA (Donegal, W.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, If it is the intention of the Crown to enter a *nolle prosequi* in the case of the people from Gweedore, who were evicted and returned for trial for having gone back to their evicted homes; and, if not, why are the trials not proceeded with, instead of having those people, who are miserably poor, kept for many days at Lifford, a distance (which they were obliged to walk) of nearly 60 miles from their homes?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University), in reply, said, that, although immediately after Notice of this Question he took every means in his power to get the information, he was sorry to say that he had as yet got absolutely none; but he could tell the hon. Member that, if their trials were postponed by reason of any default on the part of those representing the Crown, he would take care that they should be properly dealt with.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS—ALLOWANCES TO THE CONSTABULARY.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the total cost to the British Taxpayers, inclusive of special allowances, provisions, travelling and car expenses, of the force of 150 Constabulary employed during the last three weeks on special duty in connection with the Glenbeigh Evictions?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): This Question refers to a number of matters of financial detail which obviously require time for collection and examination before the result can be arrived at. I am informed that the Inspector General will be able to supply the answer in about eight days.

POST OFFICE—AN IMPERIAL PENNY POSTAGE.

Mr. DE LISLE (Leicestershire, Mid) asked the Postmaster General, Whether he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House, for the information of hon. Members, copies of the letters, dated September 25th and November 3rd, 1886, and January 25th, 1887, addressed to him on the subject of an Imperial Penny Postage, by the hon. Member for Canterbury (Mr. Henniker Heaton)?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University), in reply, said, it would not be in accordance with precedent if he were to present the Correspondence; but if the hon. Gentleman would move for it, he should offer no objection to its being laid upon the Table.

EGYPT — ARMY OF OCCUPATION — HEALTH OF THE TROOPS.

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON (York, W. R., Holmfirth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been directed to the following statement in *The Pall Mall Gazette* of 27th January, 1887:—

> "The C. D. Acts are in full force in the most shameless way in Egypt, wherever our troops are stationed. The women in Cairo are examined twice a week by surgeons, and, if any are found to be diseased, the house in which they reside are marked with the English Broad Arrow, to deter 'Tommy Atkins' from patronizing those establishments. Not only so, but when I was there an English sergeant was stationed on picket duty as a kind of official guide to the houses of ill-fame which Her Majesty's soldiers were encouraged to patronize. That is, he was a guide of the negative kind, and stood on guard to prevent the soldiers from going into the houses where the women were certified as diseased;"

whether this statement is accurate; and, what steps will be taken in the matter?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. E. Stanhope) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): My attention has been called to this matter only by the Question of the hon. Member, and we have no information at the War Office concerning it. I will ask the General Officer commanding in Egypt to report to me upon the subject.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS.

Ordered, That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Address, in Answer to Her Majesty's Speech, have precedence this day of the Notices of Motions.—(*Mr. W. H. Smith.*)

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [FOURTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January.]—[See page 84.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed*.

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): The speakers in the desultory discussion of the last three nights have directed their attention mainly to three subjects—the condition of affairs in Ireland, the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government, and the National Expenditure. Two of these have been already thoroughly dealt with. The course which Her Majesty's Government intend to take with regard to Ireland has been explained in the speech of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant; and the question of the foreign policy of Her Majesty's Government has been so clearly stated by the First Lord of the Treasury that it is even beyond the ingenuity of the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) to make an intelligible misrepresentation of it. It is not necessary, therefore, for me to go at length into these subjects. But I should like to make a few observations with regard to expenditure, especially in reference to some of the statements by my noble Friend the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill). He laid before the House two proposals, neither of them new; but it is the first time that anyone who has occupied the position of Leader of the House and Chancellor of the Exchequer has invested with his authority such an alteration in practice. The first proposal is that in future the Representatives of the Admiralty and War Office in this House should circulate a printed statement of the policy of their respective Departments, instead of making a speech on the introduction of the Estimates. That small change is one which Her Majesty's Government would be perfectly ready to assent to, if it were the general wish of the House; but, of course, until we can obtain an authentic opinion as to the wish of the great majority of the House we cannot give our assent. But the second proposal of my noble Friend raises much broader issues. Now, according to the Constitution of this country, the Executive for the time must be primarily and ultimately responsible for any expenditure it recommends to this House. But both within the limits and outside the limits of that responsibility there are at present two checks which are supposed to insure an adequate return for the expenditure incurred. The first of these checks is exercised within the Government by the Treasury over the spending Departments; and the second, which is outside the Government, is the criticism of the House of Commons on the Estimates. Everyone who has been a Member of this House for many years must admit that the House of Commons, in its collective capacity, discharges its duty of criticism in a very perfunctory and unsatisfactory manner. The late Prime Minister, a high authority on finance, always holds up those ideal days before the Reform Bill, when the expenditure of this country was very low. It is a curious fact that in proportion as the expenditure has increased, so have the discussions on the Estimates. Anyone can understand how and why expenditure has increased, because nine speeches out of ten propose to increase it. So much is that the case that when, for instance, on the Navy Estimates a reduction is proposed, it is almost invariably done with a view of extorting from the Government a promise that next year the Vote will be increased. The distribution of the representation into single-Membered constituencies has drawn closer the connection between the Member and his constituents, and it will be found even more than in the past that the grievances of certain *employés* of the Government are likely to be urged, and an attempt made on the part of new Members to obtain for their localities a larger proportion of the expenditure of the public money. I now come to the second check upon expenditure—namely, the Treasury control. The late Prime Minister, the other night, not only was pleased that my noble Friend had raised the flag of economy, but he specially emphasized the fact that my noble Friend had done so in the only way in which it was possible for anyone connected with the Treasury to act. My noble Friend looked at totals and disregarded items; and in the opinion of the late Prime Minister that was the right course, for, he added, if details were discussed the knowledge of the spending Departments would enable them to cope on unequal terms with the Treasury. I always understood that knowledge was power; but can any system be effective which, according to the opinion of the man most experienced, is based upon ignorance? If it be the right principle to check totals and to disregard items, such a system must ultimately degenerate, and it has degenerated into what I consider this fallacy—that the test of whether a Department is economical or extravagant is by looking at the outlay alone, irrespective of the results attained by that outlay. It is well worthy of the consideration of the House whether or not there may not be, as my noble Friend has suggested, some change brought about in the spending Departments. But I must at once state that there are great initial difficulties to assenting off-hand to the proposals which my noble Friend has made. The House of Commons' Committee is undoubtedly admirably fitted to undertake certain duties; but to require any Committee composed of hon. Members upon whom the full pressure of Parliamentary duties is imposed to undertake in addition the task of investigating our Naval and Military Expenditure, would be to import upon them a duty which they could not properly fulfil within any reasonable number of years. We must, therefore, at once dismiss the proposition made last year by the late Government for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire generally into our Army and Navy Expenditure. But if we were disposed to give our favourable consideration to the proposal of the noble Lord, the first difficulty that would face us would be that the Committee would have to go into broad questions of policy, and that the Government would have to allow them to shape a policy for them for which the Government alone would be responsible. A further difficulty would be that it would not be possible for any Committee such as the noble Lord has proposed to go into the technical or expert side of the question, because the House will see that the composition of any Committee which has to deal with scientific questions must be very different from the composition of a Committee which has to deal with financial questions. I do not see, however, that these difficulties are insuperable, and I think that they might be overcome. There are, certainly, two questions upon which the Government would be glad to have the assistance of the House. The first question is, whether the scale of the military and naval establishments is too large for the work they have to perform; and associated with that question is another—namely, whether the country gets an adequate return for the expenditure which year after year the House is asked to sanction. That question is somewhat clouded by what I think to be the inaccurate theory held by many hon. Members in this House as to what constitutes economy. Those hon. Members appear to think that economy should be judged, not by the results achieved by a certain expenditure, but by the amount of the expenditure. In their opinion, the Ministers who proposed a perfectly nugatory expenditure of £11,500,000 would be a greater economist than he who spent £12,000,000 with the most admirable results. I represent a Department which spends a great deal of money, and which at times receives directions to effect large and summary reductions in its expenditure. The complaints of the House of Commons—and, to an extent, they are legitimate complaints—have been that the strength of the Government establishments is in excess of the work they have to perform. Both the present Board of Admiralty and the Board with which I was previously associated felt that to be a just complaint; and, wherever it has been possible, we have got rid of redundant establishments. But the process is a very slow one, and has to be carried out both in the clerical and in the combatant branches of the establishment. It has been the practice to enlist men for continuous service, and it is not possible, without a breach of contract, to summarily dismiss them. But there are certain Estimates in the Navy Votes which cannot be reduced, which provide the work for the establishments to do. If those Estimates were to be reduced, the result would be exactly the reverse of what is intended, because the establishments would remain practically untouched, while the work they did would be diminished. This is especially the case with regard to the manufacturing branches of the Departments. The Admiralty and the War Office are great manufacturers, and are great employers of labour. Complaints are often made that the cost of shipbuilding in the Dockyards is excessive as compared with that of work done in private yards; and it is as well the House should know what is the cause of that excessive cost. If a shipbuilder gets an order to build a ship, the first thing he does is to put the maximum amount of labour which can be economically employed upon the work, thereby consuming the maximum amount of material in the shortest time. That is a course which is the reverse of what is meant by economy as understood in this House. If the Admiralty contract to build a ship, the longer they are in building it the better pleased the Treasury are. I can give a remarkable illustration of this in the building of the *Trafalgar*. In 1885 the Admiralty found that their Predecessors had announced their intention of building this and another great ship. They were to be each of 12,000 tons. The amount on the Estimates of that year for the building of these ships was only 12 tons, at which rate the House will see the ships would take 1,000 years to build. The incoming Conservative Government reversed that, and applied the principle which prevails in all private yards of putting the largest amount of labour which could possibly be put on each ship, and with excellent results. For the cost of building, so far as the average cost of labour is concerned, as compared with the two preceding ironclads, the *Camperdown* and the *Colossus*, was £16 13*s*. per ton on the *Trafalgar;* whereas in the case of the *Camperdown* it was £25 1*s*. per ton, and of the *Colossus* £26 15*s*. The House will, therefore, see that this question is well worthy of their attention. If the Admiralty are to continue to be manufacturers, as I believe it is essential they should, this House must draw a distinction between the methods in which it votes money for manufacturing purposes, and for the maintenance of combatant establishments. Therefore, if the House is favourably disposed towards the proposition of my noble Friend, it must not be assumed either that I, as representing the Admiralty, or my right hon. Friend, as representing the War Department, admit that we are extravagant, or that the expression in Her Majesty's Speech that the Estimates have been framed with a careful regard to the economy is in any way incorrect. My belief is that, if it is possible to get over the initial difficulty to the appointment of such a Committee as I have described, the appointment of that Committee would not tend to the reduction of the Estimates. On the contrary, I think the Committee will be astonished at the moderation of the demands of the Admiralty. ["Hear, hear!" *and Opposition laughter.*] I know that that must seem a somewhat ridiculous contention to some hon. Gentlemen; but I will lay before the House certain facts which I think will materially modify their views. My noble Friend, when Chancellor of the Exchequer, sent round a Circular calling attention to the great growth of expenditure during the last few years. I at once had a careful analysis and investigation made as to the growth of expenditure that had taken place during the last 10 years in the Naval Votes, and the causes of it, to ascertain how far it was capable of reduction. As Her Majesty's Government propose, as soon as this debate is concluded, to take the time of the House for the discussion of Procedure, and, consequently, no discussion on National Expenditure can occur for some time to come, perhaps the House will excuse me if I take a few minutes in dealing with this question. In the interval between 1876 and 1886 the cost of the Navy had increased 16 per cent. Now, the extent of the duties which would be imposed upon the Navy in the event of war is governed by the amount of commerce which would have to be protected. The investigation I had made showed the extent to which our Mercantile Marine had increased during those 10 years. I found that during those 10 years the amount of steam tonnage of the British Mercantile Marine which would have to be protected had increased cent per cent. Notwithstanding the large decrease in sailing tonnage, the steam tonnage had increased to such an extent as to be very largely in excess of what it was 10 years before. That increase was very remarkable when compared with the development of the Mercantile Marine of foreign nations. Whereas the combined Mercantile Marine of France, Germany, Russia, Italy, and Austria were considerably more than half the tonnage of the British Empire 10 years ago, the tonnage of the British Empire at the present moment is considerably more than one-half the aggregate tonnage of these five nations. I also made inquiries as to the expenditure of foreign nations on their Navies during those 10 years. The increases are also noteworthy. During that period the expenditure of the French has increased 39 per cent, that of Germany 43 per cent, Russia 45 per cent, and Italy 133 per cent. Austria remains very much the same. I think the House will admit that if the duties of the British Navy have been doubled during the past 10 years, and if the expenditure of foreign nations on an average has been increased by something like 50 per cent, an increase of something like 16 per cent in the expenditure on our Navy is not an exorbitant demand on the British taxpayer. But that is not all. I am taking a year which is unfavourable—the present year—as the Estimates next year will show a considerable reduction. It is no use keeping a Navy unless it be adequate to perform its duties; it would be much better to get rid of it and abolish it altogether. We are compelled to keep a strong Navy, because we draw the greatest proportion of our food supplies from abroad. We are getting closer packed, and are depending for a larger proportion of the food supply for our increasing population on supplies from abroad. It seems to me, therefore, quite clear that we must do one of two things. We must either endeavour to stimulate food supplies at home by a system of protection, or we must take measures to safeguard the transport of our food supplies from abroad. This is not a precaution in the interest of the rich, but in that of the poor; for, if we are unfortunate enough to come into collision with foreign nations, they would be the first to suffer from scarcity in the food supply. Now, Sir, I have shown that the increase on the Navy during the past 10 years has only been 16 per cent. That has been entirely due to one item alone, the great development in the defensive strength of ships rendered necessary by recent inventions. It used to be assumed that a large expenditure was brought about by a combination of the services, or by those in the employment of the respective services; but the dangerous combination which exists at the present time is from the increase in armaments of foreign nations. The enormous sums of money spent by foreign nations on warlike munitions has made the manufacture of these articles a very lucrative business. Science, art, and ingenuity have combined to make more deadly every day the weapons of war; and the result has been that the destructive power of instruments of war, year by year, has increased and is increasing. It is essential, if we maintain the Navy, that it should be armed with the latest improvements and the most improved weapons; and it is from this cause, and not from any increase in the establishment, that there has been certain additional expenditure during the past few years. These great ships and these huge guns take years in their construction, and it is absolutely impossible that this country can ever get a satisfactory return for its expenditure unless the policy it pursues with regard to the Army and the Navy is continuous. Spasmodic expenditure and summary reduction are absolutely ruinous, and that is, undoubtedly, the result of the present system. Therefore, if the proposition of my noble Friend be assented to and the difficulties I have indicated could be got over, I believe that we should be able to insure something like continuity in our naval policy, because there would be a certain number of Members in the possession of official information which would enable them to apply a true test as to whether the expenditure of the Government was economical or not. Until very recently it was not the practice of the spending Departments to lay any liability record before Parliament. When I went to the Admiralty in 1885 it was almost impossible to ascertain what our liabilities were; and it was afterwards discovered that, owing to a miscalculation, a sum of £80,000 had been spent which was not provided for. What I object to under the present system—I speak as the Representative of one of the great spending Departments—is, that if an agitation is got up out-of-doors, or in this House, however powerful the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the Treasury may be, they cannot prevent the War Office or the Admiralty going into great expenditure. The general result of this is that by the time 19*s.* in the pound is spent the agitation has cooled down, and they then decline to spend the last shilling, which would enable the previous 19*s.* to be of any avail. When we came into Office we found there was a liability on one item alone of something like £3,000,000. It is true that our expenditure is higher in the present year; but we propose next year, notwithstanding the addition to the ships, to reduce that liability to £350,000. Where the test of extravagance or economy is based on outlay alone, no cognizance is taken of this great reduction of liability. When I heard the late Prime Minister say that the only way of dealing with a Department was by a summary reduction of expenditure, so far as the Admiralty is concerned, if that rule had been adopted we should have been forced to apply to our creditors under contracts made by the late Government a system of payment not very dissimilar to the Plan of Campaign. There is another point which I think is deserving of attention—I think there should be greater caution and calculation before large schemes of expenditure are embarked upon; but if the necessity for that expenditure be proved, then it ought to be expedited, and the work in hand completed with the greatest despatch possible. If there could be a more thorough investigation than that which the House of Commons, in its corporate capacity, can exercise, I think it might lead to very desirable results. My right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury is considering whether or not it would be possible to make some proposition similar to that which my noble Friend has made. Whether we can get over these difficulties or not, I am certain of one thing; and that is that no Government, if it were to accept the appointment of such a Committee, could pledge itself to accept all or any of the recommendations it might make, for, inasmuch as the Government, and not the Committee, are responsible for the policy of the expenditure to the country, they could not tie their hands beforehand. I think I have shown that, so far at least as the Admiralty is concerned, we have not been guilty of extravagance; and I am bound, in fairness, to say that, if there was a considerable increase in the Army Estimates, that was mainly due to demands which we felt it our duty to press upon the War Office. The differences which arose between my noble Friend and the War Office and the Admiralty were almost entirely due to the fact of past Governments not having paid their way as they proceeded. The accumulated arrears of seven years have been heaped upon the Estimates of two years. I think, if a more thorough examination of the Estimates were made than is usual in this House, that each Government would be compelled to pay their way, and not postpone and heap up liabilities for their successors. The speech my noble Friend made yesterday brought back to Her Majesty's Government how great a subtraction from our strength his separation from us has made. But, at any rate, we were consoled in one respect, because my noble Friend stated, in the clearest and most emphatic way, that if we are not to have the advantage of his guidance and his advice, as we had in the past, at least we shall have his support in reference to the great question of the hour; he is at one with us in our wish for the maintenance of the Union and the authority of the law in Ireland, and will ever be ready to give us the benefit of his powerful advocacy and influence. My noble Friend spoke in a sanguine tone of the condition of Ireland, and considered the victory practically won; and he hinted that we might with advantage disband the Unionist army which had won it. I believe the last Election has secured for a generation to come the integrity of our Empire; but, as the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant stated the other night, it is no use maintaining the Union between those two countries unless in Ireland the authority of the law is upheld. We have yet that struggle to overcome. I believe the issue will be successful. I believe we are on the eve of the last battle to be fought for some time to come. Certainly, until a battle has been fought, until there is no likelihood of any further encounter occurring, no Member of the Government would be willing to insult those allies by whose assistance we gained so great and unexpected a victory last year, and by whose further co-operation we hope to secure the fruits of that victory. Now, we take our stand upon two of the greatest principles on which civilization rests—the unity of the Empire and the liberty of the individual. The first has been made safe, and the second is being made secure against coercion. Until that desirable end is obtained, and until those principles are absolutely secured against any future combination, we cannot afford to part with a single one of our Friends opposite, who have given us such strong proof of their devotion to our cause by the self-sacrifice which they have imposed upon themselves, and whose joint action with us in the future will, as I believe it has in the past, bring the cause we have at heart to a triumphant conclusion.

Mr. CHILDERS (Edinburgh, S.): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to follow the noble Lord opposite (Lord George Hamilton) into the latter part of his argument. The noble Lord began by promising that he would only deal with questions of finance, and I propose to follow his example in that declaration, and not the inconsistent course he pursued in his last few sentences. I wish to say a few words to the House on the subject of the speech of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill). I will say at once that I was one of those who greatly regretted the secession of the noble Lord from the Government and the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, not only because during last Session the noble Lord appeared, in answering Questions put to the Government in the House, to be following sound rules of finance, but also because, on every opportunity he had during the Recess, whether it might be to deputations or in other ways, of giving his opinions on financial questions, he used those opportunities to lay down what seemed to me sound financial principles. Therefore, while saying nothing as to the merits of the question which was the immediate cause of his secession, and with no reference to my right hon. Friend who succeeds him, I regret the loss the Government has sustained in the noble Lord as Chancellor of the Exchequer; and I think, in the speech which the noble Lord delivered yesterday, he thoroughly justified the impression he had previously made of the position he had taken up. I am not the only one who felt the value of the positions taken up by the noble Lord, and I will endeavour in a few words to state exactly what I mean. In that speech, Sir, the noble Lord has told us that for our present financial difficulties, or rather for the cure of those financial evils which he stated so plainly and fairly, he had two proposals to make, and the noble Lord who has just spoken (Lord George Hamilton) has referred to both of those proposals. The noble Lord the Member for Paddington suggests that it would tend to improve the discussion of the Army and Navy Estimates, and to improve the control of the House over the extravagance which obtains in the two Administrative Departments, if the Estimates were accompanied by a Memorandum in the nature of what the French call an *exposé des motifs* drawn up by the Minister responsible for the Estimates; 'a full Memorandum, which would obviate a good deal of the detail which overlays the Minister's speech in introducing the Estimates, and the debate afterwards. I did not understand from the noble Lord that he proposed to supersede the statement of the responsible Minister by this Memorandum. What I understood him to say was that this Memorandum would be placed in the hands of Members to prepare them for discussing the Estimates—[Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL assented.]—a week or more before the speech of the Minister introducing those Estimates. I think, if we had this explanation in detail of the Estimates at that time, it would greatly facilitate the discussion of the Estimates by the House; and it would, at the same time, enable hon. Members who desired to ask questions on matters of detail to find for themselves the answers to those questions; and therefore, in that respect, the Memorandum might lighten the statement of the Minister; for if this Memorandum were habitually attached to the Army and Navy Estimates the Minister himself would be saved a great mass of detail which hon. Members would have in their hands. Therefore, as to that proposal of the noble Lord, I venture to suggest to the House that it has great merit, and I hope the noble Lord will press it on his former Colleagues, and that it will become the rule in all future Estimates. The second proposal of the noble Lord was to refer the Estimates to a Committee. Now, I am not quite sure whether I understand exactly the proposal of the noble Lord. Does he say that there should be a Standing Committee for the Military and Naval Estimates? [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL dissented.] Or two Standing Committees? [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL again dissented.] Or does the noble Lord propose that at this time, and not necessarily followed by a repetition of the same process in future years, there should be a thorough overhauling of the Army and Navy Estimates? [Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL assented.] If that is so, I can only say that I strongly support that suggestion. But I think nothing could be more mischievous than a Standing Committee on the Army and Navy Estimates, even if it were composed of men of great authority on those subjects. The result would inevitably be that this Committee would be the masters of the situation, and not the Ministers who are responsible to the House and the country. If the same Chairman were appointed year after year, and supported by a powerful Committee, not only hon. Members, but the Army and Navy Departments, would look to that Chairman as the person with the greatest power in the matter, and not to the Minister; and, if that should be the case, an irresponsible Member of Parliament having this enormous power, then I say good-bye to all control of the administration of the Army or the Navy. I am further bound to uphold this plan, because it is identical with a proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) as Prime Minister, and myself as Chancellor of the Exchequer, in 1883, 1884, and 1885. We found, unfortunately, that the proposal was not agreeable to the general body of the House, and we most reluctantly abandoned it. We believe now, as we believed then, that it would be most beneficial. Now, Sir, let me remind the House of what really happened, because I think it is important that those who have desired financial and administrative economy—I am not speaking exclusively of any one side of the House—should know exactly what took place in recent years on the subject. In 1883 I had the honour of opening this Budget, and in my Financial Statement I went with some detail into the Military and Naval Expenditure of the previous 20 years. I think I began with the year 1862 or 1863, and I showed what the expenditure on the Army and Navy had been in five or six different periods within that time, during what years the Estimates had fallen, and when and why they were raised. On the following day we did our best, on the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Burnley (Mr. Peter Rylands), to explain the salient points of these fluctuating charges; and we impressed on the House that if they wished to have this expenditure put on such a footing that everyone could see to what the increased Estimates were due, that could best be done by appointing a Committee to examine thoroughly into Army and Navy Expenditure. The noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty will forgive me if I remind him of the ground on which he based his opposition to that proposal. He said it was a Vote of Censure on my two Colleagues—the Secretary of State for War and the First Lord of the Admiralty; and on that ground he could not support it. When the noble Lord brought forward that argument, I think he must have done so merely on the spur of the moment, without sufficiently considering that no Cabinet, having deliberately decided upon such inquiry, could be supposed to be censuring Members of their own body. Well, we were defeated, or, rather, the noble Lord blocked our Motion, and for a month we never could bring in on; but, as he has changed his mind and is ready to support this proposal, I will throw that in his teeth no longer. I trust the House will now support Her Majesty's Government in taking steps which to them appear wise for helping the House to exercise more control over expenditure. I entirely agree with the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington when he said—

> "Parliament is impotent, unless the Government leads the way, in respect to the control of this expenditure."

The noble Lord who has just spoken (Lord George Hamilton) gave a good illustration of the impotence of Parliament in dealing with the small details of Estimates when they are brought before this House on the authority of the Government, and how rarely it happens that any sensible impression has been made upon the Estimates, even in small points, much less upon any large source of expenditure. During the 27 years that I have been in the House I do not remember any case of sensible reduction of expenditure, either in the Army or the Navy, being effected by a vote of this House, although some 20 years previously, no doubt, there was an instance in which economy in the Army was brought about. Whether this is connected, as the noble Lord has suggested, with the democratic constitution of the House, or whatever the cause may be, there can be no question that it is practically impossible for those who are not themselves in the secrets of Office to control and reduce Public Expenditure upon the great Services, and that it must rest with the Government itself to propose to Parliament the proper measures to be taken. At the same time, do not let it be assumed that even with a powerful Committee, led by the Government, it will be over-easy to effect very great reductions, unless that Committee is thoroughly impressed with the relative importance of the economies suggested, and appreciates what in reality the great sources of increased expenditure have been. I have taken some trouble to see in what consists the large increase in the Naval and Military Expenditure since 1867-8, when Mr. Disraeli was Chancellor of the Exchequer. At that period the Estimates were fairly controlled; but, at the same time, without any very violent desire to reduce them. The noble Lord stated the other day that the increase in the Naval and Military Estimates since about that time, and comparing averages of years, was £6,000,000, and he was not very far wrong. As between 1867-8 and 1885-6, the increase of the net Army and Navy Expenditure is about £6,250,000. The House may, perhaps, be curious to know in what that increase really consists. The Army has had 15,000 men added to it. The Votes for pay, clothing, and provisions have increased by about £2,000,000. The increase for retired pay and pensions is £750,000, and the increase for ordnance and all other Votes is £1,250,000, the total increase in the Army Expenditure being £4,000,000. In regard to the Army, therefore, it will have to be remembered that the main items of increase—pay, pension, food, and clothing—are very difficult to attack. But the increase of Navy Expenditure is totally different. Instead of there having been an increase of 15,000 men, there has been a decrease of 6,000; for our ships, although affording a vastly larger fighting power, now require a much smaller number of men than 18 years ago. The Votes for pay, clothing, and provisions have been reduced by £500,000, while the Votes for retired pay and pensions have been increased by £500,000; but the Votes for shipbuilding and ship-repairing have increased by £2,000,000. But everyone knows that great war ships, which used to cost £100,000 or £200,000, now cost £500,000 or £1,000,000 each. Other Votes have increased by £250,000. Thus the Navy increase has been £2,250,000. There will, of course, be some difficulty in dissociating the economical from the political parts of the inquiry. Of course, no Government could refer to a Committee high questions of policy involving expenditure on the Navy and Army, especially on the Navy. I think, however, that an inquiry, carefully conducted by men of position and experience, and, above all, by business men, will be able to effect a great deal without touching politics at all. I hope that such a Committee, if appointed, will bear in mind what the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) has so well said to-night, as to the advantages of proceeding rapidly when building ships. When you have once decided what ships you want to build, I am sure that it is a sound rule to build and complete them as speedily as possible, without waiting to see what further improvements science or experience might suggest. The tendency of the Departments is to make small changes and improvements as the work goes on; but, in my opinion, these had better be introduced into the next ship, and not delay the particular ship in hand. I do not assent to all his doctrines; but, speaking generally, I believe that the First Lord of the Admiralty has given the House good advice, and I feel certain that if, in addition to his improvements, the proposal of the noble Lord the Member for Paddington is adopted, we shall get both the efficiency and the economy mentioned in the Queen's Speech. That being so, I shall be most happy, to the best of my humble powers, to facilitate and assist the carrying out of the plan which he has suggested.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Sir, I do not propose to follow the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Childers) in his observations with respect to the Army and Navy, of which he has so large experience, as I have neither title nor knowledge to qualify me to do so, further than to say that, in case of either wanton negligence or extravagant expenditure, I am certain it is not from this Government or this side of the House that any opposition to a most sweeping inquiry will be made. Indeed, I do not think that I should have intervened in this debate but for the speech of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), which, so far as I am able to judge, must be regarded as the prelude to a series of attacks on the financial policy of the Government as a whole. I am not concerned, nor am I called upon, to undertake a defence of the Government in these matters, which is perfectly well able to take care of itself. But I am concerned, in common with Gentlemen who sit on this side of the House, and in common, I have no doubt, with many on the other side of the House, in the maintenance of the Union and the Unionist Party—to use the language of the noble Lord himself—"intact and unimpaired," and on those grounds I ask permission to make some observations on his speech. The noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton) to-night congratulated himself on the fact that it was evident that the support of the noble Lord the Member for Paddington was still to be given to the cardinal principle and policy of the Government—namely, the maintenance of the Union and of the Unionist Party "intact and unimpaired." But I must say that some of the noble Lord's references last night to the Liberal Unionists and their Leaders were not so satisfactory in that respect as they might have been. Even if that were so, I confess that I am one of those who prefer to judge a man by what he does rather than by what he says. Therefore, I ask permission to intervene in this debate. Let me just say a word or two upon what the noble Lord said with reference to Ireland. We have reason to be grateful to the noble Lord for his references to Ireland; and, speaking as an English landlord, I will venture to tender him my thanks for his able vindication of the landlords of that country, and for the generous and just tribute which he paid to the manner in which many Irish landlords are endeavouring to perform their duties, although by the legislation of this House they have long ago been deprived of all the rights which attach to property in Ireland. Most cordially, also, would I re-echo the sentiments which the noble Lord expressed towards the Chief Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) in reference to the way in which my right hon. Friend has fulfilled the most formidable and most difficult and most thankless task which can fall to the lot of any Minister in these days--namely, the government of Ireland. There is much, indeed, which I should like to add upon this subject had it not been so well said already by the noble Lord. In the next place, may I be permitted to refer in a single sentence to the references which fell last night from the noble Lord to the New Rules of Procedure, and the personal references which he did me the honour of making to myself? The noble Lord assured us that the Rules laid upon the Table are precisely the same as they were when he left the Cabinet. I can well believe it, and I am glad to hear it. Knowing, as I do, the extremely intractable and wilful, and sometimes, I might say, almost impossible disposition of the noble Lord, I must say that I think that the greatest credit is done to my speeches and perambulations throughout the country—to which the noble Lord has somewhat scornfully alluded—by the form which the New Rules have actually assumed. The noble Lord is a master of exposition —he is an absolute master of language —and no one will convince me that he could have expressed himself with the singular infelicity and extraordinary clumsiness which he must have shown if these Rules are what he intended them to be. I have not the smallest doubt that I have been successful in converting either the noble Lord himself—no small matter in itself—or in inducing his Colleagues to resist much more stringent propositions. I have, therefore, no acknowledgment to make, as he said very properly last night, to the extremely Radical Member for South Paddington. But, on the contrary, I think I have every reason to congratulate myself. If the Rules of Procedure have not been altered, there is something else which has been, according to the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill)—if they are framed with due regard to efficiency and economy—and that is the Estimates, and the expenditure which they involved, upon which the noble Lord informed us that he resigned. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, was the third day on which we have had debate since Parliament re-assembled. We have been favoured by the noble Lord with two explanations of that resignation already. A resignation must be somewhat awkward and somewhat serious in the mind of the person who resigns, if it requires an explanation every other day. Last night we were told emphatically by the noble Lord that it was not upon the coaling stations that his resignation was made. And yet—I heard his statement and read it afterwards with the greatest care—it appears that the letter to Lord Salisbury was absolutely clear, and that there is no foundation whatever for his strictures on the Prime Minister, when the noble Lord charges him with being such a master of tactics and fastening the question of the coaling stations upon him as the cause of his resignation. This is what the noble Lord wrote—

> "The War Estimates might be very considerably reduced if the expenditure on the fortifications and guns and garrisons of military ports, mercantile ports, and coaling stations were abandoned or modified. But of this I see no chance, and, under the circumstances, I cannot continue to be responsible for the finances."

Well, if this is not a perfectly distinct resignation upon a specified point I do not know what it is, and therefore his retort upon the Prime Minister was uncalled for, and unjustified by anything which happened. Then the noble Lord says that he was pledged up to the eyes to retrenchment, and that, therefore, it was impossible for him to reconsider his position. But in which direction? By previous speeches to an increase of expenditure, or by previous speeches in favour of reduction? What is no infrequent occurrence with the noble Lord —he was distinctly pledged both ways. I am going to quote, in defence of the Government and the attitude they have taken up, one or two singular and remarkable statements of the noble Lord in former days. I remember reading with great interest at the time the account of an interview between the noble Lord and some representative of a well-known journal in this country, *The Pall Mall Gazette*. It is, among other things, on the subject of the expenditure on the Army and Navy—

> "As to the Navy, if all *The Pall Mall Gazette* says is true, then nothing short of an immediate expenditure on an adequate scale can be thought of. I am bound to say that all I have heard entirely bears out 'The Truth about the Navy,' and I shall be much surprised if the debate in the House of Commons does not conclusively make in the same direction. . . . . For my own part, if 'The Truth about the Navy' be admitted, then a large expenditure spread over a number of years should be incurred, and I should not hesitate for a moment about it, for I believe it would be as popular as it would be patriotic."

Then, so large were the noble Lord's ideas that he goes on—

> "Even worse than nothing would be a wretched million or two, which would do no good, but an infinity of harm in hanging the whole question up."

I suppose the noble Lord has changed his opinions on the subject, and something has led him to believe that such an expenditure would not be popular. Now, I wish to quote an opinion of the noble Lord to which more importance attaches, because it was made after the period when he had succeeded to the responsible position of a Minister of the Crown in this country. Speaking on the 12th of August, 1885, and addressing a large meeting in Dorsetshire, he made this statement, which contrasts most remarkably with the position and the attitude which he has recently adopted—

> "The policy we are pursuing is a great one. It is a policy upon which we shall go to the country. It is a policy which has for its object the strengthening of the Empire at home and abroad. . . . . It is a policy by which we mean to create an efficient and overwhelming Navy adequate to the defence of our commerce, our coasts, and our Colonies."

Now, Sir, I have given the House two instances in which, most undoubtedly, the noble Lord was pledged to a very large increase of expenditure, because it is impossible to suppose that by a reduction of expenditure you can create an adequate, and even an overwhelming Navy. But I wish to be perfectly fair, and I will give to the House his latest statements as a Minister, and while he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the question of expenditure. And this is the statement that he made, speaking on a celebrated occasion at Dartford, and when he made that speech which created so much sensation in the country. He dwelt there for some time on his eagerness and great anxiety, representing the particular Office that he then filled, to do that which undoubtedly was most desirable and most praiseworthy in itself—to bring about, if possible, a great reduction in expenditure, and consequently in the taxation of the people. And he said—

> "I frankly confess that I shall be bitterly disappointed if it is not in my power in one, or, at any rate, in two years, to show to the public that a very honest and very earnest effort has been made in that direction, and that it has been attended with a practical and sensible result."

That was a statement with which no one would dream of quarrelling for a moment, but which was deserving of every possible support and praise. But the noble Lord was not satisfied to give one or two years for the attainment of this result, but he hardly allowed one or two months to go by before he came forward with his proposals to his Colleagues in the Cabinet, and then, because his views were not at once accepted, he thought it his imperative duty to resign. What I want to call the attention of the House to is this. Granted that he was pledged to a reduction of expenditure, was he not pledged to something else besides, and pledged ten times more than on that question? What did he say at Dartford about the duty of the Government and the cardinal principle of their policy? I am almost afraid of wearying the House by frequent quotations, but the House and the country ought to be reminded of these explicit statements made within so short a period; and I must ask the House to listen to the words used by the noble Lord only about three months ago.

At Dartford, the noble Lord unfolded a great programme of policy to the people on the part of his Colleagues as well as of himself. He dealt with a great variety of subjects at that time, including, of course, the question of expenditure; but he declared that one and all of those subjects must be held subordinate to the great cardinal principle of the maintenance, intact and unimpaired, of the union of the Unionist Party. The noble Lord said—

> "Now, let me turn to the policy of the future. The main principle of that policy—I pray you to bear in mind—the guiding principle and motive of the policy of the Government in the future will be to maintain intact and unimpaired the union of the Unionist Party. We know how much depends, how almost entirely the future of England depends, on the union of the Unionist Party; how every institution which we value, all the liberties which we prize, are for the time bound up in the union of the Party; and everything we do"—

I beg the House to mark this—

> "Everything we do, either in domestic or foreign affairs, shall be subordinated to the cardinal principle of the union of the Unionist Party. Subject to that principle," he says, "let us examine the details of what we may propose to get next Session."

And then he proceeds to deal with all those secondary and subordinate questions to which I have already alluded. Well, I listened with great attention to hear what defence would be set up by the noble Lord in reference to this part of the question. He says it is quite true that it is our duty to maintain the Union, but that the right way of doing it is to

> "identify the Government of the Union—the Party of the Union—in the minds of the English people with good government, with efficient administration, and with progressive legislation."

Undoubtedly, in this he was perfectly right; but the noble Lord has no monopoly in the Conservative Party, and he never has had, so far as I know, of the desire either for good government, efficient administration, or progressive legislation. What, I ask, is the most difficult point in the government of this country at the present moment? Undoubtedly, it is the government of Ireland; and on that very question, the cardinal question of all, in the government of this country at this time, the noble Lord last night extended his blessing to the Ministry; and, therefore, it clearly cannot be on that point that he is dissatisfied. Then, as to progressive legislation, I take the programme of the Government, and with that the noble Lord last night expressed his satisfaction. He said it was an ample and abundant programme, and he was mightily pleased with it, because he said that it bore a strong family resemblance to a famous speech made in Kent. It is quite true that it was shadowed forth in the speech made at Dartford; and with the single exception of the closure, which everybody understood the noble Lord to mean closure by a bare majority —a point to which I took objection— with that single exception, I expressed my hearty approval of the Dartford programme. What was the Dartford programme? It was not the policy of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington. I heard the noble Lord himself spend at least a quarter of an hour in explaining to a popular audience at Bradford that this Dartford programme, about which so much fuss was made at the time, was nothing more nor less, with the single exception of the measure relating to the question of tithes, than a perfect copy of the original programme laid down by Lord Salisbury at Newport the year before. Then, I want to know—and I have cited the noble Lord himself as a witness on this subject—I want to know whether it is possible that he can have adopted this course for a single moment because we are refusing to identify ourselves as a Party with progressive legislation? As to what the noble Lord said last night with reference to the Leaders of the Liberal Unionists and their Party, and as to the taunts which he levelled at them, I must say that I heard his language with profound regret. It is barely three months ago since there was nothing which the noble Lord could say that was sufficiently good of the whole of the Liberal Unionists and their Leaders. He praised their self-sacrifice, he praised their loyalty, he praised their honourable conduct; and I desire for myself, and I am certain also for the whole of the Party on this (the Ministerial) side of the House, to say that we resent and utterly repudiate the taunts which the noble Lord flung at them. The fact is, I am very much afraid, that by the two explanations the noble Lord has given us, he has only made his position worse than it was before. There was a general desire and a general disposition on the part of the whole Conservative Party, not to say one word of condemnation of his attitude until his explanation was heard, and if his explanation had been confined to what he stated in his first speech on the opening night of the Session, nothing would have fallen from me on the subject. But, I must say that I think the noble Lord proved last night that he had not the shadow of a leg to stand on. The noble Lord, however, is not satisfied, and he is going to make his appeal to the people. What is he going to tell them about the Union? Why, that he, the Minister of all others pledged up to the eyes to maintain the union of the Unionist Party intact and unimpaired, within a brief couple of months afterwards has, so far as he is himself concerned, chucked the fortunes of the Unionist Party to the winds; and, by his resignation, has dealt at the cause of the Union about as heavy a blow as was possibly in the power for any individual man to give it. And why is this done? Why are these solemn pledges departed from? Because—and for nothing more—because the Government would not consent to leave the ports and coaling stations of the Empire undefended; and because they would not grant the noble Lord a reduction of £500,000 on the Estimates. Well, what has he got to say to the people on the question of the Estimates and of expenditure? In my humble opinion, this is more extraordinary still. Husband your resources—says the noble Lord in effect—in time of peace; make no preparation for the possibilities of war; leave your ports and your coaling stations altogether undefended; repose on the undying historic memories of the past, so that when war is actually upon you, and the fight has already begun, then you will be able to display the exuberance of your resources in all their irresistible might. That is the noble Lord's idea of statesmanlike economy and efficiency. The noble Lord made a suggestion last night by proposing that all these matters should be referred to a Committee of this House. We have had a great many Committees in this House on many different subjects, and I have no objection to the inquiries they make if good is to be the result; but does the noble Lord suppose that these matters have never been the subject of inquiries before? I think, considering the responsibility of his position, and more than all considering the enormous responsibility which attached to his resignation, the noble Lord ought to have made himself more thoroughly acquainted with everything that has transpired in this respect in the past. But I wish to remind the House that this question was carefully considered some years ago by a Royal Commission presided over by Lord Dalhousie; and, in the report of that Commission, hon. Members will find a most pregnant sentence, which is more than ever applicable to the circumstances of the present day. The noble Lord has told us to put off our preparations until the time when war begins. What was the report of that Commission, presided over by an able, a distinguished, and experienced statesman, and composed of men who were thoroughly competent to sift the question to the bottom, and report upon it?—

> "Recent events," they say, "have taught us that we must not rely in future on having time for preparation. Wars will be sudden in their commencement, and short in their duration, and woe to that country which is not prepared to defend itself against any contingency that may arise, or combinations that may be formed against it."

I do not believe that the people of this country are likely for one moment to be misled by the extremely foolish sentiments—I believe that "clap-trap" would be the right word—I will not use it—I do not wish for a moment, Sir, to depart from the proper courtesies of debate—but I do not believe for a moment that the people of this country would be misled by the idle and the foolish sentiments which the noble Lord expressed on this point last night. Let him, in Heaven's name, make his appeal to the people when he likes. They must have strangely changed their nature, unless the noble Lord is destined to be quickly and piteously disappointed. What the people of this country like is a man whose Party and whose Leader know they can rely upon him in the hour of their need. What the people of England dislike above all—what I am satisfied he will find, they will bitterly resent in a great crisis of affairs like the present—is the desertion of a Government, of a Party, and of a cause by one from whom they had every right and every reason to believe, from everything which he had said before, that he would have given his commanding powers and all his efforts to their support.

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) said, he did not feel called upon to make any apology for interposing in the debate, because, partly owing to the fact that he had taken a somewhat active part in recent events in Ireland, and particularly in reference to the atrocities which had lately taken place at Glenbeigh, and partly that during the course of the debate he had been attacked with all the violence and malignant ingenuity of which the junior Members of the Tory Party were capable, he might fairly be expected, and even claim a right, to say something on the subject. But he would not have troubled the House in saying anything in self-defence, had he not felt bound to do so in the interests of the poor persecuted tenantry of Ireland. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) had done him the honour of quoting some utterances of his in Ireland, and he thanked the hon. and gallant Member for having done so, because it gave him the opportunity of re-affirming on the floor of the House of Commons what he had said on public platforms in Ireland. They were utterances of which he was not ashamed, and he did not think, under the circumstances, anyone could blame him who had a grain of humanity or common sense in his disposition. He found a special reference to these utterances of his in *Notes from Ireland*, a publication of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, directing the attention of the Government to his speeches, of which he made no doubt the Attorney-General for Ireland and the Chief Secretary had taken due notice. If he was to be hounded down in this fashion for passages quoted from his speeches, he wanted to know where were these Gentlemen who devoted so much attention to him when the right hon. Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) went over to Belfast to incite his fellow-countrymen to civil war. A few moments ago, there was sitting on the opposite Benches the hon. Member for East Belfast (Mr. De Cobain), who, notwithstanding the Oath of Allegiance to Her Majesty which he had taken that evening at the Table of the House, had uttered the most treasonable expressions—had not only incited to civil war, but had absolutely used treasonable utterances against Her Majesty herself. No evil effects had resulted from what he (Mr. Conybeare) had said in Ireland, whilst the worst riots known in their recollection had been the result, had been the outcome of the speeches of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington and the hon. Member for East Belfast. He had only to say with reference to the attacks made upon him—both past, present, and future—that he stood there fully conscious of his responsibility as a representative of the democracy of this country. Though his constituency was in a distant part of the country, it was, perhaps, all the better for that, because it would remain uncorrupted by the taint of metropolitan snobocracy. He was not sent to that House to bandy personalities with the professional punsters and the political buffoons of the Tory Party. The issues in debates of this kind were grave and solemn, and he would not be deterred from entering on the path which he had marked out for himself. If it were in his power to assist the poor, the oppressed, the struggling and the weak, against the rich and powerful, the selfish classes and the monopolists, he should not hesitate to do so. He had no fear but that his constituents would fully approve all that he might deem it his duty to do in that behalf. Why were the Tory Party so angry with the part he had taken? Because in the past, when battles were waging in the House on behalf of Ireland, the Irish Members had to fight alone, but since the extension of the franchise the democracy of England had felt it its duty to range itself with the people of Ireland; and, to-day, the democracy of England was wide-awake, and was determined to fight side by side with the democracy of Ireland in defence of the rights of the people against the interests of the classes. Formerly the democracy had no ears to hear, because the only channel of information available to them—the plutocratic Press of this country — systematically kept back from the people the information which it should be the duty of the Press to convey. As illustrating this, he might mention that only a week ago the hon. Member for North Meath, a friend of his, wrote from Glenbeigh a long and interesting and important letter, meeting false statements published in *The Times* with reference to the evictions, and he sent that letter to *The Times*, and also to *The Daily News*. *The Daily News* had the good sense and the good feeling to publish the letter, but *The Times* had neither the impartiality nor the good sense to put the letter in. In fact, he presumed that *The Times* was afraid to publish the letter, because the more light was let in upon the atrocities of Glenbeigh, the worse it would be for its clients and readers. [*Ironical laughter.*] He could assure hon. Members who laughed that the English people would not much longer suffer themselves to be taxed for the purpose of enabling Irish landlords to turn out their unfortunate tenants; not merely when they would not, but when they could not pay their rents, and to demolish and burn the humble houses which they themselves had built. Now the noble Lord the Member for North Tyrone (Lord Ernest Hamilton) had condemned the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. Dillon) for interfering on an estate as to which he knew very little, but, if the hon. Member did so, his conduct was at all events no worse than that of the accredited agents of the Government; because one of the most singular portions of the evidence of Mr. Plunket in the Dublin Police Court was that in which he had to admit that, instigated by the Chief Secretary or in communication with Sir Redvers Buller, he interfered between landlord and tenant in a case of which admittedly he knew nothing at all. It had been said by some Members on the opposite Benches, that an extended application of Lord Ashbourne's Purchase Act would settle the Irish difficulty, and was the weapon which the Nationalist Party most dreaded. Well, one of the things which he had been advising the tenants in Ireland to do was not to purchase holdings under that Act, or under any similar Act, because the Land Judges were creating a block in the business of the Land Court by refusing to allow estates to be sold at their present market value. As a rule, only one-fourth, or at the most one-third, of the purchase value of the property in land belonged to the landlords, and the rest to the tenants, and that being so, it was a monstrous thing to compel the tenants to go into these Courts and pay for the fee-simple of their holdings 15 and 20 years' purchase for their own property—for the improvements effected by themselves—when five or six years' purchase would more likely be the proper figure. Many statements had been published in the newspapers with reference to the treatment of the Glenbeigh cottagers by the landlord, which he must stigmatize as false statements. They had been told that the landlord had been most generous during the 24 years he had been on the estate in the treatment of his tenants; that the agent, Roe, offered most magnanimous terms to them; that the tenantry had broken faith, and that in consequence, the parish priest, Father Quilter, had left them to their own resources; that the agitation had been wholly instigated by the National League, &c. He had no hesitation in denouncing every one of those statements as false. Up to 1879 the rents at Glenbeigh had been paid regularly. Indeed, so great was the desire of the tenants to pay at that time that—he had it on the authority of the medical officer—it was found necessary on rent day to have a policeman to keep order among the tenants as they rushed into the agent's office. Had hon. Members on the other side of the House heard of the foraging expeditions of Mr. and Mrs. Winn among these poor people for free supplies of eggs, and fowl, and fresh butter? He had discovered at a hotel, where he was staying at Glenbeigh, that this gentleman lived three months at the hotel some years ago, and ran up a bill of £90; and that he decamped one day without paying it, and that it still remained unpaid. With respect to rack-renting, Mr. Winn's son alleged that the rents remained the same to-day as they were 86 years ago. Hon. Members were aware that Griffith's valuation had not been made 86 years ago, but that it was made somewhere about 1850. He and other hon. Gentlemen had taken down the facts from more than 30 of these tenants, and found that in every case the rent was grossly above the valuation, and in many cases more than double the valuation. He was also informed that when the Hon. Rowland Winn came into the property, he got rid of the old agent who remonstrated with him as to raising the rents at all; and the rents were raised until the poor people were as rack-rented as they were to-day. He could give the House many instances of what he would venture to characterize as tyranny exercised over the tenants. In one case, some of them who had gone into a copse and cut some branches, had been summoned by the landlord and fined £26; while, in another case, a man had been fined £5 for having some wood in his possession which was not worth more than 2*s*. To illustrate the impartiality of which they had heard in connection with the treatment of these tenants, he would mention that at the time of this case the agent of the estate was acting as a magistrate, and left the Bench, on the case coming on, in order to give evidence. They had heard of the kindness of General Buller and Judge Curran. From evidence which he had got, he could assure the House that these poor people, when they went before Judge Curran, were bullied and brow-beaten by him, and were never allowed to tell their own story; and Father Quilter himself had described Judge Curran's conduct as worthy of a Star Chamber Court. He referred to the pamphlet of the I. L. P. U. to show that Sir Redvers Buller had acted certainly not impartially as between landlord and tenant. He had started with a misconception, because there was no evidence given of the alleged combination among the tenants to refuse to pay their rents. The only evidence was that there had not been, and was not, any combination on the estate whatever. In the police court, he swore that he was not sent there at all with the view of interfering between landlord and tenant in connection with social order; while he had written to Messrs. Darley and Roe, the agents on the Glenbeigh estate, in these terms—"I have reason to be anxious about the possibility of preserving order in the district"; and three days later he advised and instigated the levelling of the peasants' homes. If Sir Redvers Buller wrote the truth in these letters, he must have sworn what was false in the witness box in Dublin. If Sir Redvers Buller was right in his conclusions, all the evidence which they had collected showed that he was wrong in asserting that there was a deliberate combination among them not to pay rents which they were able to pay. Even in the presence of the Sheriff, when a poor man was proceeding to explain why he was unable to pay, he was at once shut up by the Sheriff; and, if they had not been on the spot, the whole country would continue to believe that these poor people were, what they were not—a dishonest set of people. The statement of Mr. Roe that he had only burnt the houses of persons who could afford to pay, was not correct in a single case. It was said that Mr. Roe was anxious to settle with the tenants in every case he could. But this was not borne out by the facts, for in more than one instance when a tenant brought in the full half-year's rent, part of which had in most cases been borrowed, Mr. Roe refused to accept it on the technical ground that his co-tenant would not or could not pay. He could also mention instances in which the houses of poor tenants who were destitute were burned down. In one case—that of Tom Burke—the tenant had no stock for four or five years. He had a wife and four children, who were notoriously supporting themselves by begging round the country; and, such was the destitution in this case, that temporary relief had been ordered by the Poor Law Authorities, and the police, with the permission of their commanding officer, collected £1 2*s.* 6*d.* for the immediate assistance of this poor family. He wanted to comment upon the character of those ruffians who were let loose upon the most inoffensive, most honest, and most industrious people that he ever came across, and who demolished their houses before their eyes and turned them out on the mountain side. The bailiffs and crowbar brigade were men of the most disreputable antecedents, some of whom, he was informed, had been convicted of felonies; and they behaved in the most ruffianly manner, and used the foulest language. The Constabulary also, in many instances, behaved with great violence, punching and knocking down girls with the butt-end of their rifles. Would the Attorney General allow his emissaries, the Constabulary, to perpetrate all these acts of violence and brutality upon these poor people without calling them to account? If they wanted to train up the poor children of the poor people, if they wanted to implant in their hearts hatred of their government, if they wanted to teach them to grow up patriotic young rebels—the best thing they could do was to go on with this fiendish work of burning the roofs of their fathers. Who could deny that they were setting a premium upon vice when they let loose among an industrious and moral population, ruffians whose character was known in the district to be of the worst description, and men who were known in the locality to be bastards. These tenants were industrious. There were people in this country, especially among the landlord class, who said that the Irish people were lazy; yet these were the people who themselves lived in lazy luxury upon the rents which could not be put into their pockets were it not for the most persistent industry on the part of these poor people. In the houses of these destitute tenants, and in the houses of the shopkeepers, he had seen processes and decrees for different articles supplied by the shopkeepers, but which they did not execute because they knew the poor people could not pay. He had been told by one shopkeeper in the neighbourhood, that the shopkeepers were on the brink of ruin themselves because the landlords stepped in and grabbed up everything before anyone else could get it. He had also seen the pawn-tickets in their homes, and, if they wanted evidence of the absolute poverty of these poor people, they had it in the fact of their having no stock for years past, and in the fact that their land had gone out of cultivation. Before he sat down, he wanted to address a few words to the Chief Secretary, and he hoped, although he was not present, that he might hereafter be able to take some note of them, because he had implored them in almost pathetic tones to help him. They were told by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington last night of the remarkably great sacrifice which the Chief Secretary had made in accepting the Chief Secretaryship. He (Mr. Conybeare) could not help thinking that there was something of crocodile's tears about the noble Lord, when he recollected that it was entirely due to the noble Lord himself that the Chief Secretary was ousted out of the Chancellorship of the Exchequer. He could not help thinking that the Chief Secretary must often have felt like the hedge sparrow who was chucked out of his nest by the cuckoo. He believed the Chief Secretary had done what he could in a humane manner, though as illegally as anything done under the Plan of Campaign, to alleviate the sufferings of the people of Ireland this winter. He felt a certain amount of pity for the Chief Secretary, who appeared to be a thoroughly good man, struggling against his fate, and against the misfortunes which were steadily gathering round his head. He found, at the end of the speech delivered by the Chief Secretary the other evening, that the right hon. Gentleman explained that he must maintain the law. They all agreed upon that point; but the question was how were they to do it? They could not do it any longer by coercion, as they had tried to do it in the past and failed. Why was the law at present detested by a great number of the people of Ireland? It was because, in the first place, the law was not based on the consent of the people, and never would be based on their consent until they had Home Rule. He had no hesitation in stigmatizing the present law in Ireland as a criminal law—it was opposed to the Divine law, "Thou shalt not steal," because it enabled the landlord to steal the property of the tenant—property which had, in every sense, been created by the latter's own exertions, industry, and outlay. The laws of Ireland, as applied to the land, violated all the principles of political economy. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington had stated that the Irish tenants were surrounded by a triple wall of protection; but he did not explain how it was that in spite of such bulwarks they could still be evicted, and their houses levelled. Anybody who knew anything about almost any part of Ireland knew that the tenant did not earn sufficient from the land to enable him to pay his rent, which was paid partly by what the tenant earned in this country at certain periods of the year, and what he received from his children in Australia or America. If a farmer in this country proposed to pay £100 a-year for a farm which would only yield £80, he would be looked upon as a lunatic. And why should they draw any distinction between the Irish farmer and the English farmer? In discussing this question, they should remember that, whereas in England the farmer did not pay for all the improvements, in Ireland the improvements were almost invariably the work of the tenant. The Glenbeigh estate produced a rental of £1,731, but he should like any hon. Member to go and see the character of the soil, and then ask himself the question, "Is there any tenant farmer in this country who could be induced to take that estate as it stands and pay that amount for it?" He was sure there would be no tenant in

England who would be induced to accept the estate on those terms; and yet that enormous rental was extorted from these unfortunate people who had given to the land the value which attached to it by the improvements which they had made. If the Chief Secretary, instead of relying for his information on the agent of the estate, and others of that class, had gone to the place himself he would have come back a Home Ruler. He would make this offer to the Chief Secretary—If the right hon. Gentleman would accompany him to Ireland during the recess, they would visit different parts of the country, and see for themselves what was the actual condition of these poor people who, in a telegram he sent to him (Mr. Conybeare) at Glenbeigh, he practically declared refused to pay their rents when they were quite able to do so. He was perfectly certain if the Chief Secretary would accede to his offer, and visit these unfortunate people, he would learn an experience which, however many years he filled the Office he now held, would be of lasting value to him. Hitherto the people of Ireland had been treated more like savages and wild beasts than anything else, and therefore it was surprising they did not cause the Government more trouble than they were doing. What they ought to do was to bring the laws into harmony with the moral instincts of the people and with political economy. So long as the laws of the country violated those two principles, they never would have any sound government in Ireland. The first thing they should do would be to stop the evictions. Before any tenant was put out of his home his case should be carefully investigated, and his house not destroyed until it was found he would not pay his rent through sheer rascality. In any case where a tenant had built his own house, he should not be evicted, even if he could pay, without receiving compensation. With respect to the congested population, the one suggestion which the Tories made was emigration or migration, as suggested by the Chief Secretary. They should not compel these people either to emigrate or migrate; by doing so they only tended to eradicate from the hearts of the people one of the greatest virtues of a citizen —the love of one's native country. Their homes were not full of luxuries, but these poor people had been born and bred there—they had spent many hours of happiness there, and no one had any more right to destroy their homes and endeavour to drive out of their hearts the love of country than they had to go to the greatest mansion of any noble Lord and tell him to go away as he was not wanted. The question, then, was how were they to relieve the congestion? This could be done by utilizing the natural resources of the country, and alluring the people from their present condition of life by offering them sufficient inducement to take up a different life. The fishing industry might be fostered, and training ships and military depots might be established, with the object of drawing the young to a seafaring or military life. It was hopeless for the Government to expect to secure the adhesion of the Irish people, unless they were prepared to cast away altogether the old-fashioned weapon of coercion. So long as they applied coercion to Ireland, so long would the democracy of this country be against them, and to-day the democracy of England was anxious and panting to range itself on the side of the democracy of Ireland. It was only by recognizing that fact that the Government would secure the confidence of their own fellow-countrymen, and be able to bring peace and prosperity to the sister country.

Colonel HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) said he thought the question of Ireland had been sufficiently dealt with in the crisp and telling sentences of the First Lord of the Treasury; and he would, therefore, devote his remarks to the paragraphs of the Queen's Speech referring to foreign policy and to expenditure. Whatever Lord Salisbury may have said at the Guildhall, or written in the letter to which the hon. Member for Northampton had referred, those utterances were superseded by the Queen's Speech, from which it might be fairly gathered that the policy of the Government, if it erred at all, would err on the side of peace. He understood that Russia was to be allowed, without protest from us, to regain her ascendancy in the Balkan Peninsula, provided she did not infringe any of the stipulations of the Treaty of Berlin. So far as we could judge, she would be able to regain her ascendancy without provoking the hostility of the Power lying contiguous to the States south of the Balkans. Up to this point, he apprehended, there was no danger to the peace of Europe in general, or of England in particular. But whether Russia, when she had once regained her ascendancy in the Balkan Peninsula, would be content to remain there, was another question, and one rather for the future than the present. Many hon. Members were anxious lest, at some later period, Russia might attempt to advance to Constantinople in pursuance of her traditional policy. The House and the country might fairly assume that if such a contingency occurred, the policy of the Government would be as firm and as bold as it was under Lord Beaconsfield. The question of economy had rightly exercised the mind of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. So far as he could gather, neither the noble Lord nor any other man wanted to object to any expenditure that was absolutely necessary for maintaining our Army and Navy. But it seemed that the noble Lord was convinced in his own mind—and the conviction was shared not only by Members on the Opposition side, but also by many on the Ministerial side of the House—that a certain amount of extravagant expenditure existed in the two great spending Departments, and that it might be effectually reduced, if not removed, without impairing or endangering the efficiency of the Services. That seemed to be the reading of the noble Lord's resignation. As he understood, the noble Lord did not object to any expenditure that was necessary to protect our coaling stations; but he objected to Estimates for expenditure on coaling stations, which expenditure was not accurately and fully accounted for, or judicious and necessary; and he rightly pointed out what we had wasted on fortifications at Portsmouth. Knowing himself every fort stretching inland from the beach to the downs, he concurred in the opinion that expenditure had been wasted. Some of the forts were mounted with heavy guns; some had guns that were dismounted; some had no guns at all, although they had been erected 25 years. Considering the present condition of the ordnance of ourselves and foreign Powers the forts would be almost useless, and if they came within range of an enemy's guns they would be in ruins in a few hours. However anxious Lord Palmerston might have been to part with the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) rather than lose Portsmouth Harbour; judging from the experience of the last two years he thought that it would have mattered very little, on the score of expense, which he lost. Of course the noble Lord could not object to our coaling stations being defended. It was absolutely necessary that they should have some protection. In the warfare of the future, ships would be sent to attack seaboard towns; and it would be as necessary that an admiral at sea should have access to secure coaling stations as that a commander of land forces should have the use of railways. As war might come upon us when we least expected it, we ought to be prepared for it in these matters. It would have been better if the £35,000,000 we had sunk in the sands of the Soudan and of Egypt, and the £11,000,000 spent in the Russian war scare, had been laid out to protect our coaling stations, and save our Colonies from panics. The right hon. Member for Mid Lothian cheered the noble Lord when he unfolded his views on economy; but how was it that the right hon. Gentleman, when he was in Office, did not initiate retrenchment if it were possible to effect it? The advance of science and invention had necessitated increase of expenditure; and what the House and the country wished to insist upon for the future was that we should have money's worth for our money, and that the Estimates put forward should be accurate and should be scrupulously adhered to, and that every farthing expended should be accounted for with that fastidious exactitude and punctiliousness which a business man expected from a qualified accountant.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.) said, that with reference to the pressing question of economy in the Public Services he was not a military or a naval officer, and therefore could not enter into details on the matter; but he represented a large commercial community in the North, and he could assure hon. Members that the eyes of the labouring classes were fixed upon the question of economy, and on the action Parliament would take in it. They would only be too glad to see real reform initiated, and would welcome the efforts of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) in that direction, together with his repentance, however late it might have come, with the greatest satisfaction. He believed, however, there was great necessity for an increase in the efficiency of both the Naval and Military Services. The noble Lord had referred in rather a cruel manner to the Liberal Unionists, and had suggested that they were the crutches on which the Government depended for support. For his own part, he (Mr. Schwann) believed the Government were going from bad to worse, for they were now depending for support on a wooden leg in the form of Mr. Goschen, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. [*Laughter.*] He said that advisedly, because all medical men had laid it down that a wooden leg had no vital connection with the body it supported; and, as some Liberals had said that Mr. Goschen had no vital connection with their Party, so he believed the Conservatives would find that he had no vital connection with them. As to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), they knew that he had propounded a great variety of plans for the settlement of the Irish Question in the past, and that he would propound a great many in the future. But there was great advantage in the multiplicity of the right hon. Gentleman's plans, because there could be no doubt that, whatever plan was adopted by the House, it was quite sure to have some distant family resemblance to some of the numerous progeny of the right hon. Gentleman. He (Mr. Schwann) wished to point out that the phrase they had heard so much about lately—namely, the union of the Unionists, was entirely wrong, because, as a matter of fact, disunion and not union prevailed in the ranks of the Unionist Party. He was in a position to say this with some authority, having spent four or five weeks in Ireland recently, and having talked with many Irish Unionists. In a journey which he made in that country, with the object of instituting personal inquiries on this matter, he found that the aims and views and aspirations of the Unionists on this side of the Channel were by no means consistent with the aims, views, and aspirations of Unionists in Ireland; and he could assure hon. Members that, if they devoted a month to the investigation of this subject in Ireland, they would come back with many prejudices cast aside, and with much clearer views of the Irish Question. He had seen during his visit men of different shades of opinion. He had conversed with landlords and tenants, so-called Loyalists and Nationalists, and, as he had said, there was a very great difference between the views of Unionists in England and Unionists in Ireland. By way of illustration, he might say that one of the chief evictors in Kerry, a Unionist, told him that the whole question was one of Saxon *versus* Celt, that the Saxons—to which he (the Unionist landlord) belonged, thank God!—were a superior race to the Celts; and that, therefore, the former had a divine mission to rule and govern the Celts. Another amiable evictor whom he met in Kerry told him "that there was one man whom he would gladly go to London to see hanged, drawn, and quartered." He (Mr. Schwann) thought the landlord was referring to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), but he found that he was alluding to the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington; and he was thus incensed against the noble Lord because he believed that he was the cause of Sir Redvers Buller being sent to Kerry. The landowners and Orangemen, who constituted the Unionists in Ireland, still wished to carry on the system of domination which they had practised for so many years; while, on the contrary, many of the Unionists in this country, especially Liberal Unionists, were ready to adopt remedial measures for the pacification of Ireland. He believed the Unionists in Ireland—the dominant class—were totally opposed to any measures of reform which would find favour in the eyes of the Unionists in England, and thus the two classes very greatly differed, and this domineering spirit existed deep down in the hearts of the so-called Loyalist faction in Ireland, though they did not always admit it. There were many points in which he thought reform was needed in the government of Ireland, and in regard to which the Irish people were not fairly treated. This was not a mere statement in the air, as he could prove by reading details given in a Bluebook issued within the past few days, on the motion of the hon. Member for South Kilkenny (Mr. Chance), in which it was stated that of a total of 5,065 magistrates in Ireland, 3,780 were Protestants, and only 1,229 were Roman Catholics, the remainder, 46, being persons whose religion was not stated.

Consequently, nearly four-fifths of the magistrates were Protestants, and that in a country where two-thirds of the people were Roman Catholics. Moreover, of this total, 2,737 were landlords, and 448 were land agents, so that out of the 5,000 magistrates, there were more than 3,000, or three-fifths, who were themselves directly connected with the land. And, as was well known, it was a usual thing in Ireland that when an agent was appointed to an estate, he was at once made a magistrate, though as such he was frequently called upon to decide, or take a part in deciding, questions which referred directly to his own personal interest, or to the pecuniary interest of his employer. That was an unjust and unwise condition of things; it must create dissatisfaction and discontent, and he trusted that, in simple fairness to the Irish people generally, it would be remedied. Then, again, it had struck him as singular, that whenever he met an Orangeman in the course of his journey, that man's great delight consisted in blackening the country which had given him birth. It had also been continually dinned into their ears last Session by hon. Gentlemen opposite, that the Irish were lazy and worthless. It was said that if they would work they would be able to meet the demands of their landlords; and he saw in a letter which appeared a day or two ago, that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Central Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) repeated the same advice, and suggested to the Irish Members of that House, that they should advise the people whom they represented to be industrious. They all felt the deepest veneration for the right hon. Gentleman; but they could not help feeling that he did not look at this Irish Question with the sympathetic feeling for the suffering Irish which animated him in earlier years. He (Mr. Schwann) determined to enquire, by his own observations, whether there existed among the Irish the idleness with which they were charged. He visited the Galtees, and there he saw tracts of land which had been reclaimed and all their value given them by the labouring population. It was heather land, which in this country would be left to the grouse and the gamekeeper, and the heather had been burnt off, and then there were three or four layers of stones beneath. He also saw layers of stones around the fields, and he could not understand what brought them there. But it was explained to him that before the land could be tilled these three or four layers of stones had to be removed bodily, and then they were laid by the side of the field. Could the people who had struggled so laboriously against such difficulties be justly accused of idleness? Then he went to Baltimore, near Cape Clear, where he spent a night and part of the next day with Father Davis, the venerable parish priest, who had done such good work for the seafaring population of the district. Father Davis explained to him how the fishing industry had died out, until his predecessor, Father Leader, in a moment of happy inspiration, applied to Lady Burdett-Coutts, whose ready generosity is so well-known, who sent a large sum of money to be applied in the purchase of fishing-tackle and boats suitable for taking the fish which swarm on that part of the coast. Before that, the population of the district had the mortification of seeing vessels from Holland, France, the Isle of Man, and other places carrying off the riches of the sea before their eyes. But the position was now totally changed. The men had most religiously paid back the money that was lent them, and they had now 18 large fishing smacks at Cape Clear, worth many thousand pounds, and there was comfort and well-being, where formerly there existed destitution and misery. This showed that the Irish, when they saw that the fruits of their labour would not be snatched from them, and that their earnings would be left at their own command, were as willing to exert themselves and as active and industrious as any other people on the face of the globe. Already, near Bantry, there was a slight improvement in the holdings, it appeared to him, compared with 20 years ago; and he did not believe that the people would return to the swinish, inhuman way in which they had lived previously, on any inducement whatever, though at present their condition was not very materially altered, and was not worthy of so hardworking a population. Sir George Trevelyan, in a speech at Hawick, had said that "sooner than consent to abandon the helpless Irish people to the lawless and unscrupulous, he would give up his career as a public man." [*Ministerial cheers.*] But who were the lawless and the unscrupulous? On an examination of the statistics of the criminal population both in England and Ireland, it would be found that the proportion of crimes to the population was much lower in Ireland than in this country. It is shown by the "statistical abstract" that in England and Wales there was, in 1885, one crime for every 2,618 persons, but in Ireland only one crime for every 3,130 persons, and this including agrarian crimes and outrages. As far as social purity was concerned, it was notorious that the Irish people were far ahead of our own countrymen. Then it was sometimes said that the Irish people were bigoted; but he had before him the Report of the Royal Commission which inquired into the Belfast riots, and, while praising the efforts of the Roman Catholic priests to preserve order and restore peace, they ascribed almost the whole blame for the riots from the 8th of June to the 18th of September to the wild, unreasoning hostility of the Protestant mob; and said that the disturbances were not in any way moderated by the language used by certain influential persons, among whom was the hon. Member opposite (Mr. De Cobain). He had heard it used as an argument in Dublin and elsewhere, that because the Protestants of Ireland monopolized nearly all the intelligence, wealth, and property of the country, that, therefore, they ought to receive special protection. But if they possessed almost all the intelligence, property, and wealth, they were perfectly well able to protect themselves. Indeed, it seemed to him that the poor down-trodden victims in Ulster were the Catholics, and that the Protestants, who were so clamorous for protection, stood in no need of it. During his visit to Ireland, he had never heard a whisper of religious bigotry on the part of the Catholics. While the Royal Commission was sitting in Belfast, the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington ought to have been at the bar, because he was one of those who were chiefly responsible for the bloodshed. He (Mr. Schwann) had not seen an eviction taking place in Ireland, but he knew that in some of the districts in the neighbourhood of Killarney two houses with their roofs off were to be seen for every one with its roof on. With that fact present to his mind, he could well understand the graphic descriptions of evictions which had been given by those hon. Members who had witnessed them. He was not able to discuss the Plan of Campaign in its legal aspects, but, as far as he could see, though it might be highly illegal, it was exceedingly human for poor people to combine together to prevent their eviction from their homes and hearths and the roofs which had sheltered them. He believed, himself, that there would not be peace in Ireland until the plan of dual ownership created by the Act of 1881 was gradually transformed into the sole ownership by the tenant of the land which he tilled. Lord Salisbury called the Plan of Campaign "organised embezzlement." He (Mr. Schwann) would use equally strong language, and call many of the present landlords "receivers of stolen property," for but few generations back it had been stolen from the native Irish and conferred, without any right or justice, on the ancestors of the present owners. He would instance the speech of the hon. Evelyn Ashley at Bury, in which he said that Irish landlordism was dead, and would ask hon. Members to look on the recent proposals as to the sale to the tenants of the holdings on the Bath and Ponsonby estates, as illustrating the rapid change which was taking place in the disposition of landlords. In his visit to Ireland, he had found no evidence of hatred of the English people. What the Irish people hated was not the English people, but English oppression, Castle rule, packed juries, one-sided injustice, and religious bigotry; and, if the grievances of the Irish people were removed, and they were placed in a position to manage their own domestic affairs, he was satisfied that Ireland would become the most loyal portion of the British Empire.

COLONEL HILL (Bristol, S.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House for the first time with feelings of very considerable diffidence. Seeing, however, that the Irish Question is the one now foremost in the public mind, and that I represent the more ancient part of an old city which, from its geographical position, has for many centuries had intimate relations, commercial and otherwise, with the sister country, it is, perhaps, but natural that I should wish to offer a few observations. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) seemed to be doubtful as to whether the masses of his countrymen were not with him in his views on the Home Rule Question. I have no doubt on the subject. In the autumn of 1885, I contested the Southern Division of Bristol; I was defeated by the small majority of 95. In the spring of the following year, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) introduced his measures, which we are bound to believe he considered were for the good of Ireland. Those measures were defeated in the House, whereupon the right hon. Gentleman made his famous appeal from the classes to the masses. The result of that appeal, so far as South Bristol was concerned—a constituency very largely composed of the masses—was my return by a majority of 1,024. The masses of South Bristol are, like most other sober-minded politicians, very much of opinion that that appeal ought never to have been made, and they are disposed to resent it as being an attempt, for Party purposes, to create a hostile feeling between class and class, which they judge rightly to be most pernicious to their very best interests. Sir, I heard, with very considerable regret, from the lips of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) some expressions that may possibly, I fear, have given pain to some Members of the Unionist Liberal Party. I do not think it possible that the noble Lord can feel otherwise than entirely in accord with that Party, and ready to afford to them that measure of respect which they deserve. If there be anything of disparagement in the metaphor he used in comparing the Liberal Unionists to a crutch, it appears to me it lies against his own Party, rather than against the Liberal Unionists; because a crutch is a very useful instrument for those who are troubled with age or infirmity, or who have the misfortune to break their limbs. I cannot possibly admit that the Conservative Party are in anything like such a condition. Again, Sir, the use of a crutch indicates a measure of pain, and I am sure I speak the sentiments of the Conservative Party in general when I say they have nothing but feelings of unqualified pleasure in the association they have with the Liberal Unionists. It is one of the most healthy and promising signs of the times to find that men occupying the distinguished positions held by the Leaders of the Liberal Unionist Party, should thus have come forward in the interest of their country; it was to their credit that they should have shown such a patriotic spirit, disregarding all personal consequences, breaking long-formed political ties, in coming forward to give their support to that which they think necessary for the good and happiness of their country. Well, Sir, I have been sent here to express the views of my constituents upon this great Irish Question, which has been submitted to them. In the first place, it is my duty to assure hon. Members who sit below the Gangway opposite, that the mandate with which I am entrusted is not a mandate of hostility to Ireland. It is, on the contrary, one of esteem, regard, and affection towards their always beautiful, but always distressful, country. The mandate with which I have been entrusted, is to do my best to endeavour to obtain a full measure of justice, not for any particular section of the people of Ireland, but for all Her Majesty's subjects residing in that country. The hon. Member for Northampton appears to me to suggest some very novel considerations as regards the observance of law. He seemed to me to think that, before you decide whether you will obey a law, you may fairly take into consideration whether you like it, or whether it coincides with your own idea of what is fit and proper. In my opinion, respect for the duly constituted law forms the difference between a civilized and an uncivilized community. We may possibly dislike a law, and we may consider it unwise, impolitic, and even unjust, but so long as it remains on the Statute Book we, as good citizens, have but one duty to perform, and that is to obey that law. A departure from this principle has been the root of the unhappiness of Ireland; it has unsettled the minds of the people; it has driven capital out of the country; it has destroyed that confidence which is necessary for those commercial and other enterprizes which alone can make a country happy and prosperous. Well, Sir, I believe that we can look for no solid improvement in Ireland until respect for law and order has been re-established from one end of the land to the other, therefore I shall certainly feel it my duty to give my warmest support to all measures which Her Majesty's Government bring in having that object in view. Every man in this free country has a right, not only to entertain, but to express his opinions, and, however much I may differ from hon. Gentlemen opposite—and differ from them I most certainly do—I can afford to entertain feelings of respect for those who believe the Bill for the Better Government of Ireland, which was introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), or even separation itself, to be the measures best calculated to ensure the happiness of Ireland; but I cannot withhold my condemnation from those leaders of the Nationalist Party, who, by the Plan of Campaign—a measure which has been pronounced by one of the Judges of the land to amount to an unlawful conspiracy—have attempted to render government impossible, with the view of extorting concessions in the direction of the object they wish to attain—that is, separation from this country. Separation, in my opinion, would be fraught with the most dire disaster and calamity to the Irish nation at large. We have heard a good deal lately of the cruelty of the Glenbeigh evictions, and of the sufferings of the evicted. It is impossible, as it would also be inhuman, to withhold our sympathy from suffering humanity, no matter how the sufferings may have been caused, but I cannot forget the fact that, as regards these particular sufferings, they have to a very large extent been brought on by the actions of the sufferers themselves. If we can believe the written statement of the agent of the Glenbeigh estate, the persons who have been evicted have been living there without paying any rent for from three and a-half years to as much as six years, and that they were offered relief on consideration of their paying one half year's rent. It certainly appears to me that those who counselled the tenants to reject so generous a proposal, have incurred very serious responsibility indeed. I understood one of the hon. Members below the Gangway opposite, to say that the Catholic priests and Bishops and Archbishops of Ireland had been consulted with respect to the Plan of Campaign, and had given it their approval. I feel the greatest possible respect for those ministers of religion; but, after all, one cannot but remember that they are frail, fallible mortals like ourselves. I also recollect that, in somewhat similar circumstances, the advice was sought of One who was Divine, and, therefore infallible. He gave an answer about which there was no doubt at all, and which I think may fairly be commended to the consideration of these rev. gentlemen, and that answer was, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." These words, I think, convey a very correct description of the duty expected from man to man. There is another saying which comes from a very sacred source, and which I would also commend to the serious attention of these rev. gentlemen, and that is, "Owe no man anything, but to love one another." I am persuaded my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) was actuated by such a feeling in whatever measures he may have taken to induce kindly relations to exist between landlord and tenant. I have never been able to understand why his supposed action in this matter should have received the criticism it has received. It is to the adoption of the principle embodied in the two quotations I have made that we must look for the disappearance, on the one hand, of hard-hearted landlords; and, on the other of tenants seeking to avail themselves of every opportunity to evade their just obligations. Mr. Speaker, there is one other subject upon which I should like to say a few words. Her Majesty, in her most Gracious Speech from the Throne, informs us that the Estimates have been framed with due regard to economy; but I rejoice to find that economy does not embrace the abandonment of the fortifications of our coaling stations. If it be true, as the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) suggested, that money has been wasted upon fortifications, it does not follow that no other defensive works of a similar character should be undertaken. I am familiar with the fortifications called the Severn Channel Defences. Those fortifications are now quite obsolete, and fail entirely in the object with which they were originally constructed. If, however, a harbour of refuge should be made at Lundy Island, which I hope, in the interests of humanity, may be the case, it would manifestly be most desirable that that harbour should be protected by guns of a heavy character, so that it may form a safe asylum for our merchant and naval fleet. I have every possible sympathy with all the noble Lord said with regard to economy. There can be no doubt that taxation is very heavy, and, that it is most desirable, in the interest of the community at large, that it should be reduced. I should, however, be sorry to see the reform take the shape of a reduction which would render our defensive power less than it is. It must be borne in mind that coal is an essential for the Fleet. In former days the motive power was sail, but now, when the supply of coal becomes exhausted, vessels which, with coal were formidable engines of war, cease to be so, and are really dangerous to one another. Our vessels can only take a certain number of days' supply of coal, and, therefore, it is necessary they should be able, without doubt, to find coal at certain stations. Not only is that necessary for our Royal Navy, but it is necessary for our mercantile navy also. Besides, we must recollect that whenever this country is engaged in war again, privateers will scour the seas, and our fortified coaling stations will form important harbours of refuge for our trading vessels. It would be a most unwise—in fact, it would be a suicidal and a fatal policy to allow our coaling stations to remain unprotected; to do so, would amount to an incitement to foreign nations to make war upon us. I sincerely trust that no such false economy as that will find its way in the Estimates which will be laid before the House. I am quite certain of this—that, however desirous the people of this country may be for economy, economy of this character will find no place whatever in the minds of the masses of the country. I thank the House for the patience with which they have listened to me.

MR. CUNNINGHAME GRAHAM (Lanark, N.W.) said, that a debate on the Queen's Speech formed the best occasion for a new Member to lose his political virginity, and, therefore, he cast himself at once on the forbearance and the generosity of the House. On glancing over the Queen's Speech, he was struck with the evident desire which prevailed in it to do nothing at all. There was a similarity in its paragraphs to the *laissez-faire* school of political economy. Not one word was said in the Speech about lightening the taxation under which Her Majesty's lieges at present suffered; not one word to make that taxation more bearable; not one word to bridge over the awful chasm existing between the poor and the rich; not one word of kindly sympathy for the sufferers from the present commercial and agricultural depression—nothing but platitudes, nothing but views of society through a little bit of pink glass. To read Her Majesty's Speech, one would think that at this present moment this happy country was passing through one of the most pronounced periods of commercial activity and prosperity it has ever known. One would think that wheat was selling at 50*s.* a-quarter, and that the price of bread had not gone up. One would think that poverty, drunkenness, prostitution, and wretchedness were in a fair way to be utterly extirpated; and one would think further that Great Britain had made the first important step towards that millennium when the Irish landlord would cease from troubling, and when the landlords and tenants would lie down in amity, and finally be at rest. Of course, it was matter for congratulation that this country was not suddenly called upon to enter upon a Quixotic crusade to place Prince Alexander of Battenberg upon the Throne of Bulgaria. They were thankful for small mercies, and he supposed they must be content. If this unlucky nation had to forego the pleasure of paying for the vagaries of Prince Alexander, it had still a pretty large group of needy Royalties who were placed on the Civil List of this country. It was not to be expected that Her Majesty's Government would vouchsafe to the House any idea of when the British troops might be withdrawn from Egypt. That was expecting far too much. But, surely, it would be wise to let the House know when it was intended to withdraw those troops from their inactivity in that pestilential region, and from playing the ungrateful *rôle* of oppressors of an already down-trodden nationality. But no. The bondholders must have their pound of flesh. We must also protect the so-called high road to India by the Suez Canal, in order that the very last straw might be laid on the unfortunate fellaheen, and that British money and British treasure might be poured out like water. He had forgotten the "cent per cent." He had forgotten by whose advice we were in Egypt—that it was by the advice of that illustrious statesman and economist who had raised the art of carpet-bagging from its primitive rudeness into a political science, and who so well illustrated the Scriptural injunction, "When they persecute you in one city, flee to another." With reference to our latest filibustering exploit in Burmah, it was a matter of great congratulation—it was something on which a Christian might truly plume himself, to hear that Her Majesty's Government were in process of rapidly suppressing brigandage, which had grown up in the country, and in putting down bands of marauders. "Marauders," like "mobled Queen," was "good," very good, when applied to poor, unfortunate, misguided people, who, in their pig-headed way, were endeavouring to defend their own country. Did the House recognize how a band of marauders was put down? He did; he had seen it done often. Surely, it could be no great matter of self-congratulation for Britons with arms of precision to shoot down naked savages. It could be no feather in a soldier's cap to suppress these unfortunate wretches with all the resources of civilization at his command. When the telegrams came from Burmah we slapped our hands on our chests, quite regardless of damage to our shirts, and talked of British gallantry; and so we laughed like parrots at a bagpiper, when we looked at the sketches in the illustrated papers depicting Natives running away from our troops. A Native wounded to death, I take it, and tormented by mosquitoes in the jungle, felt his misery as acutely as the best bebroadclothed gentleman among us, even though he should happen to be a chairman of a School Board; but what was all that to the Government? The Government, like an American hog, must root or die. The question was, how did this Government come in? That was the humour of it. They came in by the help of the pseudo-Liberals—the crutch-and-toothpick Gentlemen—through the assistance of that feeble Union ladder which, having been used and abused, was now about to be cast aside and being kicked into the dunghill. He was delighted to see how the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) last night treated his Unionist allies—to observe that, having betrayed their master, like Judas Iscariot, there was but one resource left for them, and that was to go out and hang themselves—and to see how these superior persons fell out and bespattered one another, and he thought to himself, "How these mugwumps love one another." This Government reminded him of Pope's flies in amber:—

> "Things in themselves though neither rich nor rare,
> One wonders how the devil they got there."

Personally, he regretted the resignation of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington. He was a type in times of dull uniformity, and from the depth of his obscurity he (Mr. Graham) admired the noble Lord's parabolic course. The noble Lord's resignation had saddened him as children were saddened when they saw a rocket spout up, and were all unaware that it would fall down a stick—as was well said by Ben Jonson—

> "He was a child that so did thrive in grace and feature,
> As Heaven and nature seemed to strive which owned the creature."

Where was the noble Lord now? Yesterday he was, to-day he was not—gone like the froth on licensed victuallers' beer, or the foam on petroleum champagne, leaving Her Majesty's Government, alone and unaided, to wrestle with the difficulties of the situation, and to give "their careful consideration to all the matters" pertaining to their functions. With respect to Ireland, he (Mr. Graham) had eminent qualifications for dealing with that subject, for many reasons. First of all, he had never been there; secondly, sitting next to Nationalist Members, he had gained, of late, something of National colour; and he had once known an Irish commercial traveller, who imparted to him various facts quite unattainable by the general public. He had also gained much information from the hon. Member for Camborne (Mr. Conybeare), who had recently been staying with the nobility and gentry of that country. From these sources, he had conceived a warm respect and regard for that much-abused and down-trodden class—the Irish landlords, who were held in the deepest affection by their tenants. As to the Glenbeigh evictions, the landlords had been held up to most unjust obloquy, as they had ever been most kind to their tenants, whom, in fact, they had kept in cotton wool.

It was the pride and the privilege of the Irish landlord to look after the interests, creature as well as spiritual, of his tenants; and, such was the relation of class to class that, so far from turning them out on a bleak, cold winter's night, the landlord had provided his dependents with a fire to warm their hands; only, through a pardonable inadvertence, it was their houses that had furnished the blaze. The Government had lighted a light that would serve to light the Liberals on their path. The homes destroyed in Glenbeigh were, no doubt, as dear to the poor peasant, in his lonely village on the stony mountain side in the far west, as was the shoddy mansion in South Kensington to the capitalist, as was Haddon Hall to its owner, or as was Buckingham Palace to the absentee owner of that dreadful building. Who could say that the affairs of this handful of obscure tenants in a wind-swept and rain-bedewed, stony corner of Ireland, might not prove to have given the first blow to that society in which one man worked and another enjoyed the fruit—that society in which capital and luxury made a Heaven for 30,000, and a Hell for 30,000,000—that society whose crowning achievement was this dreary waste of mud and stucco—with its misery, its want and destitution, its degradation, its prostitution, and its glaring social inequalities—the society which we called London—that society which, by a refinement of irony, had placed the mainspring of human action, almost the power of life and death, and the absolute power to pay labour and to reward honour, behind the grey tweed veil which enshrouded the greasy pocket-book of the capitalist.

GENERAL SIR EDWARD HAMLEY (Birkenhead): I am one of those Conservatives, of whom I hope and believe there is a multitude in the country, who have been anxiously awaiting the moment when the Government should take a strong grip of the situation in Ireland—and not only take a strong grip, but make it evident to all the world that they have done so. For I am convinced that the hideous spectre which broods over that land, and which owes all its terrors to impudence on the one side, and to the weak and evil course of the late Government on the other, will collapse with astonishing celerity when resolutely dealt with. There is an unfortunate impression abroad that the grip I have spoken of is not so firm as it might be—it is of the nature of words to look less strong than acts; and the most humane sentiments are but a doubtful substitute for the maintenance of the law. We have, perhaps, of late, been now and then faintly reminded of Mr. Pickwick's friend, Mr. Snodgrass, who, when his friends were involved in a street row, humanely warned the bystanders that he was about to take his coat off. The Government may not be to blame for this; it may be due to defects in the law, in which case every friend of Ireland must rejoice that the Government is going to take immediate steps to render the law effectual. If I may venture to say so, the Government could do no wiser thing than to follow a course as opposite as possible to that of their Predecessors, and to begin by making it quite clear that they have no sympathy with crime or criminals, and no fear of them. The House and the country will have perceived that hon. Members on the Irish Benches do not appear, by any means, yet to realize the change that has taken place in their prospects. They talk much as they talked before that Election which was so fatal to their hopes. The constituencies have cried out; but no Home Ruler regards them. They persist in looking forward to some immediate future, when the British electorate will be converted to Home Rule with the suddenness and unexpectedness which an astonished world has seen displayed by certain very eminent persons. They trot out, as usual, their old Irish bogeys, wrongs, grievances, oppressions, and so forth, and clothe them, as before, in fustian. To hear these fiery orators, we might fancy that they still had a Prime Minister for an ally, and the Treasury Bench for accomplices; that Her Majesty's Chief Secretary for Ireland was still a Home Rule Missionary, preaching hysterically the terrible consequences of enforcing the law of the land. They will not recognize the fact that their only allies are the discredited fragments of a shattered Party. Things were very different when they first won over their right hon. Ally. He was then about to become, through that alliance, the First Minister of the Crown; and he aided them with an influence deplorable in proportion as it was great. It is impossible to gauge the mischief done, adding, as it has, so enormously to the difficulties of the present Government, by the late Prime Minister and his—I know not whether to call him leader or satellite—I mean the late Chief Secretary (Mr. John Morley). Why, the mere choice of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle was, of itself, the knell of hope for Ireland. I do him no wrong when I say that the British people were absolutely ignorant of his qualifications for administering any office whatever, let alone the most difficult post in the Government. And it is fair to suppose that if he was not appointed for his qualifications which were not known, he was appointed for his opinions which are very well known. To a large number of people those opinions seem to be wild, visionary, and dangerous. He seems to have picked them out of the great dust-bin of the French Revolution, and, never very savoury even when fresh, they have not improved by keeping. His Chief did not cease with the loss of Office to aid the Party of Home Rule. In the last debate on the Address, he used words about the payment of rent which, viewed by the light of recent events, are of sinister and portentous import. Those utterances did not fall on barren soil; a word in season how good is it? And, at the same time, the right hon. Gentleman made it a reproach to the Government that they did not administer the law in Ireland in an Irish spirit. Well, we know very well now what law in Ireland would be if administered in an Irish spirit. Hon. Members opposite have left us in no doubt about that. It would be a very carnival of crime; it would be legalized robbery with violence, and legalized persecution; and the end thereof would be anarchy. Now, what the House would like to know—and what I think it ought to know—is, whether the right hon. Gentleman adheres to his alliance with those who profess these doctrines—with those politicians who receive inspiration—and something else besides inspiration—from a band of miscreants on the other side of the Atlantic, compared with whom Guy Fawkes would be a respectable conspirator—whether, I say, he adheres to the alliance with the authors of the Plan of Campaign, and the stipendiaries of the Chicago Convention? It is plain, from the course of these debates, that in the future, as in the past, we are doomed to hear a good deal in a vague way—always in a vague way—about the wrongs and grievances of Ireland. Even her poverty will continue to be proclaimed as a grievance against England. But have those who make the charge no conscience and no shame? Who made Ireland poor; who keeps her poor? Do nations thrive on chronic agitation? Does the sowing broadcast of hatred between different classes of the community, the systematic expulsion of capital, the harassing of trade, the repudiation of contracts—do these tend to make a country prosperous? And who are the priests and prophets of this ruinous fanaticism? If hon. Members opposite had devoted a tenth part of the ingenuity and activity which they have bestowed on fomenting animosity, and on driving prosperity from their country; if, I say, they had devoted a tenth part of those perverse pains to soothing ill-feeling, to counselling submission to the Queen's Government, and to reviving industry, we should not now be discussing the evil case of Ireland, and those hon. Members might have gone down to posterity as the very best patriots their country has ever produced. But they have chosen a different course. They have aroused and fostered a spirit of disaffection; can they control it? I would venture to remind the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) of an ancient legend which carries a moral worth considering. It tells how a magician's apprentice got hold of his master's book of spells, and learned therefrom how to raise devils. He used the spells, and raised the devils very easily and effectually. But soon their presence grew alarming, and then he perceived, too late, that he had omitted to provide himself with the counter-spells that should dismiss them. The story goes on to say that the devils tore him to pieces. We can all appreciate the dangers of being placed between manifest failure in England, on the one hand, and the unappeasable League of villainy in America on the other. We can all feel what are the difficulties of a hapless navigator who steers a rotten bark between such a Scylla and such a Charybdis. The day may soon come when the hon. Member may look back ruefully and longingly to the time when his present right hon. Ally afforded him what was, at least, security against violence, by shutting him up within the strong walls of Kilmainham. I observe that his admiring followers look with special admiration on the coolness and calmness with which he directs the movements of his Party—and he certainly does seem desirous of posing as the imperturbable Leader who stands unmoved amid the crash of Governments overturned by himself. I would suggest to thrifty Home Rulers, who so greatly value calm exteriors, that they might provide themselves with a model agitator, quite after their own hearts, by applying to Madame Tussaud. He would be cheaper in the end than the hon. Member for the City of Cork; for he could not possibly cost £40,000—and I believe he would be equally likely to effect their purposes. For when I survey the Party on the opposite Benches, and then call to mind the vast scope of their plans, I am always impressed anew with the immense—the infinite—disparity between the means and the end. They aspire to dismember an ancient Monarchy, to sway the destinies of a great Empire, and to alter the course of its history; and I ask myself whether they are of the stuff to accomplish this gigantic task; what there is in the course it pleases them to adopt, either in this House or out of it—whether making speeches themselves, or interrupting the speeches of others—to show them equal to their enterprize? To my mind, it is as if the Lilliputians had sought to impose their puny will upon the Kingdom of Brobdignag. And when I hear them reiterating, in their vague way, the demand that Ireland shall govern herself, and then think of all the proposal implies, all the severance of ties in the present, all the clouds which overcast the future, I almost fancy I am listening to deputies from the moon, demanding that the planet shall be freed from the earth's attraction, and allowed to start on an independent career through space, under the direction of the hon. Member for the City of Cork. I trust, then, we have seen the last of dallying with conspiracy, and that a vigorous, persistent effort of the Government to put down crime may be speedily successful. Even if it were not, it would not be true that the evils of Ireland are irremediable. They are obviously easy of remedy on one condition—that the Irish Party, conscience-stricken and repentant at the results of their work, should join the Government in the effort to restore tranquillity. In a former debate the right hon. Member for Sleaford (Mr. Chaplin) made an appeal to the Irish Party, which seemed to me manly and touching, such as might well at this time, with such a spectacle of ruin before us as that land presents, impress even a paid agent of the Chicago Convention, when he besought them to consider whether their last throw, made with exceptional chances in their favour, having so utterly failed, they might not now allow their wretched country some small interval of respite and of repose. We know how that has been responded to; and it is to be earnestly hoped that the attitude of the Party should at length be fully recognized by the country; their irreconcilable hostility to all government; their churlish refusal of all benefits; their sinister prophecies of disturbances, since so amply realized in the renewal of what I may almost call outrage by word of command, and their open relations with the declared enemies of England. It should be reiterated everywhere, driven home to the sense of the country, that when the question was put to them by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham—"Do you adopt the policy of your delegates which prescribes that it will be the duty of the Irish Members to make the government of England in Ireland impossible?" they remained dumbfounded and chapfallen, unable either to profess that policy for fear of this House, or to repudiate it for fear of Chicago. I wish, I say, that these simple and evident facts could be persistently impressed on the British electorate, and that it may then, if necessary, demand and insist that measures shall be taken, however stringent, to put a stop to the scandal and the shame. And even at the worst we have this one hope left—that the Irish nation may at length awake from its ghastly and terrible nightmare. When it does, it will perceive that it holds in its own hands the means of ridding itself of a large proportion of its worst evils. I say a large proportion, for their number is just 85. However that may be, sure I am that the bolder, the firmer, the manlier the course of the Government, the less indulgent, the less ready to make concessions to a faction that deserves no indulgence and no concessions, the more encouragement and protection it gives to the loyal and orderly population of Ireland, the more certain will it be of the support of the country and the success of its policy. And it may be the more confident in taking such a course, because it possesses an element of stability in the fact that it can say to its opponents, as Charles II. said to his brother—"Depend upon it, James, they will never depose me to make you King." I will venture to remind the House that it represents a people who have become great and famous, because they have been wise and resolute. If the nation should fail in its duty to itself; if, through apathy, or weariness, or for any other disgraceful cause, it should permit its own momentous interests to be sacrificed to a vile and contemptible conspiracy, it must expect to remain for posterity an example of a people that has outlived its faculties, and that is no longer worthy of even possessing the institutions which have made it great.

Mr. R. W. DUFF (Banffshire) said, that the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Sir Edward Hamley) had spoken that evening of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) and his supporters in a very different tone from that which he employed when first returned for his constituency. His opinions had evidently changed since he was first returned to the House of Commons. [Sir Edward Hamley: Not in the least.] However that might be, what he (Mr. Duff) had said was his impression. Then the hon. and gallant Gentleman appeared to go somewhat out of his way to attack the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley). No doubt, his right hon. Friend, when he addressed the House, would have something to say in his own defence, and also in support of what the hon. and gallant Gentleman had described as the Members of a shattered Party. Neither did he think that a description of that kind came with a good grace from a Member of a Party which did not seem to be quite united among themselves. The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton), in the course of his speech about the Navy, referred to liabilities which had been left to him by his Predecessors in Office. He (Mr. Duff) did not know to what the noble Lord referred. It was possible he might have referred to liabilities which had been incurred, owing to the vessels built by contract having been delivered sooner than anticipated. If those were the liabilities the noble Lord referred to, he maintained that this was a gain both to the Service and the country. But, perhaps, the noble Lord referred to the Ordnance Department. It was true that after the accident on board the *Collingwood* Lord Ripon ordered new guns, and it was possible that the liabilities might have been due to that cause. But the noble Lord said the policy of the present Board of Admiralty was, that they should meet liabilities before incurring fresh responsibilities. That was exactly the policy which was adopted by Lord Ripon and the late Board of Admiralty. He remembered that last year, on the presentation of the Estimates, he explained the naval policy of the Government to the House; and he stated, on that occasion, that there were enormous liabilities amounting to £3,186,000. He stated that the intention of the Admiralty was not to incur any fresh charges until those liabilities had been wiped off. But what did the noble Lord do? He came down to the House, and proposed that they should raise £2,000,000 on Terminable Annuities on the ground that the Navy was in an inefficient state, and that it was necessary to make it efficient. The noble and gallant Lord the Member for East Marylebone (Lord Charles Beresford) was not so modest; he wanted £5,000,000.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I did not propose to increase the liabilities; I suggested means by which the liabilities could be paid off.

Mr. R. W. DUFF said, that the noble Lord said their shipbuilding programme was not sufficient, and he proposed that certain additional vessels should be built. He blamed the late Board for not laying down a sufficient shipbuilding programme, and in order to get additional ships he proposed that £2,000,000 should be raised by Terminable Annuities. He now accused the late Board of leaving liabilities. Their policy, however, was not to incur fresh liabilities, but to carry out the programme laid down by Lord Northbrook.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said, the liabilities he referred to were in respect of 1885. They were under-estimated, and proper provision had never been made for them.

MR. R. W. DUFF said, he understood that the noble Lord referred to Lord Northbrook's programme. It was quite true that Lord Northbrook's programme had cost the country more than was expected, on account of the vessels built by contract being completed sooner than was anticipated; but that was really an economy. He did not admit that there had been any extravagance on the part of the late Board of Admiralty, or that they had left any liabilities; in fact, they were blamed for the modesty of their programme, in that it was too small. The noble Lord said that he was opposed to granting any Standing Committee to which the Army and Navy Estimates should be referred. This was an opinion concurred in by his right hon. Friend the Member for South Edinburgh (Mr. Childers), and by himself (Mr. Duff). A Standing Committee of that kind would be very impolitic, in that it would practically make the Chairman of that Committee the First Lord of the Admiralty, and entirely remove responsibility from the Minister. On the other hand, if there was a Committee such as had been suggested by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington, he believed it would be of great use. Even during his short experience of the Admiralty, he came to the conclusion that there was a considerable waste in some of the departments ; and, if he were asked to indicate one particular department, he should point to the shipbuilding department. As an illustration of what he meant, he stated that, during his six months' official experience, vessels which had been condemned and which had become obsolete amounted in value to £2,378,299. That was the value of the original cost and the repair of the vessels which were condemned during the time he was at the Admiralty. It was true that the majority of these vessels became obsolete through new inventions in guns and ships; but that would not account for all the vessels. No doubt, hon. Members interested in naval affairs had read a paper of great interest contributed recently by Mr. White, Constructor to the Navy, in which ample reasons were given for these rapid changes. But reasons of that kind would not account for all the vessels. There could be no doubt that many vessels which were condemned had become obsolete because they were built on bad designs, and in some cases from inferior material. Among the vessels which were condemned were some designed during the period of Office of the present First Lord of the Admiralty. There were vessels only eight, nine, or ten years old which would now be pronounced obsolete, and which had only been to sea for three or four years.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster) (interrupting) was understood to ask for the names of such vessels.

MR. R. W. DUFF said, he was afraid he would not be at liberty to go into details in the present debate; but he would undertake to supply the right hon. Gentleman with the names of vessels built during the period of his first administration as First Lord of the Admiralty, which were now obsolete, and they were in that condition because sufficient foresight was not taken with regard to their design and construction. But if that were true of the right hon. Gentleman's first administration, there was a still stronger case against the Board of Admiralty which succeeded. He believed there were vessels built between 1880 and 1883 which were to-day not fit to go to sea. If that was the fact, it showed that there was not sufficient control over the shipbuilding department of the Admiralty. That, however, was a matter which might well be taken up by a Committee on Naval Expenditure, if there was to be one. But while he said that, he must admit that he did not think it was possible, looking at the variety of the duties which the Navy had to perform, to make any very large reduction in the Navy Estimates. But he wanted to get as much money as possible for the Navy, and in order to obtain it he thought the country ought to get an assurance that when the Admiralty got the money it would be well spent; and if this question was referred to a Committee, it would be a guarantee that the money would be well spent. It was not from any desire to see undue retrenchment that he wished this matter referred to a Committee, but it was for the purpose of securing greater efficiency. It was because he wished to see the Navy efficiently maintained that he made the suggestion that this large expenditure might be referred to such a Committee as had been recommended by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington.

Mr. JENNINGS (Stockport) said, he felt it his duty to protest against the nature and the scope of the attack made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) upon the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill). He did not believe that the principles which the noble Lord had laid down in the House, and out of it, were open to any just and reasonable attack. He believed the noble Lord's main principle of desiring to promote economy and efficiency in the Public Service would commend itself to the great body of the people; and if the Conservative Party were to be supposed, even for a moment, to be antagonistic to that principle, the country would very naturally and properly go back to the other Party to see it carried out—and they would come back from it, as they had often before come back, disappointed. His earnest hope was that all attempts to promote internecine strife on the Conservative side of the House would fail, no matter from whom they came; and he could not suppose that any Member of the Government would sympathize with outbursts of splenetic malevolence such as they had heard that night. Those who sat around him should not forget that no one had rendered greater services to the Conservative Party, as it existed to-day, than the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington; and it was his firm belief that no one on that side of the House would be able to render it greater services in the future. One of the main principles that the noble Lord laid down was that the country should get full value for the money which it spent, and that it did not get it now. No one desired to weaken the defences of the country from its enemies abroad. He did not believe even Irish Members wished to do that; but what everybody desired to see was that there should be economy and efficiency in the Army and Navy Departments. There were very few people indeed outside these Departments who seriously believed that economy and efficiency were obtainable there to-day and under the present state of affairs. The public had undoubtedly arrived at a conclusion that the time had come when a very serious and determined effort should be made to reduce the Expenditure, and to lighten the great burden of taxation which pressed so severely upon all classes of the community. The noble Lord had succeeded beyond all doubt in calling attention to this great subject. He had succeeded at an immense sacrifice of his own interests; he had covered himself with an amount of obloquy which was most undeserved and ungenerous; he had brought upon himself the attacks of large numbers of disappointed persons who probably thought they ought to be in office or, being in office, thought they ought to have higher office than they held. All that class was sure to follow him with vilification until the day when he emerged triumphant from the struggle, as he was sure to do. The great and essential principle of his system was that this country—surrounded as it was with difficulties of the gravest kinds, having to face an amount of foreign competition in its trade, such as it had never experienced before, with taxation continually rolling up — must greatly reduce its expenditure. Not so many years ago, less than £60,000,000 sufficed to pay all the expenses of the Government of this country; but under the Government of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) it reached the enormous amount of close upon £100,000,000. With this state of things before us, he must maintain that it was high time that someone in the Conservative Party, or some Party in the House, should make a protest against the whole system. The people of this country, he was convinced, were more and more persuaded that the amount of money spent upon the Army and Navy did not represent, and was not represented by, any appreciable results. During the short time he had had the honour of a seat in the House, he had been startled to hear the questions which were continually put to the Government from its own side, as well as from the other, about guns that had burst, and ships that were not fit to be sent to sea; of an army without a machine gun in it; and a general state of affairs that any hon. Member of the House engaged in the private affairs of commerce would consider discreditable to the last degree. He believed the country would at no very distant period come to the conclusion, apart entirely from the resignation of the noble Lord, with which he would not presume to concern himself, that the main principle for which he was contending was just in itself, and must be carried out, and he could not suppose the Government would venture to resist that principle, for he believed that they also were anxious to carry it out. For himself, he might venture to express the hope that in the coming discussions which would arise, not only with regard to this financial question, but with regard to the much more troubled question of Ireland, there would be as little as possible of those bitter words which could not tend to the settlement of any question, or the reconciliation of any Party. He hoped the Session might not pass over without their arriving at an approach, at least, to a settlement, even of the Irish difficulty; but he did not believe that that could be arrived at by the interchange of any attacks, or of any bitter language whatever. He trusted that the Irish Question would be dealt with in a spirit of generosity by the Government. He was himself opposed to coercion—meaning, of course, by coercion the principle of coercion as manifested in the celebrated Bill of 1882. Any such measure as that he was certain would not be likely to proceed from that side of the House. [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"] Well, such a measure never had proceeded from that side. On the main question which was at present largely before them, that of national economy, he ventured to hope that they would have the assistance of the Irish Members, who had no motive for encouraging extravagance. He believed that the objects which the noble Lord had sought to attain had been nothing less than the welfare of the great body of the working people, the lightening of the immense pressure of taxation, and the promotion of efficiency, economy, and good government in all Departments of the State; and these, for his own part, he believed to be ends which would obtain the support and approval of the country.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): Sir, with certain intervals, I have been in the House of Commons for a good number of years; but I think that in all my experience I never remember an important debate like this on the Address carried on in so placid and undemonstrative a manner as the one in which we are now engaged. Everyone seems willing and satisfied to go on quietly and contentedly, and no one has been able to point to any definite time when the debate is likely to be brought to a conclusion. I understand that that arises from the determination of the Front Bench that the debate on the Address shall go on until they have found a seat somewhere or other for their Chancellor of the Exchequer, and have got him into the House. The Queen's Speech tells us very little indeed that we did not know before, and the most important fact that it does tell us with regard to the House of Commons is hardly accurate. I think that Her Majesty's Government have made a mistake in informing the House that the Estimates have been framed with a careful regard to economy, and to the efficiency of the Public Service. I take exception to that statement, because the only man who knew anything about it has told us that it was not so. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) tells us distinctly that our present huge and increasing armaments are unnecessary, and the taxation for them unjustifiable. The financial statement of the noble Lord was made boldly, and in a straightforward manner, and the speech of the noble Lord reminds me of an Irish Member who, in the last House of Commons but one, said—"Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to stand again, and so I am going to speak the truth." The noble Lord never intends to be again in a Tory Government—at least not as a subordinate—and so he determined to tell us the truth. My own text on this occasion is that old sentence which fell from the lips of the man who said more good things than any man in this country—the late Earl of Beaconsfield. The Earl of Beaconsfield said—"Expenditure depends upon policy." Therefore, in discussing the question of Expenditure, we are debating the whole foreign policy of the country. For my part, I thank the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington heartily for the address which he delivered last Thursday, which, in my opinion, was better than the one which he made before, although that will not be the opinion of everybody. I am quite sure that the friends of peace throughout the world are heartily delighted at the line the noble Lord has taken. What I myself and a few others have for years been saying is now repeated from the mouths of the most able men that exist in the ranks of the Conservative Party. The heavily-burdened taxpayers of the country will thank the noble Lord; and, more than that, I believe that millions and millions of people in Europe tortured by war taxation, and all the friends of peace in the world, will thank him. I know, however, that the noble Lord will incur the hatred of honest Tories, genuine Jingoes, and all those persons who belong to the Services, as they are called, although the Services seem to be our master; but I feel sure that the noble Lord has sacrificed place for principle—that he has given up private advantage for the public welfare, and that he will never regret the sacrifice he has made of personal interest. I look upon the noble Lord as a reformed character—as one who had been given to wild ways, but who has taken the pledge. But while I welcome the noble Lord into the ranks of the peaceful army I do not wish to make things as they are not. In his letter to the Marquess of Salisbury, the noble Lord said that the tendencies of the democracy were peaceful. I am not so sure of that. The right hon. Member for the Sleaford Division of Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin), in the speech which he delivered early in the evening, talked about "clap-trap." Now, the lower classes have not had political power until lately, and they have been taken in by the clap-trap of the ruling classes, by all the "bunkum" about glory and prestige. Therefore, I think that the noble Lord will not find them so peaceful as he wishes them to be. They are led, too, by the Press, which I suppose represents public opinion more or less, and which has always been for glory and gunpowder and all sorts of folly. Like the miserable worshippers of the jumping cat, we spend money because we are led on by the newspapers. I hope Gentlemen will take that to heart. It is the Smith and Hamilton policy, and not that of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington, which the Government is determined to follow. The main portion of the Speech from the Throne is taken up with Ireland. I am the first speaker who has kept clear of Ireland, but I do not suppose I shall be able to do so to the end. But what is the condition of the world with respect to these large armaments? It is perfectly horrible and heartrending. Fourteen millions of men are taken away from peaceful pursuits to be trained under arms, and what for? I know no other reason except that each nation wants to show the others how strong they are; not to defend any great principle or cause, but simply to be ready to fly at each other's throats. There is one pernicious proverb which is too implicitly believed in, and is the cause of much mischief, and that is—"If you wish for peace, you must be prepared for war." The result which that statement leads to may be illustrated by the story of the African King who was asked what he wanted to go to war for? "Of course I must go to war," he replied, "because I have a barrel of gunpowder." That is the danger to which Europe is now exposed. These immense armaments cause war, and the only way to stop war and to insure peace is to get rid of your Army. I am delighted to see that the noble Lord boldly hoists the standard of non-intervention. According to the noble Lord, the policy of the Government is one of intervention and interference in the affairs of Germany, France, and Russia. I fear that policy will be carried out. Tory Governments always carry out their policy. Who is it that keeps this interfering Government in power? Why, the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington); the right hon. Member for Central Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) who used to be the apostle of peace; and the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) who has been the apostle of all sorts of things. I wish the House would remember what the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale said in his better days—that if we went in for intervention in foreign affairs it would involve a much larger Army, and would eventually bring in the conscription, than which it is impossible to conceive a more detestable system. This is the position — a Government too bad for the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) is enthusiastically supported by the three great Leaders of Liberal and Radical opinion whom I have named. The whole previous history of politics shows no incident so ludicrous or so monstrous. These Liberal Unionists, as they call themselves, talk about the great sacrifices which they have made for their country. What is their position? Mr. Goschen said the other day that the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale was in power, and that the Government are simply in Office. The noble Marquess and his Friends are in power, without the responsibility of it; and then they talk of their high standard of political morality! It is a morality which induces them to sit on one side of the House, and to vote on the other; to spend the morning with the Prime Minister, and in the evening to sit cheek by jowl with the Leader of the Opposition. Please Heaven, the bulk of the Liberal Party may never reach a similar standard of morality! At Hawick these Liberal Unionists asked—"Why do you stone us? Remember what good deeds we have done in the past." I would reply that they are not being stoned for what they have done, but for what they are going to do; not because they have supported Liberal measures in the past, but because they have now become Tories, and are supporting the Tory Government. I give them credit for good motives; but I have always been of opinion that the better and more honourable a man is, the more dangerous he becomes when he takes to bad ways. Therefore it is that their previous good character tells against them with me, instead of forming an appeal for a mitigation of punishment. Then, why have they taken up this extraordinary attitude? Simply because they cannot agree upon a matter of detail with certain other Gentlemen. ["Oh!"] I am not surprised to hear those discordant sounds from my hon. Friends opposite; but, if it is not a matter of detail on which they differ, what becomes of the Round Table Conference? The only justification for the Round Table Conference is, that those who assisted at it met together to consider matters of detail. I am, therefore, justified in saying that it is only upon matters of detail that they differ. ["Oh!"] Well, I will not dispute that they differ as to the government of Ireland, at all events. They differ as to how 5,000,000 are to be governed out of 200,000,000 or 300,000,000 who own the sovereignty of this great Empire. But it is curious that the Liberal Unionists cannot look a little further than Ireland. Why cannot they support the policy of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill)—a policy which, if carried out, would save the lives of millions and millions of people throughout the world, who are God's creatures even as much as Irishmen—if hon. Members opposite consider Irishmen to be God's creatures at all. The policy of the noble Lord would save us from all those miserable wars in which we have been engaged for many years. It would save us from all those invasions, those burnings, those massacres, those outrages on the weak and helpless, in which we have been engaged, in every quarter of the globe, for many years past, and which we must be prepared for if we are to go on with these large armaments. I am afraid that it is of little use appealing to the Liberal Unionists to take a better and a wiser course. They must lie upon the bed which they have made; but it strikes me that they are already getting very uncomfortable upon it. The Leaders on this side will, I trust, before long, be able to unite with the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington in bringing forward some Resolution which shall raise clearly, distinctly, and definitely in this House the policy of non-intervention. I have listened attentively to this debate. I have heard officials on both sides until I am sick of them. The noble Lord was perfectly correct when he said that Parliament could do nothing in the matter of itself. Parliament cannot go into details, and say—"You must cut off £1,000,000 here, and £1,000,000 there." But Parliament can insist upon having men in Office who can do this business for us. Therefore I appeal to the Leaders of the Liberal Party on this side, before the Session is very much older, to bring forward some Resolution clearly and distinctly raising the policy of non-intervention, which is the only policy worthy of a free, a great, a civilized, and a Christian nation.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): We Liberal Unionists who sit on this side of the House have been accused of having no principles to guide us. Now, the Liberal Unionists can bear a good deal of taunting. It pleases hon. Members who resort to it, and it does not do us any harm. But I would submit to the House that it is a very different matter with regard to the peasants in Glenbeigh, about whom I am obliged to admit there has been a considerable amount of cheap sentiment expended in this House. I think it is high time that the House should cease its wrangling about the Liberal Unionists, and come face to face with such a problem as that which exists in Glenbeigh, and that we should come to it with clear and steady heads as well as warm and generous hearts. I would like to remind the House that within 12 months we have had three great measures for the better government of Ireland submitted to the House. First of all there were the two Bills of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone); and the Tenants' Relief Bill introduced towards the close of the last Session by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). I wish the House clearly to bear in mind that not one of those measures would have affected a single tenant in Glenbeigh. The first Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian — the Bill for the Better Government of Ireland — practically excluded the consideration of the Land Question from the Irish Legislative Body which it set up, and the Land Purchase Bill proposed a scheme of purchase based upon 20 years' purchase of the judicial rents. [*Cries of* "No!" *from the Home Rule Members.*] I maintain that it was based upon that principle, and the Bill of the hon. Member for the City of Cork proposed that before a single tenant entered the Land Court and was entitled to receive its benefits he should pay 50 per cent of the rent and arrears due. Not one of these measures would have touched a single tenant in Glenbeigh, and Glenbeigh is a fair sample of that part of Ireland from Derry on the North-West right down the Western seaboard to Skibbereen in the South-West. We have heard to-night from the hon. Member for Camborne (Mr. Conybeare) that he saw turned out of her house in one case a woman and nine children; and in another case a man, woman, and eight children. Is the hon. Member aware that in the description he gave he was unconsciously stating the whole Irish problem so far as the congested districts of the country are concerned? The country will, I am afraid, judge us harshly, and very rightly too, if we go on squabbling about Liberal Unionism, Toryism, and Gladstonianism, while the people are perishing for want of help. I think that any fair-minded man looking the whole matter straight in the face must admit that the owner of that property in Glenbeigh has exercised forbearance up to the furthest limit, unless you are to abolish the laws and the rights of property, and unless you are to have a general distribution of property, and establish the principle of having rights in common. No doubt, that is a very convenient doctrine for all those who have nothing; but it is not so convenient for those who have worked hard in their early years in order that they may rest at the close of life. Unless you abolish all the laws of property, I maintain that the owner of the Glenbeigh estate behaved as generously as the owner of any English estate would have done under similar circumstances. I fully admit that these tenants are sunk in hopeless poverty, and that they cannot pay six months' rent out of the six or eight years' rent now due. But history will judge the Party or the man who stands in the way of the removal of these poor people to a happier clime where life would be worth living with something like noble aspirations in store for the future. Another part of this debate has been developed into an attack upon the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland. My hon. Friend the Member for Cockermouth (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) has been talking about stoning people. Now, I want to know for what action on the part of the Chief Secretary my hon. Friend and hon. Members below the Gangway are prepared to stone him? During the debate upon the Tenants' Relief Bill last Session the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) made an appeal to Irish landlords. There was not a single Member on this side of the House who voted against that Bill, because he believed that nothing was necessary, and that nothing ought to be done. Every Member on this side who went into the Lobby against the Bill believed that something was necessary to be done. They denied that the crisis was similar to that which occurred in 1880 when famine stalked through the land. But they knew that a crisis had arrived, and they trusted that the Irish landlords would follow the example of the Scotch and English landlords. They objected to tear up contracts by the roots every three years, and believed that it was safe to leave things to take their natural course. For simply doing that which the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale recommended on the floor of the House—namely, appealing to the generosity of the landlords—the Chief Secretary for Ireland has been assailed as if he had invented a second edition of the Plan of Campaign. I want to know from hon. Members below the Gangway whether they object to the Chief Secretary for Ireland or any other Member of the House making an appeal to landlords under such circumstances? ["No!"] Then, what do they object to? If they can bring forward substantial evidence that the Chief Secretary or any other Member of the Government has interfered up to the point of refusing to carry out the law, let them have it. I, at all events, have an open mind upon that matter, and if any hon. Member will produce that evidence, more especially if it be reliable evidence, I will vote with him. Now, what is the Plan of Campaign of which we hear so much? In olden times landlords fixed the rent, and made a very bad job of it. A great deal of what is suffered now in Ireland is due to that evil system in the past. Later on Parliament appointed a Court to fix rents. What is the proposal under the Plan of Campaign? It is that the tenants should fix the rent. Have hon. Members who advocate this Plan of Campaign as being just and honest, the slightest idea that it would be possible to confine that principle to the land? If Agrarianism is clamorous to desperation, so is Socialism; and I warn hon. Members below the Gangway that a trifling abatement of rent is no equivalent for the loss of moral sense in the whole community. Because Gentlemen have been engaged for months in debauching the moral sense of the country—because, as the right hon. Member for Central Birmingham (Mr. Bright) has stated, they have not lifted up their voices in favour of industry, or thrift, or sobriety—because I believe that their principles are at variance with the highest and best interests of the Irish people, I am prepared to vote against their Plan of Campaign and their entire agitation.

MR. WALLACE (Edinburgh, E.): There are one or two points which I have not in the course of this debate heard put in the way in which I should have desired to hear them expressed, and therefore I have risen to deliver my mind upon them as briefly as I can. I will say a word, to begin with, on a subject which has received considerable attention from most of the speakers who have taken part in the debate, especially those who sit on that side of the House—I mean what is called the Plan of Campaign. I find it impossible to shut my eyes to the fact that the device, which is so described by that term, has received the disapprobation of many persons for whose intellect and moral sense I entertain a very high respect. Yet, with the best attention I have been able to devote to the matter, I have not been able to arrive at the conclusion that it is my duty to condemn what I understand to be the Plan of Campaign. That being the state of my mind, I wish to express primarily, in order that there may be no doubt about the condition of opinion on this side of the House, certainly as far as I am able to express myself on the matter, that a great deal of the condemnation that has been vented on the Plan of Campaign has arisen from the unfortunate name that has been given to it by its authors. I dare say it is attributable to the character of the Celtic intellect that it is more apt to express itself in picturesque than in homely terms. If, instead of giving it a sort of military name, they had chosen a name of a civil description, and had called it "The Tenants' Union," it is very likely that a large number of persons in all parts of the country would not have been scandalized or alarmed by the movement. As to the legality of the Plan of Campaign, of which we have heard a good deal, I cannot say that the question is one which has had much influence upon my mind. I do not know that it has been pronounced to be illegal by any authority in an authoritative manner. I am aware that a Court in Ireland calling itself some Divisional Court of the Queen's Bench has been led in one case to pronounce an *obiter dictum* on a hypothetical case which was placed before it. But those of us who have even only an elementary knowledge and experience of law must be aware of the value of an *obiter dictum* expressed upon a case which was never formally submitted to the Court and never argued out. This, however, I will undertake to say, that if the Plan of Campaign is not legal it ought to be; and that, if it should so happen that some of those Gentlemen who are Members of this House should be found guilty of a criminal conspiracy in respect of this matter, everything should be done to obtain a mitigation or cancelling of the sentence, and that the law on which they were condemned should be repealed with all possible speed. I will try to explain to the House why it is that I take that view. The reason is this. I do not think that the Plan of Campaign, as I have heard it repeatedly said by hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, is a device for the breaking of contracts. Now, I maintain that it is not so; that it is simply a plan of action that has been long in use, under the sanction of the law in this country, for the purpose of altering contracts—that is to say, for the purpose of obtaining a renewal of contracts, or the making of new contracts. I understand that Lord Dillon, through the influence of pressure brought to bear upon him by the power of combination given by the Plan of Campaign, has at last been induced to yield; and, in so doing, he has, I think, shown himself to be a sensible man. At first he stood out for £100 on £100; but at length he said to his tenantry, who combined against him, that, on their representation, taken in connection with their combination, he thought, on the whole, that it was well to take £80. Well, Sir, what is that? It is simply the making of an entirely new contract between Lord Dillon and his tenants. It is simply an instance of his yielding to a certain influence of a pressing character they have been able to bring to bear upon him, so as to incline him to enter into a new contract with them; although not absolutely the best contract for himself, and made, no doubt, under pressure, developed by a combination of his tenantry, in opposition to him. But I maintain that that is a pressure which has long been sanctioned by the law of the country. I would appeal to the great change which was made by the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, I think, in 1875, in connection with trade disputes. Before the passing of that Act the combination of workmen for the purpose of bringing pressure to bear on their employers, with respect to new contracts, was regarded as a criminal conspiracy. But the Legislature saw reason to decide that a sinister character should no longer be applied to such combinations, and ever since, such pressure has been lawful. A noble Lord behind me has said that the two cases—the combination by workmen and that by the Irish tenants—do not run on all fours. He told us truly that in the case of trade combinations pressure was brought to bear before the contract was made, and he said that in the case of the Plan of Campaign the same kind of pressure—for he admitted it to be identical—was brought to bear on a contract which had been made already. The mistake the noble Lord made was in not carrying the comparison far enough. The pressure of the Plan of Campaign was equally brought to bear on contracts not yet entered into. In both cases what you have is a new contract. In the case of a trade dispute, the pressure is brought to bear on a contract to be made in the future; and in the Plan of Campaign pressure is brought to bear with a view of exacting a new contract. Therefore, I maintain that in both respects—both in regard to trade disputes and agrarian disputes—the cases run on all fours; and as the Legislature has already stamped its *imprimatur* on combination in the case of the employment of labour, so it ought to place its *imprimatur* upon the case of agrarian contracts. If a combination of this kind is not at the present moment legal, then, for the sake of consistency, the Legislature ought not to lose a moment in placing the one upon an equal footing with the other. I may remind the House of another point in reference to this question of pressure, which has been a good deal argued, and that is the pressure brought to bear by the Government on the landlords by the action of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. The right hon. Gentleman did not deny that he had brought a kind of pressure to bear upon the landlords; but he said that it was of a totally different description from that which was brought to bear upon them by those who had united in combination under the Plan of Campaign. He told us that the pressure which he brought to bear was entirely rational and sentimental—that it was persuasion; and that he only appealed to their own human instincts, and pressed them only with the pressure of feeling; whereas he wished it to be understood that the pressure of the authors of the Plan of Campaign was one which amounted to compulsion, and almost to physical force. But I think the Chief Secretary forgot a remark which was made a long time ago by a person who said he did not think it advisable to argue with the master of 30 legions. I do not know whether the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is master of 30 legions; but I know that he is master of 30,000 soldiers, and it strikes me that when he begins to exercise what he calls moral suasion upon the landlords, those who might refuse to listen to rational or sentimental appeals are not likely to forget the physical power he has behind him. Allow me to put the case plainly, and in a homely way. Suppose I went across to Ireland, and commenced to argue with some of those who are called bad landlords. I dare say I might put a simple case like this as persuasively and as argumentatively as even the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant; but do you think that a single Irish landlord would listen to me as he would listen to the Chief Secretary? No, Sir; and why not? Because I should not have behind me 30,000 men, each with a bayonet in his hand. Therefore, I say that the Chief Secretary did bring pressure of a physical kind to bear far stronger than any friends of the tenantry of Ireland are able to bring to bear. But, apart altogether from all legal argument, this is a question which must be viewed from a moral and equitable point of view also; and I say that, from this point of view, the Plan of Campaign has everything in its favour. It holds the field, and nothing can stand against it. We have been told that it is dishonest and immoral. I do not deny that there is immorality and dishonesty in the connection; but I want to know on which side the immorality and dishonesty are? All this talk about immorality and dishonesty has a cause. There is never any smoke but there is fire, but we must know where the fire is and by whom it has been kindled. As I understand the Plan of Campaign, I cannot say a word in its favour, except upon the view I have already taken—namely, that it is confined to cases where the rent cannot be justly got out of the land consistently with the rights of the tenants. In that case, if the tenants are to be called upon to pay the rent in all instances—if the Irish problem is viewed in its history and in connection with the legislation and the rights which the tenants enjoy by statute and custom, to demand rent as a legal right where it cannot be got out of the land, I have no hesitation in describing it as dishonesty; and the landlord who, in such circumstances, asks for the rent is a dishonest man. I have heard him called a bad landlord; but a bad landlord is also a bad man. There cannot be a bad landlord without his being a bad man. I say that it is a bad and evil exercise of his landlord capacity, which has sprung out of the badness of his general nature. If that be so, I ask, where can be the dishonesty of the Plan of Campaign? If it be dishonest for a man to call for rent in such circumstances, how can it be dishonest to refuse it? It is impossible to answer that question. How can it be dishonest to refuse a dishonest demand? I say that a man who acts in that way is practically a brigand; and in the circumstances of Irish history, when those upon the land might be divided into the tillers of the ground and the cumberers of the ground, I would call him an impudent brigand, whom it could never be dishonest to resist. That, Sir, is my first point. My second point is this, and I am thankful, for the sake of the House, that this is a much shorter one. We have been told, in the course of this debate — and we have been told very little else in connection with Ireland—that order must be established in Ireland. Of course we must have order in Ireland, and I am astonished at the puerility of Gentlemen who insist on this wretched platitude, as if order was not notoriously necessary to the well-being of the community. I suppose hon. Gentlemen will next tell us that air and water are necessary for the well-being of the community. But they ought to have gone further; and they should have been prepared to say that order, divorced from justice, is tyranny. I maintain that the enforcement of order is justifiable, not in itself, but for reasons; and the reasons why it is justifiable must either be, in the first place, that the disorder that is in existence at any particular time is contrary to justice and incompatible with justice; secondly, that even if there is injustice along with disorder, or the restoration of order is essential to the abolition of the particular injustice complained of. These are the only two cases in which the establishment of order is ordinarily justifiable. But where disorder has been brought about by injustice—and there have been cases in the history of the world where that has been the fact, and there are many cases still where disorder has been provoked by injustice—merely to insist on the restoration of order, and to do nothing more, may be policemanship, but it is not statesmanship. I maintain that that is exactly the position of the Government who are now sitting on the Front Bench. They are insisting upon restoring order, but there is no existing disposition in their minds to do justice to Ireland. That being so, they are not worthy of the name of statesmen in this juncture; they are simply policemen. In this particular instance they are not in the position of persons who are competent for government; they are merely amateurs in government, imbued with nothing higher than strong Constabulary instincts. Well, Sir, that is my second point. I have only one other point on which I wish to relieve my mind, and then I shall relieve the House. That is also connected with the stock assertion that we must have order in Ireland. I venture to say to Her Majesty's Government that they are not the men to establish order in Ireland. It is a very different set of men from you who ought to be establishing order in Ireland; and I say so because I hold that you are now there wrongfully, in view of certain expressions of the national mind of Ireland, once and again repeated, which are historical, and which will be more and more signalized by history as the world grows older. You have no longer any right to be there in the position of establishing order. You have no right to be there, governing Ireland contrary to the consent of the nation of Ireland, unless you take up a despotic position and say—"We believe in despotism, in the rule of the sword, and the right of the strongest." If that is your position I understand it, although I shall not believe in it, and will do all I can to defeat it. But if you do not hold that position, I maintain that you are, in Ireland, even now in establishing order, doing that which is illegitimate because contrary to the assent of those on whom you seek to impose your own ideas of order. I say you are there by usurpation, and that you are performing acts of despotism. Your position, therefore, is unjustifiable unless you affirm the right of the sword, and the right of the strongest. You may say that there is a great deal of disorder in Ireland. Suppose I grant it. I am not prepared to grant it absolutely, because I am aware that in general respects the Irish people are the most law-abiding people in the three countries; and if it happens to be the case that in one aspect of their life they are more reckless than in others, it has been occasioned not by the wickedness of the people, but by the wickedness of your laws. Granting that there is a certain amount of disorder in Ireland that needs to be repressed, if you come to me and ask for help in restoring order I would certainly give you my help, and all the good advice in my power. That advice, however, would be to let order be restored by the Irish people themselves; let it be restored by her own authorities, her own Constitution, and by magistrates of her own selection. That I believe is the only way in which you can restore order permanently in Ireland. If you will only promise the Irish people that you will let them live under self-made laws, no man will be more ready to assist you to the best of his ability than myself in keeping order in that unhappy Island; but if on the other hand you say you do not want this sort of help from anyone to restore order in Ireland, but that you will use your own authority and your own power, then I say I will have nothing to do with it. I wash my hands of you altogether. You shall receive no help from me in any emergency whatever to restore order in Ireland. Let it be as bad as it likes, you will get no assistance from me in any unauthorized enterprise; you will get no assistance from me to act the part of despots and unauthorized usurpers.

MR. RADCLIFFE COOKE (Newington, W.): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate. [*Cries of* "No!"]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Radcliffe Cooke.*)

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I would appeal to the hon. Member not to press the Motion, as the feeling of the House is evidently against him.

MR. RADCLIFFE COOKE: Under the circumstances I will not press it, but I will proceed to make the few remarks which I intend to make.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must first withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

MR. RADCLIFFE COOKE: Sir, I cannot help wishing that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Liberal Separatists had been listening to the speech which we have just heard, and heard with some degree of astonishment. Recently a speech was delivered in the country by a right hon. Gentleman whom we have not once seen in this House during the present Session—I refer to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain). That right hon. Gentleman stated that the Leaders of the Separatist Liberals had been too long silent with respect to the Irish Question, and especially with regard to the Plan of Campaign. We have now heard the views of the hon. Member for East Edinburgh (Mr. Wallace), who is no doubt, to some extent, a Leader of the Liberal Separatists; and it would have been gratifying if the House could have heard from some right hon. Gentleman on the Front Bench opposite who occupies a more prominent position in the ranks of the Liberal Separatists than even the hon. Gentleman who has just addressed us, whether he and the Front Bench generally agree with the propositions which have just been laid down. The right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) told us that the Plan of Campaign was the result of the rejection by this House last Session of the Bill of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) for the relief of tenants. It has been further maintained that that Bill was analogous to the pressure exercised by those who have instituted the Plan of Campaign, and was also a similar kind of pressure to that which has been exercised by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. That is the view which seems to have been entertained by the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, and I propose to make one or two remarks in reference to that view. The right hon. Gentleman likened the pressure exercised by the authors of the Plan of Campaign to the pressure the operatives of this country are enabled to exercise upon their employers legitimately by law. Now, I think that the noble Lord who spoke a day or two ago was right, and that the hon. Member was wrong when he stated that the Plan of Campaign did relate to future contracts, as in trades unionism they relate to future contracts. The analogy, however, would be more complete if, instead of the operatives being able to combine, the employers had power to combine, and were able at the end of a week to say—"We have combined, and, in consequence of that combination, we refuse to pay you the wages we agreed to give you at the beginning of the week." The object of the Plan of Campaign is to prevent men who have agreed to pay something called rent—of course a very objectionable thing in the eyes of hon. Gentlemen opposite—from carrying out their contracts whether they are able to do so or not. ["No!"] I hear an observation to the effect that I am wrong when I say that the Plan of Campaign was instituted with the object of preventing the payment of rent by those who are able to pay as well as by those who cannot pay. The hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), at a place called Killorglin, actually said that the chief efficacy of the Plan of Campaign was that it not only enabled him and others to influence men who really could not pay, but that it enabled him to force those who were willing and able to pay to keep their money in their own pockets, or what was, no doubt, much preferred, to pay it out of their pockets into his own. The Plan of Campaign, as far as we know its origin, has not had a very respectable parentage, nor is it particularly new. I think we shall have to go to America to find out where it was first recommended. I have here a paper called *The Irish World*, the editor of which is a well-known gentleman, called Patrick Ford. I remember a speech delivered in this House by Mr. Healy, who I understand will shortly become a Member again, and who is certainly one of the ablest Members who ever sat below the Gangway. It having been mentioned that Patrick Ford had opinions with regard to assassination, and upon other kindred subjects not usually held by Englishmen; Mr. Healy stated that he knew this Mr. Patrick Ford to be a gentleman of a philosophical turn of mind, and a sort of recluse who kept himself very much to himself. Now, what was it Mr. Patrick Ford said in *The Irish World* a year or two ago, when speaking of the No Rent agitation then proceeding in Ireland? Mr. Ford stated that the attacks which had been made might be considered as so many skirmishes which precede a general campaign, and that sooner or later, when the tenants found that by standing together they could force the landlords to reduce their immoral thefts by almost one-half, it was probable they would be able to prevent the rent-thief from getting any of his plunder. Mr. Ford added that the Irish people might look forward to great events in the near future. Now, I do not know whether the hon. Gentleman opposite has received any lessons from Mr. Patrick Ford. I should say that he has, and that he has learnt his lesson thoroughly. The extract from which I was reading goes on to say that—

> "If the Plan of Campaign is carried out, the ultimate result will be the independence of Ireland, and that means an Irish Republic. Englishmen know that if Ireland secures a legislative independence she will very soon become a Republic."

I have read that extract because I believe it gives the hon. Gentleman the answer he asks for, when he inquires by what right we are in Ireland. We are there by right of the very simple fact that we are a large country placed by no will of our own close to a very small one, a country which if separated from Great Britain would not be able to maintain its independence practically for a single day, but would become a Republic probably seeking the protection of the Stars and Stripes, although I believe the United States would entertain no feeling of gratitude for such an addition to its territory—indeed, they seem to be hardly able to manage all the Irishmen who go over there now. But it may be said that the establishment of the independence of Ireland would be a great danger to the future independence of this country, and that we Englishmen, Welshmen, and Scotchmen have no desire lightly to lose those rights and liberties for which we have paid so dearly in the past. Although it may be the desire of the Irish Members and of the hon. Member for East Edinburgh (Dr. Wallace) that Ireland should be independent, it is our desire that she should be kept dependent, because, if once independent, Ireland would soon lose her own liberties and carry ours away with them. When Ireland is in a position to have those good laws, which, if hon. Gentlemen opposite had their way, would not prevail very long, we shall be prepared to give them every right, every freedom, every law, and every liberty which we enjoy ourselves. What more can the Irish people desire? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), addressing a meeting the other day, spoke most strongly as to the position of the Irish tenants. He said that within the last two years there had been afforded by this country to the tenants of Ireland boons such as no other agricultural tenants enjoy in any country in Europe, and I think he might have included the whole world. Such boons as the tenants of Scotland and England would rejoice to have offered to them; but, unfortunately, during the whole of that time Ireland has been the prey of a body of agitators, who have found it to their interest to keep up a state of unrest in that Island. In conclusion, I would ask hon. Members to consider what we might not give to Ireland if she were freed from that incubus from which the great bulk of her people wish to be delivered.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned" —(*Mr. Handel Cossham.*)

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I hope the hon. Member will not press his Motion, but allow the debate to continue. I would point out that there are Amendments on the

Paper dealing with almost all the subjects referred to in Her Majesty's Speech; and, therefore, I think it would be better that we should proceed with the Business before us, to avoid, if possible, loss of time.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House to agree to the Motion for the adjournment of the debate. It is very early in the Session, and I do not think that anything can be urged against the adjournment of the debate on the ground of saving the public time. I would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman upon one point raised by him—namely, that all the subjects mentioned in Her Majesty's Speech will be raised by Amendments which are on the Paper. What will be the effect of the hon. Member for Bristol (Mr. Handel Cossham) being precluded from making his speech to-morrow, but that he will probably make it on one of the Amendments? In that way, then the time which the right hon. Gentleman supposes will be saved will not be saved at all. I cannot speak with certainty, but I have strong reason to believe that the debate on the general subject will come to an end to-morrow evening. It cannot end before under any circumstances; and, therefore, the time which the right hon. Gentleman asks us to spend to-night will effect no saving whatever. Under the circumstances, I hope the right hon. Gentleman will allow the Motion for Adjournment to be carried without opposition, and that we may be able to get home at a reasonable hour.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER (Lord JOHN MANNERS) (Leicestershire, E.): I understand the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) to say that the general debate will close to-morrow evening. If that is so, I have no doubt my right hon. Friend the Leader of the House will consent to the Motion for the adjournment of the debate.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford, W.): I wish the right hon. Gentleman to understand that there is no feeling on this side of the House that the debate can by any possibility terminate to-morrow when the House will sit for a few hours only. In regard to the observations of the Leader of the House, I venture to think that whatever may be the inconvenience to the Government we are not wasting the time of the Session by a general discussion either on the Address or on the general political situation; and I think that the position demands that the present House of Commons should take part in this debate, and contribute everything in their power for the guidance of the Government. I am satisfied that this course would be agreeable to Members on both sides of the House. It is all very well to say that the Amendments on the Paper deal with every subject in the Queen's Speech, and that, therefore, the debate on the general question should come to an end. It is true that the Amendments take a very wide range, and I believe that in the end, these discussions will be appreciated by the public. There are certainly many hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House who desire an opportunity of taking part in the discussion; and I should be sorry to think that there was any impression that an understanding existed that it would close to-morrow.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): With regard to the termination of the debate, I point out that there has been no understanding between my hon. Friends and Members above or below the Gangway with regard to the closing of this debate. I quite agree with the hon. Member who has just spoken that the country will appreciate the discussion which has taken place, and which I think is likely to continue for some time. It is perfectly certain that it will not close to-morrow, and that being so I cannot see that any advantage will be gained by our having one speech more or less this evening. For my part, I think that the debate has proceeded in a most satisfactory manner; and I have not often listened to a discussion of a more instructive or useful character than the present. For that reason, I trust the Government will allow the debate to be adjourned, particularly as it can hardly be doubted that it will not come to an end to-morrow. The Government have, moreover, some other Business on the Paper for this evening, and that is another reason why I think they will do well to agree to the Motion of the hon. Member for Bristol.

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

[*Fourth Night.*]

FELONIOUS USE OF FIREARMS BILL.

[BILL 119.]

(*Mr. Howard Vincent, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Seager Hunt, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Hulse.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I will not, Mr. Speaker, detain the House more than a few minutes in moving the second reading of this Bill. It will be within the recollection of many hon. Gentlemen that of late years the use of revolvers by burglars has greatly increased and added a fresh terror to the midnight marauder. To my knowledge there have been at least four murders by burglars in the last nine years, and, within that period also, 13 policemen and five private persons have been wounded in London by burglars' firearms; while 18 burglars have escaped arrest by the use of firearms, and on 14 burglars firearms were found. I therefore know of 52 burglars who have in recent years carried revolvers with murderous intent, and there must have been twice as many more of whom nothing is known. When the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby was Home Secretary, the matter of preventing this serious crime was for long under consideration. The Metropolitan Police were consulted as to their being themselves armed with revolvers for their better protection in their dangerous duties. But with a courage which always distinguishes them, and also a lively sense no doubt of the danger of making a bad shot, and the possibilities of legal difficulties, the Force generally were unwilling to be provided with firearms. Various remedies have been suggested in many quarters—the imposing of a tax upon revolvers, and the registration of owners or of purchasers. But I doubt the practicability of any of these proposals with a weapon in such common possession as a pistol. The gun trade, too, labours under sufficient disadvantages already, owing to foreign competition, without having any additional taxes imposed upon it. At the same time, if the Government will undertake to introduce a measure which in a more effectual way than that proposed by the Bill is calculated to check the public danger in question, I have no wish to press it against them. I hope, however, that they will allow the Second Reading to be taken, and postpone its Amendment to the Committee stage, if they think any Amendment necessary. The object of the Bill is to deter burglars from carrying any firearms, and especially revolvers. I need not say that no man commits burglary by accident; and if a burglar carries a revolver, it is his intention to save himself from arrest, or to secure his object by murder or attempted murder. To protect him from the consequences of this intent, if carried into execution, but still more to protect the public and the police against such scoundrels, is the object of my Bill. The Home Secretary may possibly contend that he does not see why daggers, jemmies, and other formidable weapons should not come under the same category as firearms. But surely, Sir, revolvers are the weapons which can only be carried for no other purpose whatever than to protect life or to take it. Their use is limited to this purpose; and although I shall be glad if the scope of the Bill can be usefully enlarged, it is, I submit, no reason for resisting an attempt to check the felonious use of firearms, that it does not go far enough. The matter has been brought particularly and painfully under my notice as Director of Criminal Investigations; and I feel sure that if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby were present, he would join in urging the House and the Government to consent to take at least some step in checking the felonious use of firearms without subjecting the general public to inconvenience. I need hardly tell the House that a minimum punishment on guilty persons is no new thing to the law. The Statute 24 & 25 *Vict.*, c. 100, s. 61 subjects persons guilty of a certain offence to a minimum punishment of 10 years' penal servitude. It is far more necessary against would-be murderers than against simple rustics, who are the principal offenders against the Statute I have quoted. The House, too, will remember that penal servitude for life is already the maximum punishment for burglary. The only new point in this Bill for the Better Prevention of the Felonious Use of Firearms—the Second Reading of which I have now the honour to move—is the minimum sentence. I feel convinced that it will act as a deterrent against murder, and, at the same time, give a sense of greater security to the public. On these grounds I respectfully ask for the support of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Howard Vincent.*)

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I desire to offer the most strenuous opposition in my power to this Bill, not because I have any sympathy with murderers, but because I believe it to be wholly unnecessary. I believe it would fail to fulfil the expectation of the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Howard Vincent), that it would afford no protection to the public, inasmuch as burglars are not likely to be deterred by the punishment proposed by the hon. Member, for they are a class of men who would not be deterred by any consideration whatever, not even by the consideration of saving their own lives. Again, firearms are not carried by the burglar for the purpose of taking life. The weapon is carried when on his depredations, either for the purpose of frightening people, or of protecting himself, and not with the premeditated intention of committing murder. Therefore, I think the term of penal servitude held out by the Bill would be extreme, and that it does not meet the case. I repeat that I do not believe that the Bill, if it became law, would deter the midnight marauder or burglar from carrying firearms, or afford any protection whatever to the public beyond that which it has from the law already; and, therefore, on the ground that it would be both unnecessary and ineffectual, I desire to offer my opposition to the Motion of the hon. Member that it be read a second time.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): I shall detain the House at this late hour for a few minutes only in saying a few words on this Bill. My hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Howard Vincent) appeals to me to do what I should be very glad to do if it were in my power—namely, to amend this Bill. But I find in that a task of great difficulty, for if I were to amend that portion of it which provides the minimum punishment of 10 years' penal servitude for the felonious use of firearms, there would be nothing left in the Bill which would be operative at all. My hon. Friend says with perfect truth that there is no new principle in the Bill but that minimum of 10 years' penal servitude. Already the burglar who carries no weapon is liable to penal servitude for life, and the Judge is able to give 10 or five years' penal servitude, or two years' imprisonment only; but this Bill will leave no alternative to the Judge but to give 10 years' penal servitude in the case of any individual who may be in the possession of what the hon. Member for South Tipperary (Mr. J. O'Connor) has described as a natural and innocent implement for his own protection. I think minimum sentences are bad in principle, and I cannot, therefore, give my assent to what is proposed in this Bill. I have known juries struggle against convicting men, in order to avoid a sentence of the kind, and in the teeth of evidence to find them guilty only of the attempt. No one can doubt, and I suppose my hon. Friend does not doubt, that any Judge who knew that an individual had carried a revolver, with the intention of committing murder, would give him more than 10 years' penal servitude. But why is the burglar, who carries a long Spanish knife, for instance, which he means to use, to get off with two years' imprisonment with hard labour, while the man who carries a revolver is to have 10 years' penal servitude? The proposal of the Bill is simply to impose a particular punishment on one class of offenders which is no worse than another class. Again, as my hon. Colleague reminds me, the only minimum punishment known to our law was repealed in 1875. I cannot, therefore, admit the principle contained in the proposal of my hon. Friend, believing, as I do, that it is far better that the Judges should determine the punishment of offenders according to their own judgment in each particular case; and, that being so, I am compelled reluctantly to oppose the Motion of my hon. Friend for the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HOWARD VINCENT: After the observations of my right hon. Friend I beg leave to withdraw my Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

MOTIONS.

MINING LEASES (CORNWALL AND DEVON) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Acland, Bill to facilitate the grant and renewal of Leases of Metalliferous Mines, and for other purposes, within the Stannaries of Cornwall and Devon, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Acland, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Courtney, Viscount Ebrington, Mr. Bickford-Smith, and Mr. Seale-Hayne.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 146.]

STANNARIES ACT (1869) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Acland, Bill to amend "The Stannaries Act, 1869," and for other purposes relating thereto, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Acland, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Courtney, Viscount Ebrington, Mr. Bickford-Smith, and Mr. Seale-Hayne.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 147.]

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 2nd February, 1887.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — Public Petitions, Mr. Alderman John O'Connor *added.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee—Ordered—First Reading*—Customs Law Amendment* [155].

Ordered—First Reading—Rating of Machinery * [148]; Income Tax Administration Amendment * [149]; Registration of Voters * [150]; Deep Sea Oysters * [151]; Greenwich Markets Act (1849) Amendment * [152]; Licensed Premises (Earlier Closing) (Scotland) * [153]; Distress for Rent * [154].

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [FIFTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January.]—[See page 84.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. HANDEL COSSHAM (Bristol) said, he would confine the observations he had to make on the Speech from the Throne to two or three points which appeared to him to be of special importance. He was much delighted that the first reference in that Speech was to that most important of all questions—the Eastern Question. The country was much indebted to the late Lord Derby for many excellent things he had said; but he never made a more wise or important statement than when he said that "peace was the great interest of this country." Our commerce, trade, industry, and prosperity so much depended on peace that not only its actual disturbance, but even rumours of war, had a most injurious effect on the interests of the country all over the world. The statesmanship of Europe had hitherto signally failed in devising some better plan of settling national differences than by the arbitrament of the sword. His own belief was that England would be wise if she set the example of adopting a more civilized policy. We were great and powerful enough not to be accused of weakness if we set an example of peace to the world. The time had come when we might retrace our steps in respect to the existing enormous expenditure, and when we might seek to appreciably lessen the burdens of the people by following a policy of non-intervention abroad. Therefore, although he had not always admired the actions of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), whose course had been on many occasions somewhat erratic, yet he was bound to say he felt indebted to the noble Lord for the practical view he had taken of this great question, and he knew of no direction in which the noble Lord could render greater or more distinguished service to his country than by helping to lead the House and the nation into that peaceful and economical policy of which he had spoken with so much eloquence. But there were one or two other things which it would be necessary to do before the Expenditure of the country could be reduced. In the first place, the sooner we cleared out of Egypt the better, for our presence there was of no advantage to the Egyptian people. It appeared to him that we were there rather in the interests of the bondholders than of the people. Then he wished to stop all further increase of territory by England. There was nothing more dangerous to a country than to be continually increasing its territory. Extent of territory did not make a nation great and prosperous. If it were so, then Russia would be the greatest and most prosperous country in the world. In the enduring greatness of a nation the contentment, happiness, and prosperity of the people were far more potent factors than wide-stretching frontiers. By the extension of territory we increased the danger of being drawn into contention with our neighbours, which a steady course of conciliation and non-aggression would avoid. Next, he was anxious that the fullest power of self-government should be given to all parts of our Colonial Empire, because this again would tend to lessen the burdens of the people and of Parliament at home. He would grant Home Rule to all our Colonies, and on this point, therefore, he looked upon the question of Home Rule as having a much wider and more important application than to Ireland alone. Self-government must become the rule in the future, lessening the labour of Parliament and the Home Government, together with the burden on the taxpayers of Great Britain. It would be impossible to continue the existing rate of taxation in time of peace. To have an income tax of 8*d.* in the pound in time of peace and with no prospect of war was unjustifiable and dangerous. If the public expenditure was to be lessened in a practical way, there were several things they must do as soon as possible. They must cut down the pension list, and no doubt the hon. Member for Northampton would secure attention to that matter. They must stop the waste which it was admitted was going on in connection with the Public Establishments, which, on the testimony of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, was something fearful; and the Services must be reduced. At public dinners, and on other occasions, they frequently heard of the value of the Volunteer Force, and he thought practical effect might be given with advantage to those statements by reducing the permanent military forces and relying more on the Volunteers. He contended, further, that the time was opportune for trying to reduce the public burdens. It was a great advantage that the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington had taken up the subject of economy so earnestly as he had done. Counsel in favour of retrenchment had not, in times past, emanated from the Tory Benches. A research into ancient history, a reference to the days of Sir Robert Peel, must be made to find anything of the kind. He was ready to confess that the Liberal Party had not been as true to their traditions during many years past as they ought to have been in connection with economy in the public expenditure; but he was also bound to say that though they were forgetful of their duty they were not reminded of it by the other side of the House. Now, however, with the support of the noble Lord, he hoped that a new spirit was coming over hon. Members opposite in this matter—that being now in touch with the democracy they would feel, in common with the Liberal Party, the necessity of lessening the present expenditure. If so, he should anticipate great results from the united efforts that would be made; and in the present state of trade and agriculture economy was most desirable and necessary. He put it to hon. Gentlemen connected with trade and agriculture whether the time was not most opportune for trying to reduce the national burdens, and whether we should not carry into public affairs those maxims of thrift and economy we inculcated in all our social relations? Another reason why economy should be rigidly practised was that hon. Members must bear in mind that if further taxation had to be raised in the future the burden would have to be placed on property, and not on the industry and necessities of the people. With the present suffering, the great masses of the people could not be further burdened. If you tax their food, of any kind, you will have the democracy down on you with sledge hammer. Additional burdens must fall on property; therefore he asked those who were interested in property to join in this important work of economy, which he hoped to see very shortly taken earnestly in hand by Parliament. With regard to Ireland, he was glad to learn from Her Majesty's Speech that crime was decreasing in that country; but, in presence of that fact, it was difficult for him to understand why the House should be asked by the Government to strengthen the law for the punishment of crime. Surely the reduction of crime was not an argument for obtaining increased power; and they had a right to ask the Government to spare them the hateful task of having to impose fresh burdens on Ireland at a time when they were told that the Irish people were more law-abiding and less criminal than they had ever been. All the experience of the past had shown that severe repressive legislation had tended to the increase of crime, and he ventured to believe that it would have the same effect now. Therefore, he begged the Government to take heed before entering upon a course which had been fatal to every Government which had tried it. They were told that they must maintain the law; but he wanted to know first whether the law was wise, whether it was adapted to the people called upon to obey it, and whether it was just, because the most dangerous and disintegrating policy which could be pursued was a policy of injustice. Therefore, while he admitted that the maintenance of the law was the duty of the Government, it was the duty of that House to see that the law could be maintained with justice and a safe conscience. The result of their discussions had been to clear up certain points—first of all, that past Governments had made great mistakes. When he saw in Ireland a declining population, a starving people, great opposition to the law, he could not but come to the conclusion that these were not foundations upon which to build a future of contentment and prosperity. This country was greatly responsible for the condition of Ireland; and, therefore, he asked the House to be calm, forbearing, and sympathetic in dealing with it. Our past policy had destroyed the trade of Ireland, and made that country to depend wholly upon agriculture. If the same was done to England, her condition would be much the same as that of Ireland; but England had trade and commerce to fall back upon. With regard to the relations between landlord and tenant, he ventured to lay down this principle for the guidance of hon. Gentlemen opposite—that rents must bear a fair proportion to what the land would yield. Any other principle would lead to friction, and it was the forgetfulness of that principle which had led to all our troubles in the past. It was said that the Land Act of 1881 was a failure. He would admit there were certain provisions of that Act which had failed. One great failure was the fixing of 15 years during which a certain rent was to be paid. What was perfectly fair and just five or six years ago would not be so now. If we were to persevere in compelling the tenants to pay an utterly impossible rent we could not hope for peace. He would, therefore, appeal to the generosity and sense of justice of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and ask them to remember how great had been the decline of agriculture for the last four or five years. If rents in England had gone down 40 and 50 per cent, how could they maintain that rents in Ireland should not be re-adjusted? Circumstances would beat hon. Gentlemen, and would beat the Government in this matter. This Land Question, therefore, must be dealt with. We could not stand still. He believed the late land scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) was by far the most liberal and generous ever submitted to Parliament, and there was no chance of such terms being offered again. The scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) was less liberal to the landlords, and would be less onerous to this country. Whoever solved the problem would confer the greatest benefit upon Ireland. He hoped that this solution would be arrived at in a way just to all parties, and permanent in its effect; but a full solution there would never be until we gave self-government to Ireland in some shape or other. It must come, and was so natural a desire in a civilized people that it ought not to be suppressed. For one people to be willing to be governed by another showed a low state of civilization. Every extension of self-government had tended to solidify and unite a people. Our Empire was stronger now, when 5,000,000 had a voice in the Government, than when the electorate was restricted to 500,000. Our Colonial Government had been strengthened by giving the Colonies Home Rule. He remembered the warm discussions 40 years ago on the subject of Home Rule for Canada. The Party on the other side of the House were as positive then as they were now, and if their policy had prevailed Canada would now be a part of the United States, whereas—and he spoke from experience—there were no people in the Empire more loyal than our Canadian fellow-subjects. State Government in the United States was the salvation of that country. The States had got just enough of Federal law to bind the units into a whole, and the only way to bind the units of this country to the Central Government was to give Home Rule to every portion of the United Kingdom. They were called Separatists. So far as his knowledge went, there was not a Gentleman in that House who wanted separation. There were two kinds of union, the union of the man handcuffed to the policeman—that was our union with Ireland—or the union in which the hearts of the Irish people would be united to us. He believed Home Rule would lead to greater union, and therefore he claimed that those who supported were better Unionists than those who opposed it. Hon. Members opposite appeared to be of opinion that the policy of standing still was the right one. For his part, he wanted not only union between England and Ireland, but union between the Liberal Party. In endeavouring to obtain that union he did not desire to sacrifice principle, but he wished to give self-government to the Irish people, which he believed would increase the stability of the Throne, strengthen the rights of property, and benefit the whole community. He denied that those who thought with him were not anxious for the glory of the Empire; but at the same time he did not think that the rights of property should be allowed to overshadow the rights of humanity. He desired to recognize the rights of property as far as they were consistent with the rights of humanity. No policy that was unjust to a great country like Ireland could stand. He read in *The Daily News* of an estate which, 20 years ago, was rented at 7*s*., and had risen to 20*s*. an acre, solely owing to the tenant's improvement, the landlord having done nothing whatever for the land. In enforcing justice in Ireland they should take care that they did not merely do justice to the landlords. At present Irishmen knew little of English law, except that it oppressed them. Hon. Members opposite had referred to the contentment with which Scotland had accepted union with England; but it must be recollected that Scotland had entered voluntarily into that union, and had not, like Ireland, been forced into it at the point of the sword. In his opinion, the English taxpayers would very shortly become weary of spending their money in coercing the Irish. He should like to see the landlords of Ireland placed upon the same footing as ordinary creditors. Let them approach this question, not in the interests of Party, but in a spirit which would render the Jubilee of Her Majesty's glorious reign memorable in the future as the year when the problem was solved, and the foundation laid of a sincere and abiding union between England and Ireland.

MR. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.) said, he was glad to see in the Queen's Speech that this country remained on friendly relations with all foreign Powers; but he would venture to ask the House whether, if they adopted the policy advocated of retrenchment, there would be a greater chance of peace? History showed that a policy of peace led to war, and he would refer to the Crimean War in confirmation of that view. That war would never have occurred had there been a firm and continuous policy in this country, and they would not have had so much trouble in Egypt and the Soudan had the late Government been more firm. He ventured to assure the House that the Conservative Party deplored warlike operations, and he thought that the present Government had shown that they were anxious to maintain peace—at any rate, they had had nothing to do with the increased armaments of Germany and France; and as to Bulgaria, the present Government would act in conjunction with the other Great Powers of Europe in preserving peace, and would do nothing which would not be necessary to uphold the honour, dignity, and interests of this country. He ventured to think, looking at present circumstances, that war would be avoided. It appeared to him that the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) desired to have control not only over the Exchequer and the Army and Navy Departments, but also over the foreign policy of the Government. It was remarkable that the noble Lord had not been able to place his finger upon any particular item of expenditure which he thought ought to be reduced. He (Mr. Webster) yielded to no one in his desire for economy: but when it was spasmodic and ill-considered, it was not true economy, and led only to increased expenditure. The noble Lord seemed to ask the question, in his own mind, whether it would not be wise to go behind our plighted word to our Colonists; and, as the Crown Colonies were not represented in this House, he probably thought not very much would be heard about it. What were the facts? Lord Carnarvon's Commission entered into negotiations with the various Colonies with regard to our coaling stations, and the consequence was that they promised to carry out certain works, and would construct the fortifications if we would send the guns to arm them. Accordingly, Hong Kong, Singapore, Mauritius, and other places had performed their part of the contract, and had constructed these works; but, so far from carrying out our part of the bargain, we had not sent a single gun to one British Colony. We were, therefore, bound in honour to fulfil our part of it. To break faith with our Colonies would, in his opinion, be a most stupid and most wicked piece of economy, and would do a vast injury to our trade and commerce. He trusted the day would never come when Colonial questions would be made the battledore and shuttlecock of Parties in that House. With regard to Ireland, he ventured to hope that the Government would pursue a firm and consistent policy in that country, and that brighter days might ere long dawn on that land.

Mr. S. WILLIAMSON (Kilmarnock) said, he did not intend to follow the speech of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Webster), which was so full of Jingo sentiment. He proposed to confine his attention to the subject of Ireland, whose industrial, political, and social condition was the main cause of our own political divisions and difficulties. It was a matter of great regret that so many of the speeches of new and young Members of the House, sitting especially on the opposite side, had been marked with so much bitterness and animosity towards the Irish people. Some of those speeches might be characterized as a mixture of brimstone and treacle; but he was sorry to say some of them were undoubtedly mere undiluted and unadulterated brimstone, sword, fire, and vengeance. In that category he must class the speech delivered on Tuesday night by the hon. and learned Member for West Ham (Mr. Fulton), in which there was not one expression of generous sympathy for the Irish people, or the slightest regard to the national aspirations of the people. Speeches of that character must only increase the existing difficulty. A speech of a different character, containing a good deal of brimstone, but also an admixture of treacle, had been delivered by the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson). The hon. and gallant Member took a different view from that presented on Tuesday night by the hon. and gallant Member for Birkenhead (General Hamley), whose ponderous speech, he was sorry to say, was characterized by much bitterness. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh had admitted that the Land Act of 1881 had laid the foundation for a solution of the Irish Question; whereas the hon. and gallant Member for Birkenhead had spoken as if the acts of the late Government had been the cause of the troubles both present and future of the Sister Island. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh desired to see a settlement of the Irish Land Question on the basis of the Irish landlords being bought out. But first they must see that the bargain between the landlords and the occupiers of Ireland should be a fair one. That must be done by an Irish Legislative Assembly in Dublin—not four or five Provincial Assemblies, but one Assembly, embodying the aspirations of the people, composed largely of the young enthusiastic men of the National Party, modified by an infusion of men from the North of Ireland—men engaged in commerce in Belfast and elsewhere, and men representing the landlords, like the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh himself. Let them find out the real value of the land in Consols or other securities, and then they might expect a settlement of this question. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh had said that it was a matter of paramount importance that Ireland should be happy and contented, and that the way to effect this object was to make the tenants owners of their holdings. The hon. and gallant Member then said that the final solution could only come from the Irish people themselves. The hon. and gallant Member's speech was, therefore, a Home Rule speech. He was delighted to see one who was so identified with the Protestantism of the North of Ireland thus going back to the old and better traditions of the Irish Protestants, for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had recently pointed out that before 1800 the Protestants were the most zealous assertors of National principles; and not until the legitimate claims of the people were satisfied could we expect peace, happiness, and contentment in Ireland. He would not follow the hon. Member for East Edinburgh (Mr. Wallace) in his logical analysis of the Plan of Campaign, which was a matter *sub judice*, further than to observe that logic and moral right were not always coincident. It might not be logically defensive on the grounds of legality; but there might be other arguments used in defence of those who had identified themselves with this Plan. Supposing there was a family in distress, or had lost its bread-winner, and he happened to be in the house visiting the poor people when a tradesman came in and demanded his pound of flesh, fearful lest others might get in before him to seize the goods of these poor people, he thought he would be justified in taking that man by the throat and turning him downstairs. He might be arraigned before a Court of Law, and the matter submitted to a jury; but he thought under the circumstances he would get off with a farthing damages, if he were not acquitted on the plea of humanity. The House, he thought, took a wrong view in fixing tenancies under the Land Act at the long period of 15 years. Neither landlord nor tenant was a party to that settlement, and they would do well in many cases to revise it by agreement with each other. Mention had been made in the Queen's Speech of the question of tithes, and the only hon. Gentleman who had referred to the matter, the Member for Maldon (Mr. Gray), said he hoped the Government would re-open the whole question, and would not allow tithes to be made use of for any other purpose than that which the original donors intended. He only wished to point out that there were no original donors at all. The tithes were not really gifts; they were exactions; and the recommendation of the hon. Member simply meant that in clearing out a foul well, they were not to probe it to the bottom, but simply to skim the surface. He hoped the Government would take no such course as that, but would thoroughly go into the matter; and he commended the subject to the consideration of his hon. Friends the Members for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) and Bradford (Mr. Illingworth), knowing those hon. Gentlemen would not rest contentedly until the matter was thoroughly dealt with.

COLONEL HAMBRO (Dorset, S.) said, that a perusal of the recent debates would lead the reader to conclude that there was only one subject which Parliament was assembled to consider—namely, Ireland; and the discussion had been to a large extent concerned with the Plan of Campaign and the Glenbeigh evictions. That Plan of Campaign had been pronounced by the highest legal authority to be an illegal combination, and he thought they were rather flogging a dead horse. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] Well, if the law was not strong enough to reach it, the sooner it was amended the better. In the Glenbeigh evictions great consideration had been shown by the landlords; but they were eagerly seized upon by Irish Members who were anxious that the Irish Question should not be settled, but kept an open wound. Although, as an English Member, he did not feel qualified to suggest a solution of the Irish problem, in his view the probable real solution of that question would be to give the tenants a greater proprietary interest in the soil. But, when that was done, every tenant should have full compensation for the expenditure on improvements he had effected when he was evicted from his holding. At any rate, he hoped the whole of the Session would not be devoted to Irish subjects. There were, however, other subjects than Ireland referred to in the Gracious Speech from the Throne. With regard to local self-government for England and Scotland, he would like to see a termination to the controversy which had been "hung up" so long. He trusted the Government would deal with the subject in a thorough and comprehensive manner. He was glad also that measures were promised to facilitate and cheapen the transfer of land, and to encourage the extension of allotments. The last Liberal Government had increased the difficulties of land transfer by doubling the fees of the Court of Chancery. With regard to allotments, in his own part of the country no legislation was needed to facilitate the allotment system, which was in full operation by voluntary effort. He was of opinion that on some estates no Bill was necessary to carry into effect the objects contemplated, though he believed that in some parts it was desirable that legislation should be passed for the purpose. He was sure that the sale of glebe lands, which had attracted the notice of the Government, would do much to increase allotments, especially as glebe lands were often very favourably placed for the purpose. He was sure the country would be glad to hear that the Government intended to practise economy; but there was no desire that economy should be attained by the sacrifice of the thorough efficiency of the two Services.

Mr. CRILLY (Mayo, N.) said, as one of the five Irish Members who were being prosecuted for having advocated and promoted the Plan of Campaign, and, as one who, by the means of a well and carefully packed jury, might probably be sent to prison within the next 10 days, he would ask the House to permit him to explain and defend, as far as his capacity allowed him, his connection with the agrarian movement in Ireland within the last three or four months. With almost every phase of the Plan of Campaign since its initiation he had a close association; and he desired to say that he was neither ashamed of his action, nor afraid to face the consequences of what he had done. He was not ashamed for three reasons: in the first place, because he was not inclined to accept those who condemned the Plan of Campaign as authorities on the moral law; in the second place, because he had higher authorities, whom he reverenced, who said that the Plan of Campaign was perfectly moral, and, under the circumstances of the hour, perfectly legitimate and justifiable; and, in the third place, because the Plan of Campaign had proved abundantly efficacious in bringing unjust landlords to their knees, in having saved many pounds to many tenants in Ireland, and because it had saved many tenants from eviction in Ireland during the past winter. On Monday evening he listened to the speech of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), who had a brother in another branch of the Legislature, and the noble Lord declared that the Plan of Campaign was hopelessly immoral. It did not lie in the mouth of the noble Lord to taunt the Irish people with immorality. The moral lives of John Dillon and William O'Brien were as clean and pure as the life of the noble Lord, and cleaner and purer than the lives of many of those who were associated with the noble Lord in politics or by consanguinity. It was not for those who lived in the glass house of Marlborough to throw stones on the ground of immorality. Then the Prime Minister had spoken of the Plan of Campaign as organized embezzlement. He had only to say in reply to this that there was a very interesting and very instructive work published at the small price of 1*s*. It was entitled *Our Old Nobility*, and, in the fourteenth chapter of that work, there was an historical sketch of the house of Cecil which he would commend to the Members of the House and the outside public, and then ask their verdict as to who should carry off the palm for organized embezzlement—the noble house of Cecil, or the plebeian Plan of Campaign. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), who had been described by the noble Lord opposite as a "crutch" to the Tory Party, had also denounced the Plan of Campaign. It was amusing to hear such declaration from the author of the doctrine of "ransom"; who had been compared by the Prime Minister to Jack Cade, and who was looked upon by his newly-found friends on the Tory Benches, only a little time ago, as the arch-apostle of spoliation. He and his friends were convinced of the usefulness and the morality of the Plan of Campaign, which was an attack upon the system which was responsible for all the miseries of the Irish people; and so long as they knew that it had the approval of such ecclesiastics as Archbishop Walsh, of Dublin; so long as they knew that, in promoting this Plan of Campaign, they could have standing on their platforms by their side the priests of Ireland; so long would they bear with equanimity, and regard with contempt, the censures and strictures of a Tory Party, and their crutches in that House. But, if he was to be condemned for his connection with this Plan of Campaign, the two men who were responsible for his connection with it were the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Attorney General for Ireland. If he were a criminal, it was those two men who induced him to become a criminal; if he were a conspirator, it was those two men who had enticed him into the conspiracy. The man who was primarily responsible for his connection with this movement was the Chief Secretary for Ireland. The Chief Secretary made a speech in Bristol on November 14, and he then used the now historic phrase that the Government had brought what further pressure they could, acting always within the law, to bear upon those few landlords who would not follow the example of their more generous fellows; and he added that the result had been an evident improvement in the state of Ireland. During the last six weeks, he said, outrages had diminished by half, compared with what they were in the previous six weeks. Outrages had diminished. Why? Because the Gentlemen who occupied positions on the Front Ministerial Bench, and their officials in Dublin Castle, had brought what pressure they could to bear upon those few landlords who would not make concessions. The promoters of the Plan of Campaign wanted to do the same. They wanted to supplement the action of the Government, and assist the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to bring pressure upon those landlords who would not give reductions, and thereby to lessen still further the number of outrages, and the number of crimes. The right hon. Gentleman, on Friday, said that the word "pressure" was unfortunate; but they interpreted it in connection with other facts—they interpreted it in connection with the action of General Buller, and Captain Plunkett, and Captain Moriarty, and of Judge Monroe in Dublin, and Judge Curran in Kerry. In *United Ireland* of December 4 there was a legal opinion published, signed "Hugh Holmes, Attorney General," which was written in answer to a landlord who suggested that the money should be seized and taken by force. The right hon. and learned Gentleman replied that there was a mode by which the landlord might get the whole of his money; but that it was not a matter for the Government, and that he did not see how any action could be taken by the Executive. He and his Colleagues brought pressure to bear on unjust landlords with more effect and more satisfactory results than any that the Government could show. They were trying to gain the same end; but while the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General could shelter themselves behind the bar of privilege, he and his Colleagues would have to defend themselves from behind the bars of a penal dock. The three speeches which he was prosecuted for making, and for delivering which he might have to go to gaol within the next 10 days, were delivered, one at Castlerea, on the 5th of December, one at Ballaghadereen on the 10th of December, and one at Loughglynn on the 12th of December. They were delivered amid the silence of the Government as to the illegality of the Plan, and he desired to say that, on the face of the facts which he had stated, the Government stood condemned; and, with a knowledge of these facts in the minds of the English people, he was satisfied that they would not tolerate for one moment that John Dillon or William O'Brien should be sent to prison for doing what they honestly and conscientiously believed the Government of England was also doing. It was very difficult for public men in Ireland who desired to relieve the misery of their kindred to know what to do. If the people were driven by despair to seek the fields of secret organization, to lift their country into a position of prosperity and comfort, they were hanged or sent to penal servitude; if the leaders of the people advised them to abandon these paths, and to come to that House, and if they asked for such a petty measure as was submitted last Session by his hon. Friend and Leader the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), it was insolently rejected by a brute majority; if they adopted the plan of going as public men upon the public platform, where the police reporters could take down every word they uttered, and advised the tenants of Ireland to follow the example of the trade unions of England, and by uniting in combination wring some justice from the landlords, they were again brought to the prison dock, and the men who refused them the very small concession they asked last Session were the men to stand before them now as their accusers in Green Street Court House; because they had advised the tenants to do what they believed to be perfectly legal, and what they believed the Government had already done—that was, to bring pressure to bear upon unjust landlords. What was their crime? They were accused by the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) with having preached a crusade of no rent in Ireland.

They had done no such thing. What they had done in Ireland was to advise the tenants, on those estates where the landlords refused to give any concessions at all, to combine for their own protection. It had been stated by several hon. Members on the Government Benches that the landlords of Ireland had acted generously and in a humane way during the past winter, and that they had given voluntary reductions. Where these reductions were given voluntarily by the landlords, the tenants had met them at once generously and handsomely; and the fact that the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh and other landlords on the Government Benches were not in conflict with their tenants was a proof that the Irish Leaders had not preached a No Rent crusade in Ireland. The Plan of Campaign was only put into operation in such cases as those of Lord Clanricarde and Lord Dillon. Whether the Tory Party believed it or not did not matter much, but the truth was he and his friends had no desire to prolong the ceaseless fight between the tenants and landlords. They had no desire to come to that House from their own country to carry on a perpetual war between the Irish people and England. It would be very much better for young men like himself and many of his Colleagues if they could pay attention to their own domestic affairs, and in commercial or professional circles build up careers for themselves. It was not true that they were paid for coming there, as was insultingly, and frequently offensively, said by the other side. They fought with all the strength of their nationality and their love for their native land to lift Ireland up from her present enslaved condition, and put her in a position that they believed would tend to her great good in the future. He was being prosecuted for speeches he delivered to the tenants on the estate of Lord Dillon. Not very long ago the rental of that estate was £5,000; but, owing to the ceaseless industry of the tenants, it had increased to £25,000. Yet the tenants of that estate never saw their landlord, and never received from him one single penny to improve the condition of their wretched homes. To-day there was standing near the avenue leading to the mansion of Lord Dillon, at Loughglynn, a village of hovels that would simply disgrace a Zulu kraal. A Zulu kraal would be comfort and magnificence compared with the village of Loughglynn; and, as Mr. John Dillon had said, no English Member, be he Tory or Radical, could look upon that village and not go back to the House of Commons with the conviction that there must be something bad and vicious in the system that could bring the people to such a low ebb of poverty and allow such a village to exist. Lord Dillon was asked to give 25 per cent reduction. He had been all over the estate, and considered that that was a perfectly fair demand. He could say, defying contradiction, that not 20 per cent of the tenants could pay their rents from the produce of the soil. The other 80 per cent of the tenants paid their rents from their earnings in the harvest fields of England; but, during the last two or three years, that source of income having failed owing to the agricultural depression which prevailed, the tenants were not able to pay their full rents, and when they asked for the moderate reduction of 25 per cent their request was insolently refused. Lord Dillon, so the story ran, declared that he would rather go into the workhouse for two years than grant one single penny of abatement. The tenants joined the Plan of Campaign, and the result was that, though the pressure of the Government brought by the Chief Secretary failed to induce Lord Dillon to give one penny of reduction on rents that were not made on the land at all, the Plan of Campaign induced Lord Dillon to give 20 per cent reduction, pay all law costs, and reinstate evicted tenants. To-day the receipts—if he might use the phrase—given under the Plan of Campaign to the tenants of Lord Dillon were legal coin of the realm in the rent office of Lord Dillon; and if he were a criminal for advocating the Plan of Campaign, Lord Dillon was also a criminal, and standing beside him and his Colleagues in the dock when they were brought to trial ought to be Mr. Maurice Hussey, agent to Lord Dillon, and Lord Dillon himself. He and his hon. Colleagues were prosecuted for what Lord Dillon acknowledged to be a perfectly legal transaction; but no matter what the consequences to them might be, whether they were in a prison cell or in that House, they would have the consciousness that the Plan of Campaign had done good work in the past, and, despite coercion, would do good work in the future. Their conviction would do the Tory Government very little good. They had often tried coercion before; but the Anglo - Irish difficulty still survived. They had sent men to prison and to the block; but they had not broken the spirit of the Irish people—they had not quenched their desire to have legislative freedom, nor shaken their purpose to have sitting in Ireland a Parliament which, though subservient to the Imperial Parliament in all Imperial matters, should have authority to legislate for the wants and requirements of the Irish people. They might send the traversers to prison; but when the prison doors were locked on them the landlords of Ireland would not be one inch nearer their object, and the English Government would not find a smoother path to their goal of subjugating Ireland. He might tell the House many a harrowing story of the poor people whose homes he and his hon. Friends had saved and whose pockets they had protected. He had listened with much feeling and sympathy to the speech delivered the other evening by the hon. Member for Darlington (Mr. Theodore Fry), and also afterwards to the speech of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). The hon. Member for Darlington had declared, in reference to the technical question of the arrears that were pressing on the tenants of Ireland, that a large portion of these arrears was made up of law costs; and the hon. Member for Northampton, examining the question from an economic point of view, showed that the first charge on the land should be that which enabled the tenant to live and thrive, and the second charge the rent due to the landlord. But, in fact, the first charge on the land in Ireland was neither that which would enable the peasant to live and thrive nor the rent that went to the landlord, but the law costs which went to the agent. The men who lived and thrived and made their fortunes out of the land in Ireland were neither the landlords nor the tenants, but the agents of the landlords and the solicitors connected with them; and he knew it to be the fact in the West of Ireland that they had thrown obstacles in the way of tenants paying rent in time, so that they might serve writs and processes on them, for which they must receive payment before the landlord got a single penny. In one case, a poor widow, with a rent of only £5, had paid from the 1st of November, 1883, in addition to her rent, £9 2*s.* in costs—that was to say, she had paid to the land agent about twice the sum which she owed to the landlord for rent. He would put a suggestion to the Inland Revenue—that some steps should be taken to prevent land agents giving such receipts as he held in his hand to tenants. On one side was the ordinary receipt for the rent, and, instead of giving a separate receipt for the law costs, they wrote it on the back of the rent receipt. Hon. Members might assist the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) in becoming economical by inducing the Inland Revenue to charge these land agents 1*d.* for every receipt they gave for law costs above £2. In conclusion, he would say that every humane man, who was not charged too much with political passion, whether Tory or Whig, would admit that they were warranted in making a desperate fight to save the homes and the lives of their people, and in fighting to the death the system of land tenure which existed in Ireland. He believed that there could be neither peace nor comfort nor happiness in Ireland until that system of land tenure was broken down; and that, even when that system was broken down, there could still be no lasting peace or prosperity in Ireland until the British Parliament gave into the hands of the Irish people, landlords and tenants alike, the control and direction of the domestic affairs of their own country.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.) said, he thought that the speech of the hon. Member for North Mayo (Mr. Crilly), who had just sat down, was an admission that the Plan of Campaign was not a scheme for securing fair rents but to promote the abolition of all rent. It must dispose entirely of that gloss which hon. Members below and above the Gangway opposite had chosen to place upon the agitation which had been disturbing Ireland for the last few months. The junior Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) evidently felt very strongly the sentimental side of the question of evictions. Undoubtedly, the misery which had followed on the evictions appealed to the feelings of hon. Members on both sides; but he hoped before they allowed their compassionate feelings to be aroused—which might be entirely misplaced — they would examine the facts and circumstances that had occurred, in order to form an opinion upon whose shoulders the blame for these evictions must be placed. It was his aim to prove that they were to be attributed to the action of hon. Members below the Gangway. The hon. Member for Northampton had expressed his opinion that the evictions were the cause, and the National League and the Plan of Campaign the effect; but he should have examined the facts of the case before he arrived at such a conclusion. An analysis of the evictions that took place in the first six months of last year would show that they were not very harsh or very numerous, and that they could not have entailed any very great misery. A Parliamentary Paper laid upon the Table when the Tenants' Relief Bill was before the House last Session showed that the total number of evictions for the six months ending June last amounted to 2,007. Those evictions had been investigated, and full details received in 1,233 cases. In the first place, it had been found that 15 per cent of those evictions took place in houses in cities and towns ; 21 were from town parks ; 143 were from unoccupied farms, or farms derelict. That would leave, out of the total number of 1,233 cases, 878 evictions to be accounted for from agricultural holdings that were in the occupation of tenants. Of these, 118 were on title—that was, the persons evicted were trespassers, and had no right to be there. That left 760 cases to be accounted for. He did not know what the law was when those evictions took place; but at present the landlord was bound, under a penalty of £20, to give notice to the Poor Law officials of the evictions, in order that they might provide accommodation for the evicted persons. Of the 760 he found that 250 of the tenants so evicted were immediately reinstated as tenants, while 377 were reinstated as caretakers; so that out of the whole number of 1,233 cases there were only 117, or rather less than 10 per cent, in which tenants were evicted and not re-admitted. With regard to the sentimental side of the question, he would draw attention to the following significant fact:—If public opinion had been so much aroused as to the desperate state of the Irish tenants, would they not have expected to find the fund which had been set on foot to relieve their necessities swelled by an enormous amount? But the sums of money received by hon. Gentlemen opposite below the Gangway showed a totally different result. For the general purposes of the National League, during the half-year ending December 31, the National League received £8,000; for the Parliamentary Fund they received £43,000; but for the evicted tenants they only received £200. It appeared to him that these figures were conclusive as to the sentimental feeling of the public on this point. It was impossible to suppose that the evicted tenants' fund would have amounted to so small a sum if their condition had been so lamentable as had been represented by hon. Members opposite. He would recall the attention of hon. Members to the fact, that there was no anticipation in the early part of the autumn last year of evictions. They could not be expected at that time, for there was no reason to suppose that the rent would not be paid, and there was a better feeling prevailing. There was a revival of security and trust for the future, and a fair prospect of peaceful relations in the autumn and winter between landlord and tenant. That was the exact opposite of the state of things predicted by the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) when the Tenants' Relief Bill was before the House. The policy of the National League, on the other hand, received in the last Session a defeat in this House. Its prestige in Ireland had been enormously diminished, and the supplies from America were arriving in diminished volume. It was, therefore, absolutely necessary for its Leaders to revive that prestige, and to justify the policy of introducing the Relief Bill; and on that account it was that the hon. Member for East Mayo introduced to the public in Ireland the Plan of Campaign. It was introduced with a good deal of mystery; its authorship was not avowed; but at length the hon. Member for Fermanagh (Mr. W. Redmond) revealed to the public the real authors of the Plan. He said —

"It was the mercy of God that put into the minds of Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Brien this Plan of Campaign."

He had also told them why the Plan was propounded, and he (Mr. Macartney) found it was not because of the agricultural condition of Ireland.

MR. W. REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.) asked the hon. Member to quote the speech from which he was reading more fully.

MR. MACARTNEY, in reply, said, that he was reading from a report which appeared in *United Ireland* on December 11, and, no more of the speech being reported than he had read, he could not give it. The hon. Member, according to that report, told his hearers that it was not because of the condition of the tenantry of Ireland that the Plan was started, but because the English people refused to give any concession to Ireland. The Plan of Campaign was also stated to be the platform of national independence; and Mr. W. O'Brien, as one of its authors, had declared that it had been started for the purpose of freeing Ireland from landlordism and British rule, which were spoken of as the two great curses of the country. Ireland had been the scene of much agitation in the past; but he (Mr. Macartney) ventured to assert that never on any occasion had an agitation been forced upon the country so wantonly, needlessly, and cruelly as this Plan. He would refer the House to the speech of the hon. Member for South Monaghan (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) the other night, who had told them that nothing approached in baseness the application of the Plan of Campaign to his estate. When the plan of Campaign had first been brought forward it had been received not only with indifference, but with absolute apathy. For the first few weeks it had fallen completely flat, and it was not taken up by the tenants until after desperate exertions on the part of hon. Members opposite, who promised them that if they joined in the Campaign they would find that it would be extremely worth their while. At the Central Branch of the National League in Dublin, Mr. W. O'Brien, speaking of the period at which the Plan of Campaign had first been brought before the country, said that he feared many people had looked upon the Plan of Campaign as rather a forlorn and wild proposal. It was then necessary to put the country through its facings, and the various branches of the National League were put into motion; but this indifference to the work of their saviours still pervaded the tenants in Ireland, and the hon. Member for East Mayo, on the 7th of November last, had been obliged to confess that the people of many districts, while pleased to read of the fights of tenants elsewhere, did not like to fight themselves, and that they had not the courage to do so. That opinion had been corroborated by the hon. Member for the St. Patrick's Division of Dublin (Mr. Murphy), when he had spoken of the "educational policy" going on rapidly. What was that educational policy? It had been carried on upon the platforms of the National League, and without it the Plan of Campaign would never have succeeded, even in the instances where it had done so. Public meetings were held, and orders given to the agents of the local branches of the League. Committeemen were ordered out, and sent round the country to see all the tenants on the estate, or in the neighbourhood, who had not paid, and these tenants were given a certain day up to which they were free to give in their money. If they did not, they were subjected to the coercion of the local branch, denounced as slaves and cowards, and warned of the judgment of the National League whenever it was in a position to carry out its decrees. No tenant in Ireland, however desirous he might be to fulfil his legal obligations, had the power of withdrawing from this conspiracy to rob, once he had become a party to it. The hon. Member for East Mayo enforced the decisions of local branches of the League by reference to the power which it was able to exercise, and which had kept 400 farms in one county alone without occupiers. It was difficult for hon. Members in that House to imagine the extent and authority of that power; but it could be best explained by saying that it possessed that authority and influence in Ireland which the majesty of the law possessed here, and which it did not possess there. It was not necessary for the hon. Member for East Mayo to define it to his hearers; what that power had done in former years was stamped upon their recollection by many outrages and crimes; and it would have been impossible for a tenant, unless he chose to mulct himself by paying a double rent, to do anything but join his neighbours in what, in many cases, he considered to be an illegal conspiracy. But not only coercion had been employed; it had been found necessary to hold out bribes as well, and tenants were told that if they came into the Plan of Campaign they would be paid far more than they could make out of the profits of their farms. Even this had not been as successful as hon. Members opposite had hoped, and the hon. Member for East Galway (Mr. Harris) had said that he could not disguise the fact that there were men among them who had paid at the miserable reduction of 15 per cent. The object of the Plan was not to obtain such reductions as might be necessary under the difficult circumstances of the time, but practically to make the payment of rent in Ireland impossible. [“No!” *from the Home Rule Benches.*] Hon. Members would no doubt deny that; but other people would draw a different conclusion from their speeches. It was part and parcel of the policy of the National League and of hon. Members opposite to do away with all rent in Ireland. They wanted to upset the Constitution. [“No, no!”] If hon. Members opposite denied that, he would refer them to the words of the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) who, speaking in America, said—

> “I want you to understand that the reduction of rent we require is no small or petty one, but the total abolition of rent.”

That was the policy which was aimed at at the present moment, and that was what hon. Members opposite hoped to attain, and not merely a temporary relief in respect of agricultural depression. The National League had often objected to and opposed an amicable arrangement between landlord and tenant, and in the last few months had done their best to prevent any agreement being arrived at. What the National League intended was to usurp the functions of a Court of Law in Ireland. Hon. Members opposite said that the National League was not a secret society. He quite admitted that it was not; but it was engaged in as dangerous a conspiracy as any secret society ever was—a conspiracy against the first principles of law and order. As the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had said some years ago, the struggle was between the law on one side and lawlessness on the other. The National League claimed to be conducting a Constitutional agitation; in reality, it was aiming at upsetting the Constitution of the Three Kingdoms. [An hon. MEMBER: It is not so.] On this side of the water, Nationalist Members were wont to pose as Constitutional agitators; on the other side of the water, however, they appeared in quite a different figure, using unmistakable language full of menace to all the best interests of Ireland. It would, indeed, be impossible for them to retain the sympathy of their friends in America if their agitation had anything Constitutional about it. This Plan of Campaign had been forced on the people of Ireland, and there had been no hesitation as to the means employed to carry it out. The hon. Member for East Mayo had, in one of his speeches, stated that he would not raise his voice against any excesses of the people; and Mr. W. O'Brien had stated that the Government would have to face the consequences, and he added significantly — “God forbid that the Irish people should lie down and die without a struggle.” In a subsequent speech, he pointed out that the struggle would not be a peaceful one. In the course of the agitation the landlords, and those who sided with them, had been threatened with the “day of reckoning,” and they were told that those who were the friends and those who were the enemies of the people—that was, of the National League—would be remembered and rewarded or punished accordingly. Were English Members, on either side of the House, prepared to give their support to a Party which made “the day of reckoning” so conspicuous an element in their future policy in Ireland? The language of hon. Members opposite had been full of menace to all the best interests of Ireland; but the Loyalists of Ireland, fighting as they were for what the right hon. Gentlemen the Member for Mid Lothian termed “the elementary principles of civilized society,” felt confident that they would be victorious in the end. It was true the Government had asked for additional powers, and hon. Members on the Opposition side told them that the power demanded was an invasion of free government; but, he would ask, were free Governments to be less capable than absolute Governments of maintaining law and order, and were they to be deprived of methods which all other Governments had? In doing so the Government were only putting themselves in possession of that which Lord Grey declared to be "the condition of all free Governments." With regard to the paragraph in the Most Gracious Speech which referred to local government in Ireland, he admitted that there were difficulties in the way of granting it which did not exist for England and Scotland; but he hoped that a measure would be introduced for all the three countries at the same time, and that it would be of such a nature as to take away the assertions that hon. Members opposite had not the same power in joining in the local government of their country as was enjoyed by hon. Members representing English and Scotch constituencies. Besides, he did not think it would be for the advantage of that country that the measure should be unduly delayed.

MR. CRILLY said he wished, as a personal explanation, to say that the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Macartney) had not correctly represented him. He did not say that the Plan of Campaign was adopted, not for the purpose of reducing rent, but for the purpose of abolishing it. On the contrary, he said the Plan of Campaign was not for the total abolition of rent, but for the reducing of unjust rents.

MR. CALEB WRIGHT (Lancashire, S.W., Leigh) said, he desired to draw attention to the great increase in the Military and Naval Estimates in recent years. For many years, financial affairs had been grossly neglected in that House by successive Governments. During the last 14 years, from 1874 to 1886, Expenditure had increased from £71,000,000 to £92,000,000. This monstrous expenditure could not go on without injury to the trade and commerce of the country. Excessive taxation was a national injury, and no class felt it more than working men; and he was therefore glad to see the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) was making a stand against this continued extravagant expenditure. In 1870 the Naval Estimates were £8,500,000, last year they amounted to £13,000,000; the Army Estimates in 1870 were £12,000,000; last year they were £18,000,000. The debates on the Estimates during last Session disclosed an amount of incompetence and extravagance in these Departments which had caused great dissatisfaction among all Parties, and he believed the country would demand retrenchment and reform. Yet, while these large increases of expenditure had been going on, the Military and Naval Authorities had been constantly representing the country as being in a state of insecurity; and year by year Parliament had been asked for more and more money—for more war ships and more big guns, although they had not agreed among themselves as to the proper sort of guns and ships they needed. But there was the greatest variety of opinion among naval men as to what was wanted. Some cried out for big guns—five of which when obtained burst—others for torpedoes, and others for rams and small vessels. At a lecture delivered not long ago at the United Service Institution, Major General Codrington pointed out that France, Germany, and Russia had each over 400,000 men under arms, and that any of them could, without difficulty, select 150,000 choice troops for the purpose of invading England. The lecturer stated that in 24 hours a fleet of merchant steamers would be ready to convey from one of those countries six or seven Army Corps of 30,000 men each, and that the preparations could be made in a time of peace without exciting attention or arousing suspicion. With reference to this point, he would like to ask for what we paid our Ambassadors and Diplomatic Agents, if not to inform the Government of transactions such as the lecturer described? General Codrington further stated that we ought to have an organized Naval Reserve, corresponding to the system of Military Reserves adopted on the Continent. This formation of a large Naval Reserve with a view of meeting an imaginary evil would never, he felt sure, be sanctioned by the House of Commons. The House should remember what Lord Salisbury told the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, speaking on the depression of trade, a short time ago. His Lordship said—

> "The real cause of the increase of protective duties is the establishment of these gigantic military forces which are increasing every year in every one of these large countries of this hemisphere, and constitute a permanent drain

on the forces of industry, and a permanent danger to commerce."

The other evening the House was told by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington that the Military and Naval Authorities controlled the Government. If that were so, then he thought the sooner they reversed that state of things the better, so that the Government might control the men who wished to urge them to incur expenditure. But if they could not do that, the House should control the Government, and demand the large reduction of expenditure, which those who sat on the Opposition side of the House believed might be made without impairing the Services, and with the effect of increasing their efficiency.

COMMANDER BETHELL (York, E. R., Holderness) said, hon. Members from Ireland sometimes expressed surprise that those on the other side of the House did not readily accept the evidence which they offered as to the state of Ireland. He would give them a reason for that—and, in doing so, he did not refer to his own authority, but to that of a man who had lately addressed to the Irish people, and particularly to the Nationalists, something of a rebuke and something of a reproach. This was a man who belonged to a generation which was passing away—a man who was a warm sympathizer with the Irish cause, and a practical exile from this country for the part he took in the National movement. This was Sir Charles Gavan Duffy; and he had recently reproached the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) with ingratitude, and he proceeded to place his finger on what was the weak spot in the Irish cause. He said—"You have failed to fuse together in Ireland the conflicting interests which you found there—the North and the South"—and then went on to point out that the fusion of these two distinct Parties in Ireland was the key to the solution of the Irish Question. By these statements Sir Charles Duffy had placed his finger upon what constituted the strength of the Conservative Party in connection with the Irish Question and the weakness of their opponents. Take the agrarian question. How could they, who believed they were impartial, accept evidence given them on the agrarian question, when those who supplied the evidence were pledged to the eyes, as far as they possibly could be, to extirpate Irish landlords, and were thus themselves parties to the suit awaiting the judgment of the country. Neither could they accept the evidence altogether of the Irish Members who sat on the Ministerial side of the House. That was the main reason which induced him, last Session, to vote against the Tenants' Relief Bill of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). The House was asked, almost solely on the evidence of hon. Members opposite, to break a great contract; and he, for one, refused, without independent evidence, to give his vote to the breaking of that contract. He was not at all of opinion that the mere fact that the Irish rent was fixed, in some sense, by Parliament, made it most easy, or possible, for tenants to pay it; and he was glad the Government, last Session, issued a Commission to inquire into the Land Act of 1881; and he presumed that, on the Report of that Commission, something would be done to settle the question. The declaration of Sir Charles Duffy supplied a very strong argument against the legislation proposed by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone). It recognized that in Ireland there were two classes, which, though once fused by the efforts of the writer's Party, were now again separate and antagonistic. A few nights ago the Chief Secretary for Ireland offered a defence of the policy which had been pursued recently by the Government. He asserted the two principles, that whoever was charged with the Government of Ireland had no business to refuse the protection of the law to all those who demanded it. That was generally admitted; but he said another thing, which was not so generally admitted. That was that the Government might justly use its influence, whether in the way of persuasion, or suggestion, or conciliation, to assuage the bitter differences between landlord and tenant with the view to obviate, if possible, a resort to the powers of the law. That, he thought, might almost meet with the approval of anyone, though it had been questioned. No one doubted that the pressure used by the Chief Secretary for Ireland was both legal and moral; but he found it very difficult to follow the workings of the minds of those hon. Gentlemen who contended that the pressure used by the Plan of Campaign was moral. For his own part, he did not find much difficulty, resolving the Plan of Campaign into its natural elements, in asserting that every one of its elements contained an immoral doctrine. It was immoral for a man, no matter whether to a tailor or to a landlord, to refuse to pay his debts; it was immoral to use money improperly withheld for the purpose of perfecting an engine for the repudiation of the debt; and it was no less immoral for those who were educated and intelligent to recommend that course to others. It was, indeed, argued that on account of dual ownership the debt of the tenant could scarcely be called an ordinary debt; but the Acts of 1870 and 1881 did not give a legal sanction to an original right; they initiated the tenant's ownership in the land—["No, no!"]—subject to the condition that a certain rent should be paid, and apart from that the dual ownership did not exist. He could not find any defence of the Plan of Campaign on the considerations offered by Archbishop Croke. An eminent historian said recently—"A great idea never lays down its arms with impunity for its country." They—the Conservatives—believed they were maintaining a great idea in seeking to maintain the Legislative Union; and he had no doubt hon. Members opposite thought they were doing the same thing by seeking to dissolve it. They—the Conservatives—certainly could not lay down their arms in their cause; and he admitted hon. Members opposite could not, because if the cause was really deep in the hearts of the Irish people, if they laid down their arms others would arise, and the difficulty would only be postponed for a while. It was much better that the battle should now be fought out to its ultimate and bitter end. He hoped it would be fought by his side in such a manner as to get rid of and pulverize the idea represented by hon. Members opposite—not by crushing it down, but by studying more carefully the characteristics of the Irish people, in order that the legislation which flowed from that House might be more in accordance with their wishes than it had been in the past.

MR. W. A. MACDONALD (Queen's County, Ossory) said, that a right hon. Gentleman, who had an important seat in the Government, but no seat in the House, had lately spoken about making his will. The Government, he (Mr. Macdonald) thought, had made their will, and it was contained in the Queen's Speech, the document which they were now considering. They had, indeed, heard of a codicil, which was a preparation which would require the residuary legatee to pay the modest sum of £6,000,000 for military and naval expenditure, but he believed that before the codicil was executed, the testator would have died. The Tory Government were weakened by the resignation of the noble Lord opposite (Lord Randolph Churchill) and by their refusal to adopt the policy of the Dartford speech, and they were also discredited by the peculiar course they had adopted in Ireland. That had also discredited them; and he believed that a Government which a few months ago had a prospect of living three or four years, could not now live for more than three or four months longer. He said that, because he never knew an Administration which, in so short a time, had been so tremendously discredited as the present Government. It was once supposed that the policy of the Government was to be found in the Dartford speech. According to that, Ireland was to be governed by the ordinary law, the Irish Members were to be gagged, and England and Scotland were to have legislation of a radical character. It was a very clever policy, but the noble Lord did not consider the circumstances of his Party; he did not realize that he was the only Member of it who possessed anything like original ability, and the power to understand and act in a crisis like this. If the Government had recognized that it was their own objects that were promoted by the Plan of Campaign, there would have been peace in Ireland, and no prospect of a Coercion Bill. Then, a great blow was struck at the Government by the melancholy circumstances attending the tragic death of Lord Iddesleigh. According to the medical testimony, the worry, anxiety, and trouble which that most amiable and kindly statesman suffered at the hands of one of his Colleagues and of his Leader, had the effect of shortening his life. ["No, no!" *from the Ministerialists.*] In saying that he expressed not only his own opinion, but, he believed, the opinion of the country at large. The final blow was given to the Government when they had to send round begging for some one to take the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer; and they ultimately took a man whom everybody before knew perfectly well to be at heart a Tory, and who would be indebted to a Tory constituency for a seat in this House, and who was unable to obtain a seat in a popular constituency. An hon. Member had said in the course of the debate, that the Plan of Campaign was disapproved by the people of this country. He (Mr. Macdonald) was astonished when he heard that statement; and in presence of it, he was forced to the belief that many hon. Members opposite, as regards that matter, appeared to be up in a balloon, for they really did not know the state of feeling existing in their own country at the present time. He had attended a large number of popular meetings in the country, in Devonshire, Cornwall, and in the neighbourhood of Lancashire, and when he had fairly and fully explained the objects and aim of the Plan of Campaign, instead of being disapproved of, it was received with unanimity and enthusiasm by the meetings. Any serious opposition to the Plan of Campaign on the part of the rank and file of the Liberal Party in England absolutely did not exist. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) had written a letter in reply to an hon. Member in which he said, that whatever suffering might arise from the evictions on the Glenbeigh estate was to be traced to the previous action of others;. but the other night he abandoned that position, and admitted the truth of the statement that the tenants on that estate were unable to pay their rents. If that was so—if the poor people were unable to pay the money demanded of them — it was absurd to say that the miserable things done at those evictions were due to the actions of others. The right hon. Gentleman said he was anxiously considering the condition of those poor tenants with a view to improving it, and he, added, that if any hon. Member would place a plan for this object before him—a plan that should, at the same time, be consistent with the maintenance of the rights of property as those rights were understood in England and Scotland—he would give it his serious consideration. Now, there was a doctrine of political economy which was also a doctrine of common sense, and he would commend it to the attention of the right hon. Gentleman as suggesting the lines on which he should proceed. There was land confessedly so barren that it would not pay to cultivate it on any terms; and there was land so rich that it would yield a profit to the farmer, and, at the same time, pay a rent to the landlord. There was land, again, only sufficiently fertile to keep life in the man who toiled upon it, and which could not possibly yield any rent. It was land of the latter sort which the poor tenants on the Glenbeigh estate had to deal with; and the idea that the poor people could be evicted for the non-payment of rent which the land did not produce, was altogether unjust and unfair. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had also told them that he had exercised pressure on the landlords; but that this pressure was of a moral and persuasive kind only, and within the law. He was careful, however, not to say what that pressure was. What was it? He would like the right hon. Gentleman to explain what were the arguments he addressed to some of the Irish landlords. And why was the right hon. Gentleman so anxious to assure them that he only exercised moral pressure? Because he did not wish to admit that he had been exercising a dispensing power in Ireland. The law of eviction in Ireland was a bad law, and should not be carried out. If a law equally as vicious prevailed in England, if there were certain to be great disturbances, great difficulties, and great discontent as the result of carrying out that law, the Government would not use the law if they could possibly avoid it. The carrying out of the law of eviction in Ireland was, he believed, the outcome of the extraordinary love of the English fetish—the love of law and order. There was so much said about it in the House, that he was absolutely sick of the subject. A law should be respected and obeyed so long as it was a good, just, and merciful law; but, when a law was unjust and cruel, so far from it being entitled to reverence because it was a law, it was deserving of less respect. On that account, it was deserving of no respect at all, and the sooner they got rid of the absurd idea that the law must be respected—whether good or bad—the better it would be for them all. He had been much interested in reading some remarks made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain), who had spoken of the law with extraordinary reverence. The right hon. Gentleman asked what law was, and said it was the security of the weak against the strong, the protection of the poor against the rich, and the safeguard of the few against the many; but he (Mr. Macdonald) could only say that the law as it was known in Ireland—the law of eviction, the law of rent—was directly the reverse of all this. Instead of the law protecting the weak there, it sacrified the weak to the strong; instead of the law preserving to the poor man in Ireland the possession of what was his own according to all moral considerations, it deprived him of it; instead of the law being a friend to the poor Irish tenant, it was his enemy. There was only one other matter to which he would refer—namely, the agrarian question in Ireland. It had been said by the right hon. Member for West Birmingham that, if the agrarian question was settled, they should not hear any more of Home Rule; and the hon. Member for South-West Lancashire (Mr. Curzon) said the other night that the Irish Celt cared for nothing but his pocket. But was that true? He did not believe that anyone could say that of Michael Davitt, for instance, an Irish Celt of the Celts. It was true that the people of Ireland wanted a settlement of the Land Question, but they wanted a settlement of the National Question still more, and until that question was settled there could be no peace or contentment in Ireland. And the settlement they wanted was one which must give to Ireland a real, and not a merely fanciful, control over her own affairs, and must include an Irish Parliament and an Irish Executive responsible to that Parliament. That was the least they would take, and if anybody supposed they would take anything less than was offered in the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) he did not understand the Irish Members and the Irish people.

MR. MASON (Lanark, Mid) said, he wished to direct attention to the expenditure of the country—a question to which he had devoted attention from the time he had entered Parliament, when he had proposed that the Estimates might be revised by a Committee before they were submitted to the House. He thought that the debate showed that this question had made a very distinct advance, and the practical outcome, he believed, would be that a Committee would, in all probability, be granted by the Government and the House. He had listened to the speeches of the noble Lords the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton), and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Edinburgh (Mr. Childers). The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Edinburgh said that the proposal which had been made by the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill), and partially adopted by the First Lord of the Admiralty, was identical with one which was proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) when Prime Minister, and when the right hon. Member for South Edinburgh was Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was glad to hear that such high authorities were in favour of the method, but he was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman, when he was in Office, did not do something to advance this proposal which he had so much at heart. However, it was a good thing to find both the Front Benches in accord. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington wrote a letter to an elector of Glasgow about a month ago. The noble Lord was rather in the habit of writing letters expressing his most advanced opinions to Glasgow gentlemen; about a year and a-half ago he wrote one to a Glasgow gentleman in which that famous sentence occurred about Ulster being called upon to fight, and that Ulster would be right in doing so. In the letter he wrote about a month ago, the noble Lord referred to the advance of expenditure in three very distinct periods during the last 20 years, in which he said that the gross expenditure of this country from 1868 to 1874, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian was Prime Minister, was "satisfactory"; from

1874 to 1880, under the Premiership of Lord Beaconsfield, was "not quite so satisfactory"; and from 1880 to 1886, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian was Prime Minister, was "simply infamous"—a very strong word, he must confess. What, however, were the facts in connection with these periods? He had looked them out in the Statistical Abstract on the preceding evening, and he found that the gross expenditure of this country during these three periods was as follows:—In the first period, the average expenditure was £72,000,000 per annum; in the second period it was £79,588,000; and in the last period it was £86,507,000. He did not say that that expenditure was justifiable of a Liberal more than any other Government, but he would say that it was extravagant. The cause of that expenditure was quite another matter. But there was another fact, and it was this—he was astonished to find that in 1874 the unfunded or floating debt was only £4,479,000; but when the next Liberal Government came into power, it was no less than £27,344,000. He never had any doubt that the House of Commons had practically no control over the Estimates. He admitted that the policy of the Government must dominate the expenditure of the country, and he admitted that the Government in power was to a very great extent reflecting the majority of the hon. Members of this House, and of the country; but that was not the question he was discussing. The real question was this—Did they really get value for the money spent? £90,000,000 a-year was a sum of money they ought not to be spending on the government and defences of the country; and, he believed it was becoming the feeling of the wealth-producers of the country, that no Government, whether Liberal or Tory, was worthy of their confidence unless they could make up their minds and determine that the country should be governed and defended efficiently for not more than £75,000,000 a-year. He held that they could cut down the expenditure to that amount with safety, and that, if they did so, they would immediately relieve the springs of commerce, wages would rise, the money now wasted would be applied to productive sources, and everyone in the country would feel the effect of it. There was no reason why they should not do so. It was not so long since Mr. Cobden stated that the Government and the defences of the country should be carried on for £50,000,000 a-year; and, making allowances for the difference between that time and the present, he (Mr. Mason) held that the expenditure for the Government and defence of the country should not be more than £75,000,000 per annum. Whilst he freely admitted that the policy of a Government must dominate the expenditure, he wished to know whether or not they were getting value for the money they were spending so lavishly. The Departmental scandals that had been spoken of by the noble Lord the Member for Paddington, and by numerous speakers in the course of the debate, and the evidence given to them lately, had shown very clearly that they were not getting value for their money. Brittle swords, bending bayonets, jamming cartridges, bursting guns, rotten food, and ships that when ready to launch were found to be obsolete and useless, was a list condemnatory of the way in which the affairs of this country were managed. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Edinburgh in his speech told them that the Army had increased by 15,000 men; but, at the same time, the right hon. Gentleman told them that the expenditure had increased by £4,000,000. Surely, there was in this a great disproportion between the additional number of men and the expenditure. This was a question that required great consideration, especially when they bore in mind the fact that, during the last seven or 10 years, the value of clothing and all other supplies required for the Service had gone down from 50 to 30 per cent. Yet, in face of this immense fall in the value of all commodities, the expenditure had increased by £4,000,000, whilst the additional number of men was only 15,000. That being so, he thought he was entitled to ask where the money had gone? What had become of this enormous sum of money, for which there was apparently no explanation or reason given? The same right hon. Gentleman stated that during his experience—extending over 27 years—he never saw a sensible reduction made in the Estimates by the House of

Commons. That was precisely the contention of all economists, both in and outside of the House of Commons; and they held that the House of Commons had practically lost all control over the Estimates. It was in consequence of this that he had raised the question that they should have some other method set in motion by which they might be able to overhaul and revise the Estimates before they came to the House pledged and supported by the Government of the day. Then came the question of the method—whether it should be by a Select or a Standing Committee. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Edinburgh recommended that it should be done by a Select Committee, and he was glad to find that both Front Benches agreed in this—that there should be some sort of Committee. He thought a Committee of any kind would lead to beneficial results; but he failed to see why they should not have the Estimates brought before a Standing Committee. Still, he thought it was absolutely necessary they should be revised and overhauled every year, and not merely in the present year. The reason given by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Edinburgh for rejecting the Standing Committee, did not appear to him to be a very satisfactory one. The right hon. Gentleman said that if they sent the Estimates to a Standing Committee they would be bidding good-bye to all control over the Army and Navy administration. To him it appeared that they had already lost all control over both the Army and Navy administration. The First Lord of the Admiralty seemed to be disposed to give way in regard to a Standing Committee, provided that the Government of the day were not to be committed to its decision. When he introduced the question last year, he stated that he had no intention of depriving the Government of its responsibility, nor to hamper the action of the House, but to assist individual Members in cutting down the Estimates. The Committee of which he then spoke would strengthen the Government of the day. He did not cast any reflection upon the First Lord of the Admiralty, or the Secretary of State for War, either in the present or past Administrations; but he merely said that these right hon. Gentlemen could not possibly have the knowledge in connection with supplies and the value of ships and material that experts had, and, therefore, in regard to the Army and Navy contracts they were constantly called upon to sanction, they would be very much strengthened and supported if experts from the House of Commons were appointed to work with them in overhauling the Estimates. The reason for this was very simple. Ministers came and went, but the heads of Departments went on for ever. It was quite clear that if these right hon. Gentlemen had not the knowledge, the heads of the Departments were practically the masters of the situation; and, having all the technical knowledge, they were apt to be careless, if not worse, if they were not looked after. As the Government had evidently turned their attention to this question, if they would appoint a Committee of some kind to carry it out, they would receive the support of many hon. Members on that, the Opposition, side of the House. He would not have spoken in this debate but for the prominence that had been given to this question; but, before sitting down, he wished to say a few words on another point of great importance—that of finding a solution to the terrible Irish problem that blocked the way. No legislation was likely to be accomplished until they got this serious Irish Question out of the way. He visited Ireland in October, and came back with the strong conviction that the Irish demands were just; and that they must face the question in a conciliatory way that would solve it; and by doing so they would unite the Irish people more closely to the English and Scotch than had ever been the case before. The representation of the Irish people, which was now ample, showed clearly what the Irish demands really were. The Irish people were undoubtedly at the back of their Representatives, and, unless they reduced representative institutions to a complete mockery, they must accede to the demands of 85 per cent. of the Irish people by giving them Home Rule. He did not believe in the dangers which the opponents of Home Rule had conjured up in connection with this great question. He was sure if they met the Irish demands, they would find the Irish people joining England, Scotland, and Wales in carrying forward the future greatness of this country, in a way they had never done before. He was sorry he could not congratulate the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington on the references he made in respect to Ireland. He was glad that the noble Lord had come round to the question of economy, but he regretted that he had not made the same progress in connection with the Irish Question. If the noble Lord had announced his views in the direction of Home Rule, he believed that he would probably have settled the question; and they would have seen a solution of the difficulty either this year or next, which would have satisfied both countries alike. He regretted that justice should not be done to the sister country during the present year. The Irish were an interesting and warm-hearted people—there was no more warm-hearted or better race of people under the sun. He regretted that this great question should not have been settled during a year in which they were all looking forward to congratulations in connection with the benignant reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty—a Jubilee year, which would have been a fitting time to settle this question of giving to the Irish people those just demands of which they had been so long deprived.

Mr. SETON-KARR (St. Helen's) said, that if he were inclined to be critical with regard to the financial paragraph in the Queen's Speech, he would say that of late years Ministers had been in the habit of making professions of economy which they subsequently did not act up to. In 1868 the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) professed to desire the abolition of the Income Tax, yet he had gone on increasing it ever since. In 1880 he sailed into power chiefly under the flag of economy, yet, in the short space of five years, he plunged this country into a greater amount of taxation than had ever been known before. These were no doubt matters of ancient history; but, at all events, the expenditure had left a legacy of debt on the present year which was not a matter of ancient history. The large expenditure of which they had heard so much from the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, was inherited from the faults of the Liberal Party. With regard to the resignation of the noble Lord the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, his case was that there was a necessity for absolute and unconditional retrenchment, and he set that up as an idol to which they must all bow down. He admitted the ability with which the noble Lord had stated his case, but suggested that that case did not hold water, because the premises on which he founded his arguments seemed to be unsound. He could not agree with the noble Lord as to the paramount, absolute necessity for retrenchment under all circumstances. No doubt it pleased popular constituencies, but it was not absolute and unconditional, and depended on the efficiency of our Army and Navy. They were absolutely required for the defence of our commerce and industries at home and abroad, and must be kept in a state efficient for that purpose. If they admitted the principle of absolute retrenchment, the measure of the national expenditure in any year was not to be the growing needs of the Empire, but the personal opinion of the Minister of the Crown who happened to possess the greatest force of character and the strongest will. He did not advocate extravagant expenditure, but they had it on the authority of the wisest of the Jewish Kings that there was a time to save and a time to spend. Instead of unnecessarily sacrificing himself, he thought the noble Lord would have done better had he devoted his great ability to seeing that the nation got fair value for its money, for that seemed to be the direction in which all true national economy ought to go. The hon. Baronet the Member for the Cockermouth Division of Cumberland (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) approved of the noble Lord's resignation on the ground, apparently, that all warfare was wrong and the Tory policy was warlike, and that in the resignation of the noble Lord he thought he saw a true repentance from Tory Policy. As to all warfare being wrong, the hon. Baronet might one day find himself in the position of the Quaker who went a voyage. The ship on which he sailed was attacked by pirates, and the Quaker did not disdain to take up a handspike with the rest; but, as he plied his weapon, he accompanied every blow with the exclamation—"Friend, keep to thine own ship." It did not follow because the hon. Baronet had turned his sword into a ploughshare that they should all follow his example. He doubted whether the hon. Baronet meant what he said on the subject of war; but, taking him at his word, he might remind him of the elements of International Law, which told them that where they had hostile nations with opposing interests the sword was the only final tribunal to which they could appeal. Unfortunately, the millennium of peace was yet far off, and, in the meantime, this country could not escape from the responsibility of protecting the lives and liberties of her subjects and of her Colonists all over the world, however wicked and deplorable warfare might be. In their speeches with reference to Ireland, hon. Members below the Gangway opposite had ignored altogether the fact that it was the first duty of any Government to protect the lives, the property, and the liberty of its subjects. They seemed to think that hardship or poverty was sufficient excuse for any amount of political agitation, inflammatory language, or lawlessness. It was not, however, the province of legislation to indulge in sentiment, and allow the law to be broken with impunity. He believed that any Government which permitted such a state of things to continue would be rapidly swept from Office by the indignant constituencies. He asked those hon. Members why they did not resort to other methods for the relief of the distress in Ireland. Why, for instance—pending the legitimate and final settlement of the Irish Question—did they not appeal to public sympathy, and why did they not utilize some of those dollars which came across the Atlantic in such large quantities, but as to the destination of which we were so profoundly ignorant, in a benevolent way, for the relief of those poor people? Ireland was not the only part of the United Kingdom in which poverty, suffering, and distress were to be found. In the East End of London and the large provincial cities of Great Britain there was, he ventured to say, ten times as much undeserved suffering as in Ireland; and yet the poverty was not made the excuse for political agitation and systematic lawlessness and outrage. Although he had heard a great many harrowing descriptions of the sufferings of the Irish peasantry, he had failed to gather any facts showing that the landlords had acted unjustly. On the other side, however, he had heard plenty of facts showing that the landlords had only resorted to eviction in the last extremity. He had alluded to the large amount of poverty and distress to be found in London and other large towns in England; and it was chiefly owing to the large amount of public attention absorbed by the Irish political agitation that this great social evil had not received its proper share of attention. He hoped that the Government, encouraged by the Report and evidence of the Royal Commission on Trade and Agriculture, would see their way to bring in some measure for the relief of the poverty-stricken people of both these Islands by some scheme of State-directed colonization. Private enterprize in that direction had failed, owing, as he contended, to the fact that it was not, and could not be, conducted on a sufficiently extensive scale. The matter must be taken up by the State. The increase in the population since the beginning of the century rendered some measure of that sort an absolute necessity, and he earnestly appealed to the Government seriously to consider whether they could not, by some well-organized scheme of State-directed colonization, find at least a partial remedy for the social and political evils of the present day.

MR. MAHONY (Meath, N.) said, one hon. Member had stated that there were two distinct Parties in Ireland; but he would ask him if it was not a fact that there were more than two very distinct Parties in England; and he would also call the hon. Gentleman's attention to the fact that the Irish Party, as at present represented, had done more than any other Party in modern times to consolidate the whole opinion of Ireland. He pointed to the fact that, at the present moment, the majority of the Members from Protestant Ulster sat with them on the Opposition side of the House. In fact, they represented at the present moment five-sixths of the Irish people; and he would like to know when English Parties had been so divided that one Party was so overwhelmingly strong as to represent five-sixths of the English people. As regarded the policy of the present Government towards Ireland, he thought they must look for the mainspring of that policy to a notable declaration made in one of the early days of last Session. That declaration was to the effect that, if judicial rents had to be reduced, the landlords should be compensated for the reduction. There was no getting out of the fact that that declaration was made. [*Opposition cheers.*] He had heard it denied; but if the English language of 1886 meant what it meant in the year 1885, it was beyond yea or nay that the Prime Minister did declare that, if the judicial rents had to be reduced, the landlords ought to be compensated for the loss. Bound by that declaration, the Ministers of the Government in that House had practically no course left open to them but to endeavour to prove that no reduction was necessary. He maintained that in their endeavour to prove that they utterly and absolutely broke down. He maintained that the Irish Members had proved beyond yea or nay that the fall in the prices had been so great and so general that rents which might have been fair in the year 1881 or 1882 had become hopelessly unfair in 1885 and 1886. Since last Session the finishing touch was put to the unfortunate position of the tenant farmers in Ireland by the very bad end to the harvest. Men who were in a difficult position then had become hopelessly embarrassed now. What had happened since the House last separated? Last Session they based their arguments on the price of agricultural produce for the year 1885. Since then the year 1886 had come to an end, and the price of every single article of agricultural produce in the year 1886 was lower than in the year 1885; so that, if the position of the tenant farmer of Ireland was bad in 1885, it was worse in the year 1886. Since last Session, they had had a Return collected of the amounts of the agricultural produce in Ireland, and that Return, collected by the Government officials from sources which were by no means friendly to the tenant farmers of Ireland, showed a marked falling-off in the amount of produce; so that, so far from anything having occurred to alter the position of the tenant farmer for the better, several things occurred to show that his position was much worse. He had no intention of further arguing the necessity for a reduction in the judicial rents, because the Government had, by their action, shown the necessity for it. The Government had endeavoured to do, in an un-Constitutional manner, and by means of persons who had no knowledge of the subjects and no way of obtaining satisfactory information, what his hon. Friend the Member for Cork proposed last Session should be done by means of properly constituted Courts and the assistance of official experts in the work. If the landlords were entitled to compensation, by all means let the Government bring in a Bill to give it to them. They had heard a good deal about Glenbeigh, and statements had been made in the public Press about Glenbeigh, which he had no hesitation in branding as absolutely false, and without a tittle of foundation. He should not be doing his duty as an Irish Representative if he did not take that opportunity of endeavouring to lay before the House some facts which he had ascertained on the spot regarding the tenants. That duty was all the more imposed upon him from the fact that, although one of the chief London daily organs, *The Times*, published an account from one side of what happened in Glenbeigh, it refused to publish any contradiction of accounts written by people on the spot. He wrote a letter, at the request of some gentlemen in Glenbeigh, to *The Times* contradicting the statements of the agent. He told his friends that *The Times* would not publish the contradiction, and he took the precaution of sending a copy of the letter to *The Daily News*. It appeared in *The Daily News*, but it did not appear in *The Times;* and he would ask hon. Members to read that letter for themselves, and then judge whether *The Times* gave fair accounts of what was going on in Ireland. They had in Glenbeigh a population which was never well off, but which, up to the year 1879, paid exorbitant rents with punctuality—they paid those rents, not out of the produce of the land, but by the earnings of the men who went as labourers to other parts of Ireland; by the wages of girls who went as dairymaids and servants to other places; and by small industries of their own, such as the collection of periwinkles on the sea-shore of the coast. The source of income derived by the labour of the men in Ireland had practically ceased with the depression, and since then their only remaining source of industry had suffered terribly by the fall in the price of stock, which in Glenbeigh and other mountainous districts had been far greater than in districts where there was good land. He had bought largely of this class of stock in the year 1882, and two-and-a-half year heifers, which in that year would have fetched from £6 10*s.* to £7, were sold freely in the autumn of last year for £3 10*s.* He bought in the fair of Cahirciveen in November last two-and-a-half year old bullocks at prices ranging from 30*s.* to £2. He would like to know where was the profit to the people, who had kept the cattle for two and a-half years. The tenants of Glenbeigh were too poor to avail themselves of the benefits of the Arrears Act, and the vast majority were too poor to avail themselves of the Land Act of 1881. But a few did find their way to the Land Courts. He had not been able to ascertain the result in all cases; but in 12 cases which came under his notice, and which were in no way specially selected by him, the reductions given in the Land Court amounted in the 12 cases to 27½ per cent. These reductions were given in the years of 1883 and 1884—good years—and he had no hesitation in saying that the fall in the price of this class of stock since then rendered a further reduction of 35 per cent, at least, necessary now, while those tenants who were too poor to go into the Land Courts should get 60 per cent. In the last seven years this unfortunate property had had no fewer than five agents, and very often the tenants did not know to whom they ought to pay their rents, owing to unfortunate disputes between the owner and the mortgagee. Last year, 70 of the tenants received processes for non-payment of rent, and the cases came on for hearing before the County Court Judge in October. The majority of the persons summoned, knowing that they were wholly unable to pay, did not put in an appearance; but 12 appeared in Court and raised a legal point, which was over-ruled. When their legal point was over-ruled, they thought they would be decreed in the ordinary way, but since the last Quarter Sessions a new County Court Judge had been sent down to Kerry with special instructions, and he, and also the County Court Judge of Clare, had interviews with General Buller. It would be satisfactory if the Government would give the House an account of those interviews. He was informed that one of the County Court Judges, in reply to General Buller, remarked—"What you ask me to do is perfectly illegal"; and that the General thereupon observed—"By some means or other we must stop evictions." [The hon. Member then proceeded to refer in detail to the circumstances leading up to the Glenbeigh evictions, and read parts of the correspondence which has already been read several times to the House.] He referred specially to a passage in a letter of Colonel Turner's to the agent, in which he said—"Sir Redvers Buller could not, in common fairness, support the exception of Griffin." He contended that the use of the word support implied more than persuasion, and that if the influence which they had heard was used by Sir Redvers Buller with the landlords in favour of the tenants was moral influence merely, it was impossible to distinguish it from actual pressure. [The hon. Member then described what took before Judge Curran, and stated that the Judge offered them a receipt in full, up to November, 1885, on payment of one year's rent and costs. He would not listen to any explanation on their part of their inability to accept these terms, but said—"If you do accept this, I will decree you for the full amount." The hon. Member added the tenants then chose the lesser evil.]

It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the debate stood further adjourned till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

——o——

RATING OF MACHINERY BILL.

On Motion of Sir Bernhard Samuelson, Bill to amend the Law relating to the Rating of Machinery, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Bernhard Samuelson, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Peacock, and Sir Frederick Thorpe Mappin.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 148.]

INCOME TAX ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Hubbard, Bill to amend the Administration of the Law of Income Tax, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Hubbard, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Whitley, and Sir George Balfour.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 149.]

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS BILL.

On Motion of Viscount Ebrington, Bill to make better provision for the Registration of Parliamentary Voters in England and Wales, *ordered* to be brought in by Viscount Ebrington, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Lewis Fry, and Mr. Pitt-Lewis.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 150.]

DEEP SEA OYSTERS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Bill to remove the restrictions on the sale of Deep Sea Oysters, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Cozens-Hardy and Mr. Colman.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 151.]

GREENWICH MARKETS ACT (1849) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Boord, Bill to amend "The Greenwich Markets Act, 1849," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Boord.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 152.]

LICENSED PREMISES (EARLIER CLOSING) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Dr. Cameron, Bill to provide for the Earlier Closing of Premises licensed for the sale of Exciseable Liquors in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Dr. Cameron, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Mark Stewart, Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. Lyell, and Mr. Provand.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 153.]

DISTRESS FOR RENT AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Broadhurst, Bill to amend the Law of Distress for Rent, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Burt, and Mr. Arthur Williams.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 154.]

CUSTOMS LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Customs Law Consolidation Act of 1876.

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Seymour King, and Mr. Gourley.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 155.]

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 3rd February, 1887.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Copyhold Enfranchisement * (13); Pluralities Act Amendment * (14).

Committee — Report — Christchurch (Southampton) Charter (Correction of Error) * (4).

ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY ON HER MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

"We humbly thank Your Majesty for informing us that Your Majesty's relations with all Foreign Powers continue to be friendly.

"We thank Your Majesty for informing us that the affairs of South Eastern Europe are still in an unsettled condition, but that Your Majesty does not apprehend that any disturbance of European peace will result from the unadjusted controversies which have arisen in that region. We humbly thank Your Majesty for informing us that, while Your Majesty deplores the events which compelled Prince Alexander of Bulgaria to retire from the Government of that Principality, Your Majesty has not judged it expedient to interfere in the proceedings for the Election of his Successor until they arrive at that stage at which Her Majesty's assent is required by the stipulations of the Treaty of Berlin.

"We thank Your Majesty for informing us that the task which has been undertaken by Your Majesty's Government in Egypt is not yet accomplished; but that substantial advance has been made towards the assurance of external and internal tranquillity.

"We learn with satisfaction from Your Majesty that the operations in Burmah have been conducted by Your Majesty's Troops with bravery and skill, for the purpose of extirpating the brigandage which has grown up during recent years of misgovernment. Humbly to thank Your Majesty for informing us that the bands of marauders by whom Upper Burmah has been long infested have been dispersed, that many of the leaders have laid down their arms; and that Your Majesty entertains a confident hope that the general pacification of the country will be effected during the present season.

"We thank Your Majesty for informing us that Commercial Treaties have been concluded with the Kingdoms of Greece and Roumania, and that Papers on these subjects will be laid before us.

"We humbly thank Your Majesty for informing us that the condition of Ireland still requires our anxious attention; that grave crimes have happily been rarer during the last few months than during a similar period in the preceding year, but that the relations between the owners and occupiers of land, which in the early part of the autumn exhibited signs of improvement, have since been seriously disturbed in some districts by organised attempts to incite the latter class to combine against the fulfilment of their legal obligations. We thank Your Majesty for informing us that the efforts of Your Majesty's Government to cope with this evil have been seriously impeded by difficulties incident to the method at present prescribed by Statute for dealing with such offences; and that our early attention will be called to proposals for reforms in Legal Procedure, which seem necessary to secure the prompt and efficient administration of the Criminal Law.

"We humbly thank Her Majesty for informing us that since Your Majesty last addressed us, the Commissioners directed to inquire into certain subjects of great importance to the material welfare of Ireland have been actively prosecuting their labours, and that the Report of the Commission on the operation of the recent Acts dealing with the Tenure and Purchase of Land will shortly be laid before us, which will doubtless receive from us the careful attention which the serious importance of the subject demands.

"We thank Your Majesty for informing us that Bills for the improvement of Local Government in England and Scotland will be laid before us; and that, should circumstances render it possible, they will be followed by a measure dealing with the same subject in Ireland; that a Bill for improving and cheapening the process of Private Bill Legislation in England, Scotland, and Ireland, will be submitted to us, and that we shall be asked to consider measures having for their objects to remove hindrances which exist to the cheap and rapid Transfer of Land, to facilitate the provision of Allotments for Small Householders, and to provide for the readier Sale of Glebe Lands.

"We humbly thank Your Majesty for informing us that the Commission which Your Majesty issued in 1885 to inquire into the lamentable depression under which Trade and Agriculture have been suffering for many years, has presented a valuable Report, which, together with the important evidence collected by them, will be laid before us.

"We thank Your Majesty for informing us that a Bill for altering the mode of levying Tithes in England and Wales will be submitted to us; that, in regard to Scotland, we shall be asked to consider measures for the reform of the Universities, for completing recent legislation as to the powers of the Secretary for Scotland, and for amending the procedure of Criminal Courts; and that measures dealing with the regulation of Railway Rates, and for preventing the fraudulent use of Merchandise Marks, will also be brought under our consideration.

"We humbly assure Your Majesty that our careful consideration shall be given to the subjects which Your Majesty has recommended to our attention, and to the measures which may be submitted to us; and we earnestly trust that, with regard to these and all other matters pertaining to our functions, the keeping and guidance of Almighty God may be vouchsafed to us."

QUEEN'S SPEECH—HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS.

THE LORD STEWARD OF THE HOUSEHOLD (The Earl of MOUNT-EDGCUMBE) reported Her Majesty's answer to the Address as follows:—

My LORDS,

"I thank you for your Loyal and Dutiful Address.

"I resort with great satisfaction to your Counsel and Advice in dealing with the important Questions that will be brought before you, and which concern the highest Interests of the Country, and the Welfare and Happiness of all Subjects."

COPYHOLD ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL. [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Copyhold Acts, and for the enfranchisement of copyhold and customary lands—Was *presented* by the Lord Hobhouse; read 1ª. (No. 13.)

PLURALITIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL. [H.L.]

A Bill to explain section twenty-six of the Pluralities Act, 1838—Was *presented* by the Lord President; read 1ª. (No. 14.)

House adjourned at half past Four o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 3rd February, 1887.

MINUTES.]—NEW MEMBER SWORN—The Right honble. Sir William Hart Dyke, baronet, *for* the County of Kent (Dartford Division).

SELECT COMMITTEE—National Provident Insurance, *appointed.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—*First Reading*—Church Discipline Amendment* [156]; Contumacy Imprisonment Abolition * [157].

Select Committee—Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) * [1], *Committee deferred.*

NOTICE OF MOTION.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (RULES OF PROCEDURE).

MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith): I beg to give notice that when the Rules of Procedure come on for discussion, and when the Rule No. 9, dealing with the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, is under discussion, I shall move to add to the Rule the following words:—

> "The Question on the Motion for the Address to Her Majesty to convey the thanks of the House for Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech to both Houses of Parliament, at the opening of the Session, shall be put on the same day as that on which the Motion is made, and not later than half-past Twelve of the clock at night, unless an Amendment shall have been previously proposed."
>
> "That, after all Amendments on the Address have been decided, the Motion for the Address shall be put forthwith, and decided without debate."

QUESTIONS.

LAW AND JUSTICE—PROSECUTION OF REV. WALTER DAVIES.

MR. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether it is correct that Mr. Justice Mathew at the last Gloucester Assizes, on the trial of the Rev. Walter Davies, stated that the prosecution which had been instituted by the Director of Public Prosecutions was "a deplorable and reckless one" that "ought never to have been undertaken," and that "the defendant left the dock without a shadow of imputation upon his character"; whether this prosecution was instituted by the direction, or with the approval, of the Attorney General, or of the Secretary of State for the Home Department; what is the amount of the costs which have been paid, or are payable, out of public funds on account of this prosecution; and, whether any grant had been made to the Defendant towards the costs of his defence?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) (Isle of Wight): The statements attributed to the learned Judge in the Question of the right hon. Gentleman are substantially correct. The prosecution was not instituted by the direction or with the approval of the Attorney General, or of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. I feel, however, that it is right to add that, having carefully looked through the information which was before the Director of Public Prosecutions at the time of the institution of the prosecution, he was, in my opinion, justified in the steps which he took, and he acted throughout upon the opinion of counsel of the highest experience. The amount of costs payable out of the public funds is £50 18*s*. 4*d*. So far as I am aware, no grant has been made to the defendant towards the costs of his defence. I shall be happy to show the right hon. Gentleman all the information which I possess respecting this case.

MARRIAGE LAW (ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND)—ATTENDANCE OF REGISTRARS.

MR. KNOWLES (Salford, W.) asked the Lord Advocate, Whether it is the fact that where one of two parties intending to marry resides in England and the other in Scotland, they may marry in England upon production of a certificate of proclamation of banns in Scotland, but that there is no similar provision enabling them to marry in Scotland; and, if such is the fact, whether, when the Bill is introduced by the Government for the purpose of dispensing with the presence of the Registrar at the celebration of marriages in Nonconformist places of worship, or at some other time, he proposes to authorize Superintendent Registrars of districts in England to issue certificates for the celebration of such marriages in Scotland, or otherwise remove the anomaly?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): In Scotland there is no statutory equivalent to the Act passed last Session recognizing certificates of banns published in Scotland as sufficient to legalize marriage in England. By custom, however, English certificates are generally recognized and accepted by the officiating clergyman; but, as I understand that occasionally some difficulty has arisen through clergymen demurring to accept English certificates, and as when it occurs it must undoubtedly create very serious inconvenience, I shall be prepared to propose a clause to remedy such inconvenience when any suitable Bill is brought in, which, I understand, in contemplation.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND) — THE EVICTIONS AT WOODFORD—COST OF TRANSPORT, &c.

MR. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the total of the sums paid and claimed for the transport of police and military to aid in effecting the late evictions at Woodford, county Galway; what was the total amount of rent due by the tenants evicted; and, so near as he can ascertain, what was the amount of the reduction in rent claimed by the evicted tenants?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The cost was a little over £1,350—of course, a very exceptional amount, due to several special causes. I cannot take it upon myself to attempt to answer the other parts of the Question; but no doubt the rent due was much less. It is obvious that the Government, when called upon to assist in enforcing legal process, cannot be influenced by the proportion which the cost of doing so bears to the amount due.

ARMY—JOHN CAMERON, SEAFORTH HIGHLANDERS.

MR. FRASER MACKINTOSH (Inverness-shire) asked the Secretary of State for War, Why John Cameron, Seaforth Highlanders, Fort George, N.B., born 15th August 1869, and enlisted in the year 1886, is not discharged, in compliance with his father's request, and according to the Regulations of the Service?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle), in reply, said, that the soldier referred to was 18 years of age. His father knew of his enlistment within a few days, but took no steps until three months had elapsed, when he claimed his son's discharge on the ground that he was under age. The young man had just the physical characteristics of one 18 years of age, and he had stated in writing his wish to continue in the Army; and in these circumstances he was held to his engagement. There was really no statutory limit of age below which a young man could not be enlisted. The essential point was that he possessed the physique corresponding to the age of 18.

POST OFFICE—POSTAL COMMUNICATION WITH THE OUTER HEBRIDES.

MR. FRASER-MACKINTOSH (Inverness-shire) asked the Postmaster General, What is the cause of the delay in placing a Steam Postal Service between Strome Ferry, and Harris, and North Uist, which was promised last year?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): I am not aware of the promise to which the hon. Member refers. Tenders were invited for a Steam Packet between Portree, Harris, and Lochmaddy, with a view to determine what new arrangements, if any, could be made for the Postal Service; but, after very full consideration, the circumstances did not appear to warrant the large outlay required. As regards Lochmaddy, I am happy to state that arrangements are in progress for establishing Steam Postal communication with Lochboisdale.

IRISH LAND ACT, 1870—THE BRIGHT CLAUSES.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the promised legislation on the Irish Land Question will include provisions in relief of the Purchasers under the Bright Clauses of the Land Act of 1870, or whether it is intended to deal with that part of the subject by an independent measure?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I cannot state the details of proposed legislation on the Irish Land Question; but I have made no promise to deal with the case of the purchasers under the Bright Clauses of the Act of 1870, either in a general or in a special Bill.

COMMISSIONERS OF IRISH LIGHTS—LEGISLATION.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether it is the intention of the Government to propose any legislation dealing with the Irish Lights Board; and, if so, of what nature; and, whether there has been any recent official correspondence on the subject; and, if so, whether a Copy of it will be laid upon the Table?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Her Majesty's Government have no intention to propose any such legislation as is suggested by the hon. Member's Question, and there has been no recent correspondence on the subject.

LOCAL COURTS OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)—LEGISLATION.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, as stated in the Public Press, the Government intend to introduce a measure for the establishment of Local Courts of Bankruptcy in Ireland; and, if so, on or about what date?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): This is a matter with which, I think, Parliament ought to deal; but I observe that Notice has been given of more than one Bill on the subject, and I hope that the hon. Members who are in charge of them may be more successful in finding opportunities for their discussion, than, judging from past experience, the Government is likely to have. I should be glad to give any aid in my power in the matter.

COMMISSIONERS OF IRISH LIGHTS—"THE PRINCESS ALEXANDRA."

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Irish Lights Board recently sent the ship *Princess Alexandra* to London to be repaired; what the cost of her repairs amounted to; and, why she was not repaired in Dublin?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth) (who replied) said: The *Princess Alexandra* was sent to London by the Commissioners of Irish Lights in order that the repairs referred to by the hon. Baronet might be carried out under the supervision of the technical staff of the Board of Trade in London, by whom the boilers were designed; and in order that the work might be effected by Messrs. Penn, who originally constructed the engines and boilers. As these repairs have not yet been completed, the cost of them cannot at present be stated.

ARMY—THE AFGHAN PRIZE MONEY.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he is in a position to give any information as to the probable date of distribution of the Afghan prize money?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham) (who replied): I find, on inquiry, that there is no Afghan prize money to be distributed. The captures made at Cabul did not come within the conditions of prize. I may mention that "donation batta" was given to the troops engaged in the Afghan campaigns.

ARMY ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGES AT WOOLWICH AND SANDHURST.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any, and if so, what steps have been taken towards carrying out the recommendations of the Board of Visitors in regard to the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, and the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, with a view to the remedy of the various defects which they observed in their inspections in June and July 1886?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): As regards the Royal Military Academy, the provision of increased sleeping accommodation and of hot water for the bath rooms will be proceeded with when funds are available after the completion of more urgent services. No room in Herbert's Hospital can at present be made available as an infectious ward for cadets. As regards Sandhurst, steps have been taken to carry out the recommendations that the Riding School be lit with gas; that better furniture be provided for the cadets' ante-rooms; that windows be added in certain rooms; and that a dressing room be added to the gymnasium. The Racquet Court will be re-roofed early in the next financial year; but funds are not as yet available for building accommodation for the servants on the College estate. Ammunition for voluntary revolver shooting has been issued to the cadets; but it has not been thought necessary to make shooting a part of the course.

POST OFFICE—THE NEW POSTAGE STAMPS—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE UPON STAMPS.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether, seeing that the new postage stamps have been on issue to the public since the 1st of January, he has now any objection to lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Committee upon Stamps, appointed by the late Mr. Fawcett when Postmaster General, together with the evidence taken by that Committee, and also the Report of the Controller of Stamps upon his visit to and inspection of the various Governmental Stamp Factories of Europe?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): The Report of the Committee on Postage Stamps, to which the hon. Member refers, includes matter which it would be very inexpedient to publish, and I therefore do not propose to lay such Report upon the Table. As regards the Report of the Controller of Stamps to his Board, I would refer to the reply given to the hon. Member by my Predecessor (Lord John Manners) on July 16th, 1885—namely, that an undertaking was given that all that the Controller saw and learnt during his inquiries was to be treated as confidential; and that it is not intended to lay the Report before Parliament.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND) ACCOMMODATION AT GRANGEGEITH AND SLANE.

MR. O'HANLON (Cavan, E.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether a private letter carrier is being paid by the people of the district of Grangegeith and Slane since the 16th of August last year; whether, previous to this, some of them had to travel four and a half miles to have their letters posted; whether he will institute the inquiry which he promised last Session when this Question was put; whether the daily average of packets and letters is over 20; and, whether this number of letters would be sufficient to compensate the Government in having a permanent office appointed at Grangegeith?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): A private letter carrier is, I learn, employed by the people living in the Grangegeith district to fetch their letters from the Slane Post Office. Grangegeith is 3½ miles from Slane, and some of the persons living in the neighbourhood of Grangegeith would probably have to travel 4½ miles to post at Slane. The inquiry promised last Session was duly made; but the average correspondence did not appear to warrant the establishment of a Post Office at Grangegeith, with a postman for conveying the letters from and to Slane. The daily average of packets and letters is believed to be considerably below 20; but further accounts will shortly be taken, with the view of ascertaining whether the circumstances are more favourable than formerly to the establishment of a Post.

NAVY—PRICES OF COAL, IRON, STEEL, &c., TO THE DOCKYARDS.

MR. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he can inform the House what were the average prices per ton of the coal, iron, and steel (including cost of carriage) delivered to the Dockyards at Chatham, Portsmouth, and Plymouth in the year 1886?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) Middlesex, Ealing): There are so many kinds of coal—steam vessel, furnace, yard engine, &c.—and descriptions and sizes of steel and iron plates, bars, angles, &c., that an average price, as asked for, could only be given with an infinity of labour, and, when furnished, would be of no practical use. The following average prices of certain specific descriptions may be of some service:—Welsh steam coal, per ton, Chatham, 12*s.* 5*d.*; Portsmouth, 12*s.*; and Plymouth, 11*s.* 11*d.*; furnace coal (chiefly N.C.), per ton, Chatham, 10*s.* 10*d.*; Portsmouth, 12*s.* 6*d.*; Plymouth, 12*s.* 4*d.*

THE MAURITIUS—THE EXCHANGE.

MR. COX (Clare, E.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether remittances from the Mauritius by bill of exchange cost, at present, £53 per £100; and, if so, whether the Government would use their influence to place the question on a more reasonable footing?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.), in reply, said that the Treasury had no official knowledge as to the cost of the remittances referred to by the hon. Member; but their experience was that the cost was far lower than the amount stated in the hon. Member's question. The Government had no control over the rate charged for remittances, which depended upon commercial considerations.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) — TRAWLING IN SLIGO AND KILLALA BAYS.

Colonel NOLAN (Galway, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if any step has yet been taken to meet the wishes of the Galway fishermen, by excluding trawlers from the whole or part of Galway Bay; and, if the precedent lately set, by excluding trawlers from the Firth of Forth, will be followed in Ireland?

Mr. P. M'DONALD (Sligo, N.) had also the following question on the Paper:—To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, what has been the result of the recent inquiry into the system of trawling in Sligo and Killala Bays; whether the Commissioners recommended its discontinuance; and, whether trawlers are permitted to fish in other waters on the British Coast.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The Inspectors of Fisheries are engaged upon a general inquiry on the subject of trawling on various parts of the coast, and they state that until their inquiry is complete they cannot come to any decision with regard to any particular bay. They have, therefore, not as yet made any recommendation with regard to the bays mentioned in these Questions. Speaking generally, the Inspectors inform me that they think no evidence has been given that would justify them in recommending the prohibition of trawling: but the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel Nolan) was good enough to bring under my notice the other evening some important information with reference to Galway Bay. I will communicate with the Inspectors as to this, and take care that the matter is not lost sight of.

SEA FISHERIES (IRELAND)—A STEAM CRUISER.

Colonel NOLAN (Galway, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If any intimation has reached the Irish Government from the Fishery Commissioners, to the effect that a steam vessel of 150 tons would be highly useful if placed at the disposal of the Irish fishing authorities for experiment and research; and, if the Scotch fishing authorities possess such a vessel?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): In accordance with a promise made by me last Session, this proposal, which is an old one, has been revived, and the Irish Government is at present in correspondence with the Treasury on the subject. The expenditure involved, both by way of initial outlay and future maintenance, would be very heavy, and their Lordships have not as yet seen their way to consent to it; but I will do my best to get it carried out in some form or other.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS—THE SUPERINTENDING ARCHITECT.

Mr. BROADHURST (Nottingham, W.), asked the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, Whether the Superintending Architect of the Metropolitan Board of Works is empowered by Statute to give decisions vitally affecting the inhabitants of the Metropolis, without his awards being subject to the revision or control of the Board; and, if so, whether it is the intention of the Board to propose legislation during the present Session to remove this anomaly in Metropolitan local government?

The CHAIRMAN (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg (Middlesex, Hornsey): I beg to inform the hon. Member that the Superintending Architect of the Metropolitan Board is not subject to the control of the Board with reference to his decisions as the officer appointed by Statute to determine the general line of buildings in the Metropolis, and this has been the state of the law since the passing of the Metropolis Management Amendment Act, 1862. I am not aware that any representation has been made to the Board that Parliament should be asked to give the Board control over the Superintending Architect in the exercise of his jurisdiction; and I am not able to inform the hon. Member whether it is the intention of the Board to propose legislation during the present Session with a view to an alteration of the existing law.

ARMY OF OCCUPATION, EGYPT—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL (Kirkcaldy, &c.) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether Her Majesty's Government propose to ask the House to sanction a Supplementary Estimate of £500,000 for expenses connected with the Army in Egypt; and, if so, when that Estimate will be presented; and, whether it will contain explanations so that it may be duly considered previously to a Vote being taken on it?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The question of Supplementary Estimates is under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. The amount cannot yet be determined. When presented every possible information will be given.

RAILWAYS (INDIA) — MASSACRE ON THE QUETTA-PISHEEN RAILWAY.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL (Kirkcaldy, &c.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether a khan and many coolies, working on an advanced part of the Quetta-Pisheen Railway, have been killed by the Duranis; whether the whole of that part of the line as now carried on or sanctioned is in British territory; whether there are any Papers available to Parliament showing by whom, and in what limits, the territory now forming the Pisheen District was ceded, and whether the consent of any tribes claiming rights there was obtained; if the works now carried on, or sanctioned, go beyond the British territory, into whose territory they run, whether that of independent tribes, or within the Suzerainty of the Ameer of Cabul; and, in the latter case, whether the consent of any local tribes claiming the territory has been obtained as well as that of the Suzerain; whether it is contemplated to lay the Railway beyond Chaman Chauki; and, whether opposition to that proceeding is expected as stated in Reuter's telegram?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The hon. Baronet will be gratified to learn that the report on which his first Question is based is wholly without foundation. No irruption of Duranis has taken place, nor has anybody been killed. The territory through which the Railway passes has since 1878 been in the occupation and under the absolute control of the Government of India. The Secretary of State is now in correspondence with the Government of India as to its exact legal status. The Papers relating to the Pisheen District are to be found in the Afghan Blue Books published between 1878 and 1881. The works now sanctioned and being carried out do not extend beyond British territory: nor has the question of extending the Railway beyond Chaman Chauki yet been finally decided. The remaining Questions of the hon. Baronet are, therefore, premature.

BURIAL ACTS — CONSECRATION OF CEMETERIES—THE ATTLEBOROUGH BURIAL BOARD.

MR. OSBORNE MORGAN (Denbighshire, E.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Burial Board of Attleborough, in the county of Norfolk, have received notice that a *mandamus* will be applied for to compel them to obtain the consecration of the cemetery lately opened by them, or of some part thereof; and whether it is intended to institute such, or similar, proceedings against that or any other Burial Board which has opened, or intends to open, for public use, a cemetery containing no consecrated ground?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): Yes, Sir; the Burial Board of Attleborough have received notice that a *mandamus* will be applied for to compel them to do what the law requires them to do—namely, to apply to the Bishop of the diocese to consecrate part of their burial ground, which has been duly appropriated for the purpose of consecration. Since I have been in Office ineffectual attempts have been made to induce the Board to fulfil their statutory obligation without legal proceedings; and I am informed that the Board have refused the offer of a parishioner to defray the costs of consecration himself. The result is that, as the churchyard has been closed by Order in Council, the parishioners are deprived of their right to be buried in consecrated ground if they so desire. It will depend on the circumstances of each case whether similar proceedings shall be instituted against other Boards. I hope the decision of the Queen's Bench will prevent other Boards from throwing on the ratepayers the costs of refusing to fulfil their legal obligations.

COMMONS (METROPOLIS)—WANDSWORTH COMMON ACT, 1871—LEASING OF LAND.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether land (about 55 acres), part of

Wandsworth Common, was given to the Royal Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund for the purposes of the asylum, since erected thereon, to afford a visible and permanent memorial of the national generosity which provided the means for its foundation; and was enclosed from the Common without any equivalent or compensation to those enjoying right over the Common; whether the Royal Commissioners have recently admitted that a portion (about 20 acres) of the land is not required for the purposes of the asylum, and have leased the same, as a market garden, to a contractor for public works, who, by an extensive vehicular traffic, has for some months past done grievous damage to the existing portion of the open Common reserved for purposes of exercise and recreation under the provisions of "The Wandsworth Common Act, 1871;" whether any offer of such land was made to the Wandsworth Common Conservators; and, in what manner the advertisement of their intended letting of the ground, referred to on page 8 of the last Report of the Commissioners, was published; and, why no notice thereof was given to the Conservators?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The land on Wandsworth Common was not given to the Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund; but was purchased by them from the lord of the manor at a substantial price. The Commissioners have recently leased about 20 acres of their estate to a market gardener; but this is not, in reality, any variation from the original object for which the Commissioners held the ground. That object was to produce vegetables for consumption in the boys' and girls' schools, and to instruct the boys in the art of gardening. But the boys' school was given up, and it was found that the ground was cultivated at a loss. By the present arrangement the vegetables are obtained from the tenant, and there has been so great a gain that the Commissioners have been enabled to maintain seven more beds. As regards the increase of traffic across the Common an action at law is now pending; and my hon. Friend will understand, therefore, that I cannot express any opinion upon it. The letting of the ground was publicly advertised in *The Times* newspaper of June 19, 1885, and also in *The Gardener's Chronicle* and in *The Agricultural Gazette.*

HALL-MARKING—INDIAN GOLD AND SILVER PLATE AT THE COLONIAL EXHIBITION.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been directed to the fact that whereas, at the Colonial Exhibition, Indian gold and silver plate was permitted to be sold without the compulsory obligation of assay and hall-marking, that permission was denied to Colonial exhibitors; and, whether Her Majesty's Government are prepared to extend the same facilities for trading in gold and silver plate to Her Majesty's Colonial subjects as are enjoyed by Her Majesty's Indian subjects, by abolishing the practice of compulsory hall-marking?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): At the recent Exhibition at South Kensington the same regulations were applied to gold and silver plate as were applied to plate sent from India, the Regulations being those to be found in the Revenue Act, 1884, by which foreign plate which, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Customs, may be properly described as hand-chased, inlaid, bronzed, or filigree work, is exempted from assay and hall-marking. The plate sent to the Exhibition, and which was not found by the Customs officers to come under the above description, could not be legally exempted. The same facilities for trading in gold and silver were so far equally extended to the Colonies and India.

UNITED STATES—THE HOMESTEAD AND EXEMPTION LAWS.

MR. E. ROBERTSON (Dundee) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, When the Reports from Consular Agents in the United States on the Homestead and Exemption Laws are likely to be published?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): As soon as the MSS. were returned by the hon. Member, to whom, on their receipt, they were sent for perusal, orders were given that they should be at once printed and presented to Parliament. The Papers are already in type, and will be in the hands of Members in the course of a few days.

HOME DEFENCES—GARRISONS OF THE THAMES FORTS.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the statement in *The Times* of February 1st, relative to the garrisons of the Thames forts, is correct?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): In time of peace only sufficient men are retained in the Thames forts to take care of the stores and guns; but behind them are the garrisons of Woolwich, Chatham, and the Home District, which would hold these forts in case of alarm; and in the general scheme for the defence of the country detailed provision has been made for the necessary garrison for each fort.

PARKS (METROPOLIS)—COST OF MAINTENANCE.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, When it is intended to bring in a Bill throwing the cost of the maintenance of certain Parks in the Metropolis upon its inhabitants?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): If the hon. Member would be so good as to read the Order Book of the House, he would not, I think, be in doubt as to the intention of the Government in this matter. A Bill transferring to the Metropolitan Board of Works the maintenance of certain Parks has already been read a first time, and is down for second reading to-night.

POST OFFICE (ENGLAND AND WALES). —STATIONERY CLERKS IN SURVEYORS' BRANCH.

MR. COBB (Warwick, S.E., Rugby) asked the Postmaster General, Whether, in December 1868, because of an application for increase of salary, the position of Stationery Clerk in the Surveyors' Branch of the General Post Office was abolished, and a new regulation made, by which the Surveyors' stationery, i.e., office duties, were in future to be performed by clerks borne on the establishment of country post offices at a much lower scale of pay; whether the effect of that regulation is, that the officers permanently employed as Stationery Clerks in the Surveyors' Branch are denied any status whatever on that branch; whether the results on the officers themselves, and the offices to which they are nominally attached, but in which they perform no duties whatever, have been brought more than once under the notice of the Department without effect; and, whether the work now performed by Stationery Clerks is of a much more important and arduous character than formerly, while their official prospects are worse; and, whether he will take steps to have their grievances, both as regards rank and remuneration, inquired into and ameliorated?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member, I have to state that the Stationery Clerks do not hold any permanent appointment as such. If, as alleged, the work now performed by the Stationery Clerks is more important and arduous than it was, it must remembered that the remuneration of the classes on which those officers are borne has been considerably improved. As regards the rank and remuneration of the Stationery Clerks, I am now considering whether some changes may not be desirable.

POST OFFICE—NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE TELEPHONE COMPANIES.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, Camlachie) asked the Postmaster General, If he is in a position to state what progress has been made in any negotiations which may be pending between the Government and the Telephone Companies with a view to the acquisition and extension of the present lines, and the removal underground of all existing overhead wires, as also with a regard to the Public Service by improving the present most inadequate and defective arrangements?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member, I have to state that no negotiations are pending for the acquisition by the Government of the Telephone System of the various Companies carrying on business in the United Kingdom. The Post Office continues the practice, which has been adopted for many years past, of substituting underground for overhead wires in London, and other large towns, whenever the number of wires is considerable. The length of underground wire in the

United Kingdom is upwards of 20,000 miles, and the main trunk lines from London are carried underground to distances varying from five miles to 22 miles from the General Post Office. The principal and many of the smaller offices in London, 315 in all, are connected with the Central Telegraph Office by underground wires. As the hon. Member is, no doubt, aware, the Telephone System in London does not belong to the Post Office, but to a private Company, to whom any question of improving the present arrangements should be addressed.

ARMY—ISSUE OF KIT BAGS.

VISCOUNT BARING (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade) asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is the intention of the War Office to issue kit bags, as supplied to the Infantry of the Line, to those Militia Battalions that are equipped with valises, and which annually train away from their head-quarters?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The Question of issuing kit bags to the Militia is under consideration. Opinions on the subject are somewhat conflicting; and as the expenditure involved is considerable, both as regards initial issue and annual maintenance, no decision has yet been arrived at.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)—MR. THOMAS MORONEY.

MR. P. M'DONALD (Sligo, N.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the recent proceedings in the Irish Court of Bankruptcy, in the case of Mr. Thomas Moroney; whether Mr. Moroney, having been adjudicated a bankrupt by Judge Boyd, and having appealed against that Judge's decision, the bankruptcy proceedings were, nevertheless, continued against him; whether Mr. Moroney was, in consequence, committed to prison by Judge Boyd on the 28th January last for refusing, on his examination in bankruptcy, to answer questions put to him in relation to certain proceedings under what is known as the Plan of Campaign, in connection with which a criminal prosecution is at present pending in Ireland against a number of persons, some of whom are Members of this House; whether the Mr. Gerard, Q.C., who acted as Counsel against Mr. Moroney, and who cross-examined him, is the same person who is acting as counsel for the Crown in said prosecution; whether it is the fact that Mr. Gerard, in seeking to procure from Mr. Moroney, under threat of committal, evidence which would be available for the Government against the traversers on the pending prosecution, was acting under the instructions of the Government, or with their sanction; and, whether, having regard to the possibility that the Court of Appeal may reverse Judge Boyd's decision, and annul the adjudication in bankruptcy, the Government propose (pending the appeal) to put the committal order into force against Mr. Moroney?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): The case of Thomas Moroney being a private lawsuit, my sources of information in regard to it are equally open to the hon. Gentleman who puts the Question. I have seen in the newspapers that Thomas Moroney, having been adjudicated a bankrupt, was committed to prison, not for refusing to answer any particular questions, but for declining to be sworn. He was not examined nor cross-examined by any person. Mr. Gerard, Q.C., is not acting in the case under the instructions of the Government, nor has the Government had any communication with him in reference to it, nor can I conceive how any evidence that Thomas Moroney would give could be used in any pending prosecution. I observe that it was stated in Court that an appeal was pending, and that the Judge decided that this circumstance did not justify the bankrupt in declining to be sworn. As to the last clause of the Question, the Government cannot, and ought not, to interfere with the exercise of his jurisdiction by a Judge, or with the means given by the law for enforcing it.

POST OFFICE CONTRACTS—AUSTRALIAN MAIL CONTRACTS.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury) asked the Postmaster General, What is the present position of the tenders for the Australian Mail Contracts?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): Tenders for the Australian Mail Service were received on the 30th of April last, and were at once communicated to the Governments of the three Australian Colonies, which proposed to enter, jointly with Her Majesty's Government, into the contract for this service. At their suggestion, negotiations have recently taken place with the tendering Companies for certain modifications of the original tenders, and copies of their replies have this day been sent to the Colonial Agents General in London for their information. The views of the Representatives of the Colonies on the question of Imperial Postage will be elicited by the discussion of the subject at the coming Colonial Conference in the course of next month; and a statement of those views will, I understand, be transmitted to me. In the meantime, I shall have to consider whether, with due respect to the Colonial Governments, it will be desirable to conclude any arrangement concerning these tenders before the Conference has fully discussed the general question, and until the result of this discussion has been communicated to me.

LAW AND JUSTICE—PUBLICATION OF EVIDENCE IN DIVORCE AND OTHER CASES.

MR. J. HOWARD (Middlesex, Tottenham) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is prepared to take any steps to prevent the unrestrained publication in future of evidence unfit for publication in divorce and other cases before the Courts of Law?

COLONEL LAURIE (Bath) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is possible to regulate the publication of evidence in Divorce Cases?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): I will answer the Question and the Question of my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Bath at the same time. I could not, myself, take any steps for the purpose indicated except by way of legislation. I have adopted the speedier method of communicating with the President of the Divorce Division. He has the subject under his consideration; and I hope he will be able to deal with the matter by way of Rule of Court, and to check the daily publication of offensive reports, without impairing the important advantages of the public administration of justice in such cases.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—NOTICES TO RELIEVING OFFICERS—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS.

MR. WOOTTON ISAACSON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether any landlord in Ireland, before evicting a tenant, is legally obliged to give notice to the relieving officer of his intention to evict; whether the relieving officer is legally obliged to provide necessary food and lodging, and means of conveyance, for every person so evicted; and, whether such provision was made for the persons recently evicted in the Vale of Glenbeigh?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): A landlord is bound, before evicting from a holding where there is a dwelling-house on the land, to give not less than 48 hours' notice to the relieving officer. Such notice was, I am informed, duly given in the Glenbeigh case. Any person becoming destitute by being dispossessed may apply to the relieving officer for relief; and the relieving officer, upon the receipt of such application, is bound to make temporary provision for the wants of the applicants, and means of conveyance to the workhouse if necessary. In the Glenbeigh case the relieving officer was directed to afford relief in cases of destitution, and to be vigilant in attending to urgent cases of distress.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked if the right hon. Gentleman could say whether the relieving officer carried out the instructions?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, the relieving officer was the officer of the Local Government Board, to whom the Question should be addressed.

THE NORTHERN PACIFIC—EVACUATION OF PORT HAMILTON.

CAPTAIN COLOMB (Tower Hamlets, Bow, &c.) asked, Whether the late Government, responsible for the occupation of Port Hamilton, acted upon Naval advice; and, if so, what has been the expenditure from Imperial funds incurred from the date of occupation down to the present time at Port Hamilton?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The best way in which I can answer the Question will be by stating the circumstances under which Port Hamilton was originally occupied, and also the circumstances under which the subsequent Government ordered its evacuation. Port Hamilton was occupied in May, 1885, by an Order sent from the Admiralty to Sir William Dowell, who was then Commander-in-Chief on the China Station. Before effect could be given to that occupation a change of Government took place, and shortly afterwards a Report arrived from Sir William Dowell, who had had considerable experience in that quarter of the world, pointing out the unsuitability of the place for the purposes for which it was occupied, and recommending its abandonment. I was then at the Admiralty, and I found that the views of the Naval Lords at the new Board entirely coincided with those of Sir William Dowell. I also consulted Sir George Willes, who has been Commander-in-Chief on the China Station, and he strongly adhered to the opinion of that officer. Sir William Dowell was relieved in September, 1885, by Admiral Hamilton; and before he hoisted his flag I gave him special instructions to fully report upon the whole matter. He had made a series of Reports, which will be presented to the House. The purport of these Reports is that the occupation of Port Hamilton in time of peace entails unnecessary expense, and in time of war would not be a source of strength, but of weakness, to the Navy. The main cost of occupation has been the laying down of a cable between Port Hamilton and Shanghai, and a certain sum has been spent in building huts for stores and Marines. The total direct expenditure has not yet been brought to account; I cannot, therefore, state the approximate amount.

CHARITY COMMISSION SCHEMES—ELECTION OF TRUSTEES.

Sir JOHN SWINBURNE (Staffordshire, Lichfield) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether any, and what, steps have been taken to give effect to the Resolution passed on the 18th of May, 1886—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, every Scheme of the Charity Commissioners ought to provide for the majority of the Trustees or Managers, being directly elected by the ratepayers in the locality to which the Charity extends."

The FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster): The Charity Commissioners have done, and are doing, much in recognition of the principle of representation in their appointments of Trustees of Charities, where it is practicable to do so. But I must remind the hon. Baronet that, in order to give effect to a Resolution of the kind he refers to, legislation is necessary; and it rests with him, if he thinks such legislation is necessary, to take the proper steps.

PARLIAMENT—PUBLICATION OF EVIDENCE.

Mr. HOYLE (Lancashire, S.E., Heywood) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, If it is possible to give Members of Parliament and the general public the benefit of a daily publication of the evidence given before Royal Commissions and Select Committees of both Houses of Parliament?

The FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster), in reply, said, the hon. Gentleman seemed to be under the impression that the Government had authority over the proceedings of Royal Commissions and Committees of the House, and that it was open to them to secure the publication of the evidence given before such Bodies when they thought proper. That, however, was not the case. In some instances, Royal Commissions allowed reporters to be present at their proceedings; but the evidence could not be made public until it was submitted to Her Majesty. As regarded Committees of the House, reporters were occasionally allowed to be present, and even then the Report of the Committee was considered confidential until it was submitted to the House.

THE PUBLIC FUNDS—TRANSMISSION OF DIVIDENDS.

Mr. JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, in the absence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he will make arrangements for the dividends due on Consols to be remitted to the address stated in the Register of Proprietors, as in the case of Railway and other Companies; and, in the event of him being unable to do this, he will arrange for a notice to be sent to each proprietor that a dividend is due to him?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): In the case of Consols, as in the case of all other Stocks inscribed at the Bank of England, dividends are sent by post to any Stockholder who desires to have the money remitted to him in that way, and who makes the necessary application to the Bank. These facilities are afforded by the Act of 1870, 33 & 34 *Vict.* c. 71; and any extension of them on the lines suggested by the hon. Member would, it is thought, give rise to great inconvenience, possibly open the door for fraud, and certainly involve a large increase of labour.

HYDE PARK CORNER (NEW STREETS) BILL.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked, with reference to the course of Public Business for that evening, Whether it was intended to proceed that evening with the second reading of the Hyde Park Corner (New Streets) Bill, which stood upon the Paper as the third Order of the Day? He had found, upon inquiry, that the Bill had not yet been printed.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University), in reply, said, that it was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to proceed with the Bill that evening. He hoped that it would be circulated among hon. Members to-morrow, or the next day, and in that case it would be placed upon the Paper for second reading next Thursday.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SIXTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January.]—[See page 84.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. MAHONY (Meath, N.) said, that he wished to refer to the remarkable correspondence from General Buller, which had been published in order to show that General Buller was following out, distinctly and faithfully, the line of policy laid down by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, during his examination at the Police Court in Dublin. The Chief Secretary there stated that everything the Government had done had been done in the interests of the landlords. That, he maintained, was the clear and distinct reading of the correspondence which General Buller wrote. The first thing which directed General Buller's attention to the state of Glenbeigh was not the poverty of the people, or their inability to pay the terms fixed by Judge Curran; but as he himself said in his letter of the 22nd of November—

> "I have every reason to be anxious about the possibility of preserving order in the district."

It was the old story—the Government did not care in Ireland for simple justice. No; it was only when injustice was made difficult that then they began to think about justice. It had been alleged that the National League had interfered in order to prevent the tenants settling with their landlords, and that the Plan of Campaign had been put in operation on the Glenbeigh estate. Such statements only showed utter ignorance of what the Plan of Campaign really was, for the essence of the Plan of Campaign was that these people should pay a fair rent; and their position was that at this time these poor people were utterly unable, many of them, to pay rent at all. Another fact was that his hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) stated at a public meeting at Killorglin that if the Plan of Campaign had been put into operation, or there had been any idea of it, he would have been the first man to hear of it, and yet he said that until these evictions commenced he never heard of the property. There was a local branch of the National League existing in Glenbeigh; on the committee of that branch were 14 of the tenants, and, out of these 14, eight had paid their rents; so that did not look as if the local branch of the League were preventing the payments of rent. The total number of tenants was 300, and, out of these, in or about 100 had paid; and, to his own certain knowledge, there was not the slightest ill-feeling against those who had been able to pay. In reference to the Glenbeigh evictions, General Buller had said, in one of his letters, that the tenants were poor and ignorant, and misled by bad men. He (Mr. Mahony) had searched in vain in the whole of the subsequent correspondence for one particle of evidence to show that the tenants were misled by bad men; and he challenged the Government to produce one single particle of evidence to show that "the bad men" influenced the tenants in any way. The system of joint tenancies had an unfortunate effect on the Glenbeigh tenants. Many of the tenants, although holding separate portions of land, and holding separate houses, were joined by the landlord in one common receipt, and in one common Poor Law valuation. The effect of that in regard to the landlord was this—If one tenant failed to pay his rent, the whole of the joint owners must suffer; and it also enabled him to escape his liability to pay poor rate. Mr. Roe was often represented as being willing to accept six months' rent, and give a full discharge of all existing arrears on its payment; but they should remember that the costs made a serious difference to the tenants. He (Mr. Mahony) could only, therefore, describe the statement as inaccurate and misleading; inasmuch as an additional sum was demanded from them for costs, and the total amount asked amounted in some cases to two years' rent. It was useless to ask men for rents which they had afforded the most convincing proofs of their inability to pay by allowing the houses which sheltered them to be burnt or levelled to the ground. He would like to say a few words about a precious document which had just been put into his hand, which was published by the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union. As well as he could judge, the greater portion of it was merely reprint from the London organ of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union. It contained what purported to be statements of facts relating to Ireland, and emanating from reliable sources. There were one or two of those statements to which he wished to refer. The first was a statement that—

> "Although 64 decrees had been issued by County Court Judge Curran, only 31 had been placed in the hands of the Sheriff for execution."

That was intended to convey the impression that Mr. Roe had only executed 31 out of 64 decrees, and had mercifully refrained from executing the others. But almost without exception — he doubted, indeed, if there was a single exception — in every one of those cases where the decrees were not executed the tenants had paid their rents; that fact, however, had been carefully and purposely suppressed in the precious document to which he alluded. Another statement was that, in a case where two joint tenants had been evicted, one of them had been restored as a caretaker with a promise to let him alone. He (Mr. Mahony) could only say that that statement was utterly false if it referred, as he understood it was intended to do, to the case of two men named Diggins. The Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union knew that that was one of the worst of all the barbarous atrocities committed during the late evictions, and therefore tried to minimize it. The men had been evicted in 1884 for four years' arrears of rent. One of the joint tenants offered to pay £4, but Mr. Roe refused to accept it, unless his wretched partner would produce a like amount. The eviction campaign in Ireland was only just beginning, and the object of the National Party was to defend the lives, the homes, and the very existence of the people. If the technicalities of a harsh and cruel law stood in their way, then they appealed to a higher law founded upon the eternal principles of justice, and they appealed in the spirit of Him who said—"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." The Government might go on in their course of coercion. Coercion was the natural consequence of their rule. They could not govern, by Constitutional means, a people against their will. Let them go on—how long did hon. Members opposite suppose the democracy of England would consent to pay for the 30,000 soldiers which, as the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) had said, were encamped permanently in Ireland as in a hostile country. How long would they be content to pay for the police to protect the persons engaged in carrying out these barbarous evictions perpetrated at Glenbeigh? Perhaps not so long as hon. Gentlemen opposite imagined. During the Vacation he went among the democracy in some of the so-called Unionist strongholds, and was received in the kindest manner. At every meeting he justified the Plan of Campaign, and when he had explained it his auditors accepted his justification. In spite of the efforts of the Unionists, the democracy would yet follow their old and trusted Leader. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) had a policy. If hon. Gentlemen opposite had a policy at all, it was one of war at home and war abroad. The policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian was a policy of peace. Might God preserve him to complete that policy, and to bind together in the bond of true and lasting friendship the peoples of Great Britain and Ireland.

MR. ERNEST BECKETT (York, N. R., Whitby) said, he must apologize for interfering in the debate; but, even if he had not risen, the time of the House would not be saved as some Gentleman on the other side intended to keep the ball rolling for the rest of the evening. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), in opening the debate, made an important admission, which he hoped the House would take note of. He said, of the subjects mentioned in the Queen's Speech the great bulk appeared to be very rational and very beneficial. The programme unfolded in the Queen's Speech was, according to the right hon. Gentleman's admission, a satisfactory programme, and, if the measures contained in it were not passed into law, whose would be the fault? It would not be the fault of the Government. No one could question their zeal for reform; it would not be the fault of the hon. Members sitting on the Conservative Benches. Their zeal for reform was greater even than the zeal of the Government. They took their stand on the Dartford programme. Unfortunately, the author of that programme was no longer in the Cabinet; but the spirit which he inspired still survived. Most of them on that side of the House were pledged to every jot and tittle of the programme; and he trusted that before the time came for the Government again to appeal to the country, every jot and tittle would have been fulfilled. If not, whose would be the fault? The fault would lie with hon. Gentlemen on the Irish Benches, assisted by their friends the Radicals, under the leadership of the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). It was a curious thing how Party prejudice tended to warp the mind. The senior Member for Northampton said, that because the Tories received a majority at the last General Election, that they were only actuated by lust and greed for Office, and that they should be resisted by every means in their opponents' power. On the other hand, no doubt if the Radicals had obtained a majority, the result would have been hailed as the *vox populi vox Dei*, and all the usual Radical clap-trap. The hon. Member for Northampton had been very active of late. Taking nothing seriously himself, much to his own surprise he had been taken seriously by a large number of Gentlemen opposite, and had been exalted to the position of a sort of leader of the left wing of the Radical Party. Abandoned by the vine and the fig tree, and the olive, they came to the bramble, and said, "Come thou and reign over us." The bramble accepted with pleasure, and forthwith declared his intention to burn down the cedars of Lebanon. The hon. Member, in his references to the Tory Party, had indulged freely in bluster, and seemed to think that under his fierce fulminations and flippant philippics the Tory Party would melt away. The hon. Member made a violent attack upon Lord Salisbury's foreign policy, and asked if he intended to play a great or a small part in European politics. His answer was that Lord Salisbury intended to play no part at all if he could help it. The hon. Member had commented severely on what he called Lord Salisbury's Jingo speech. Well, that Jingo speech, if it had any effect at all, had had the effect of preventing the armed occupation of Bulgaria by Russia. The hon. Member then spoke of Lord Salisbury as the perturbator of the peace of Europe, and seemed to think he was anxious to pose as a modern war-god. But Lord Salisbury, more than any man, knew that peace hath her victories no less renowned than war. Never could he forget the ovation he received when he returned from Berlin, bringing back "peace with honour." To no Roman general, having his brows bound with the laurels of victory, and dragging captive kings at his chariot wheels, was ever accorded a more gracious and honourable triumph. No tears mingled with the rejoicings; no sighs rose up with the shouts of applause; no sad hearts nor houses of mourning rebuked the general rejoicing. Bearing this indelible recollection in his breast, Lord

Salisbury could never do otherwise than seek peace and ensue it, and thereby maintain the traditions of the Tory Party. The Tory Party had ever been the Party of peace. ["Oh, oh!"] A hon. Member said "Oh"; but since the great Napoleonic wars the Tory Party had not embarked the country on a single war on the Continent of Europe; and even as to the Napoleonic wars, Pitt was forced into them against his will, for there was no more sincere lover of peace than Pitt. He need, however, go no further than bring to bear against the hon. Member for Northampton the wonderful testimonial which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian gave to Lord Salisbury in his address on the Queen's Speech last year, in which he stated that Lord Salisbury's foreign policy had been worthy the name and the fame of this country. A great deal had been heard, in the course of the debate, about the peaceful tendencies of the democracy. He rather doubted those peaceful tendencies, for two reasons—democracies never were of a peaceful character, and the English people were most pugnacious. Even the members of the Peace Society had to let off steam occasionally, with the result that there was no more turbulent and aggressive set of politicians in the country. An hon. Member opposite who had addressed the House said that until he entered Parliament the voice of the democracy had never been heard. He would not mention the hon. Member's name, because he complained that he had received too much attention from the Tory Party already. The Tory Party paid him attention for the same reason that the public paid attention to Pears' Soap—it was forced so prominently on their notice that they could not overlook it. The democracy might have peaceful tendencies; but it was not for peace at any price. The wealth and possessions of the British Empire rendered it an object of covetous desire all over the world, and, if we wished to retain our own, we must be as "a strong man armed." He thought the expression of the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) the other night had been very much misapprehended. He did not understand the noble Lord to say that we were not to be prepared for war, or that we were to let our ships rot on the ocean and our guns rust upon their carriages. The noble Lord said if the money was not wasted on coaling stations and fortifications he should have nothing to say against the policy of maintaining them. All, therefore, that he gathered from the noble Lord's speech and the illustration he drew from Lord Palmerston's fortifications was, that they were not to expend any money upon fortifications and armaments; but that they were to expend it judiciously, and that stricter care and supervision should be exercised over those who had the spending of it. It was impossible to deny that the Navy Estimates were in an satisfactory condition, and that they were not properly investigated, when it was possible for such a thing as he had heard only yesterday to happen. He was told by a well-informed correspondent that a case came under his knowledge in which the gig of a man-of-war was painted at a cost of £5; but the cost was entered in the Naval Estimates at £60; and he said that that sort of thing went on habitually, and was not the exception, but the rule. Such outrageous waste, to give it no harsher name, amply justified the statement of the noble Lord, that while the fortifications and armaments might be kept more efficiently, the amount expended might be materially reduced. It was natural that any inquiry into the expenditure would be met with considerable hostility on the part of those into whose pockets the difference between the £5 and £60 went, and they need not be surprised at it; but they must not regard it too much. The inquiry should be unsparing, and a searching eye directed to every single item of expenditure. The noble Lord referred to the historical memories and patriotism of the English people, and said that they could rely upon them. The people who forgot its historical memories were already on the high road to ruin. They might fence it round with fortifications; they might guard it with guns; they might enclose it with navies; but, nevertheless, the day of its decline, though put off for a while would inevitably arrive. But, though historical memories are a great deal, they are not all, and patriotism would not propel ironclads, nor would it protect their coasts from bombardment; and if their ancestors had relied on patriotism only, they would never have shattered the

Spanish Armada, or hurled the French Guard down the slopes at Waterloo. If they had not had ships that could sail, and men that could fight, those splendid historic memories would never have been ours. He understood from what the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) said, that he had resigned on the question of retrenchment; but he (Mr. Beckett) maintained that the whole Tory Party was pledged to retrenchment as well as he. Was it not well within the memory of hon. Members that, at the General Election of 1885, every Conservative candidate pointed to the extravagance and the growing Expenditure of the Liberal Party, and denounced it in the most forcible language he could command; and was it not also a fact that political thermometers in red and blue were posted on all the walls of the Kingdom, showing the abnormal and extravagant expenditure of that Party? And were they not to practise the economy they had preached? If they did not do so their words would be flung in their teeth, and their pledges would be flaunted in their faces, for they would have followed the worst of all examples—the example of the Liberal Government that came into Office in 1880. It would be well if the Government appointed a Committee at once, and invited the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) to preside over it, for they would thus guarantee that the work of investigation would be thoroughly done. The suspicions of the country had been aroused, and it would not be satisfied that the Government intended to move effectually in the matter until the Committee was appointed, and had begun its work. The spending Departments, he believed, needed the most thorough overhauling. There was a story told about a schoolmaster and a boy whom he met on a Sunday. The master asked him, "What are you doing?" "Please, sir," he replied, "I am doing nothing," and the boy's companion, when asked what he was doing, said, "Please, sir, I am helping him." He maintained that until these gentlemen who were helping each other in doing nothing were sent packing, and, until sinecures were swept away, and all snug berths provided for Ministerial hangers-on remorselessly abolished, they would have no proper economy; and then he believed the sacrifice of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the altar of thrift and economy would not have been in vain. He did not think they sufficiently considered what that sacrifice was. They heard a great deal about the sacrifices made by the Liberal Unionists, who were held up to admiration on every Tory platform in the country. No doubt the Liberal Unionists had made very great sacrifices—but not one of them had made a sacrifice to be compared in scope and magnitude with with that made by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington. Why, then, should they attribute honourable motives to them, and unworthy motives to the noble Lord? The parallel held good in all ways. Each of them had sacrificed power and place to be true to pledges; each had incurred unpopularity in order to maintain principles; and, therefore, he could not see why they should praise the Liberal Unionists, and bestow blame upon the noble Lord. Was nothing but the voice of censure to be heard from the Conservative Benches? Should they not also express profound regret that the noble Lord no longer sat on the Treasury Bench? Surely, the measure of their regret was that of the services which the noble Lord had rendered to the Party. These services were great and inestimable. Did hon. Gentlemen realize that at present many right hon. Gentlemen would not be sitting on the Treasury Bench, and many hon. Gentlemen would not be sitting on the Ministerial Benches, but for the influence and exertions of the noble Lord? Why then should those who were under such obligations to the noble Lord to turn round on him and lift up their hands against him to stone him? By such conduct they reached a depth of political ingratitude happily rare in the history of this country. The noble Lord was now accused of having violated the cardinal principle of the Union. In what way had he done so? Had anybody in the House delivered a stronger Unionist speech than that made by the noble Lord on Monday last, and had not the effect of his resignation been to bring one of the Liberal Unionists over to the Treasury Bench? The principle of the Union was still intact. No doubt, there were Liberals who wished to receive the noble Lord into their ranks, and the hon. Member for Cockermouth (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) put himself into almost an affectionate attitude towards him; but the hon. Baronet would have to extend his arms for a very long time before the noble Lord would rush into his embrace. Another expression used by Lord Randolph Churchill had been very much misunderstood. The noble Lord talked about a "crutch." To his mind that expression was not an insult to the Liberal Unionists, and it was not even a term of reproach. A crutch was a very sound, useful thing, and it exactly illustrated the position of the Tory Party with reference to the Liberal Unionists. Neither of them could get on without the other at the present moment. The alliance between the Tories and the Liberal Unionists might be permanent—they would all rejoice if it were. On the other hand, it might not; and then, if they were not able to stand alone or to walk by their own strength, what would become of the Union? Therefore the noble Lord taught them a useful lesson—he wished to impress upon them that if that Party had not confidence in itself, in its Leaders, and in its principles, it could not expect the country to have confidence in it. One hon. Gentleman yesterday indulged in the sanguine expectation that the present Government would be out of Office in three months. If the hon. Gentleman liked to comfort himself with that reflection he had no objection, but, if they were to go out in three months, who was to take their place? Hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House? Had not they better agree among themselves first? The senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) said he was satisfied with the unity of the Liberal Party. Well, if the hon. Gentleman was so satisfied, so were his opponents, but there was no unity either in the Liberal Party, or in the Home Rule Party. ["Oh, oh!"] By the Home Rule Party, of course he meant the entire Party who sat on both sides of the Gangway. Was there agreement on the Plan of Campaign? No; that had been an apple of discord; some approved of it and some did not. He quite admitted that the Plan of Campaign had been a godsend—not to the Irish people, but to those persons gorged with American gold, who, if the Plan of Campaign had not come to their rescue, would have had to replenish the eviction fund from their own pockets. That Plan had had very evil effects. In the first place, it marred and interrupted the friendly relations which were growing up in Ireland between landlord and tenant. When the National League found that landlord and tenant were gradually regarding each other with more friendly feelings, they felt that something must be done, and accordingly the Plan of Campaign was brought into the field, with all its "devilish enginery," and its pernicious influence soon stamped out the germs of happier things which had commenced to spring. In the second place, he objected to it because it had a political purpose. A Member of the Irish Party, in December last, said—"We have been able to force the Government to give up the ordinary law and to fall back on coercion." Therefore, it was evident that the Plan of Campaign was invented in order to stir up strife and animosity in Ireland, to make the Government interpose by strengthening the law in such a way that they could stigmatize it by the name of coercion; and then their idea, no doubt, was that if coercion was introduced it would be rejected, and the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) would be reinstated in power. Therefore the Plan of Campaign had a political more than a philanthropical object. The third reason why he objected to the Plan of Campaign was, that not only was it illegal in itself but it made others break the law. If landlords did not receive their rent, how could they pay their debts? The other day a landlord told him he had not received a penny of rent for two years, and if he had not been able to live on the charity of his relations he would not have been able to meet his just debts. It must be remembered that when a landlord did not receive his rent from his tenants and was made bankrupt others suffered—the tradesman and all to whom he owed money. Therefore the Plan of Campaign spread ruin and bankruptcy over a very wide area. With regard to evictions, he found that in the first six months of last year there were only 850 evictions out of 565,000 tenancies. If a man was not to be evicted when he did not pay his rent, what was to be done with him? Were those who were unwilling or unable to pay rent to be left perpetually on the soil? Such a course would be to put a premium on rascality and incompetence. The truth was that evictions were not only necessary, but in many cases they were right. If a man could not do justice to the land on which he lived, it was only right that he should make way for another who could. The policy of keeping those on the soil who could not pay their rents, was the policy of protecting the weakest against the strongest. The law of Nature was that the weakest must go to the wall, and if they violated that law, and the ignorant and incompetent were kept upon the soil by artificial means, then the country to which they belonged must suffer. That was the reason why there was so much misery and poverty in Ireland, because the tenants there were not able to do justice to the capabilities of the land, and therefore its full productive power was never called forth, and the number of those it was able to support was proportionately reduced. What they wanted were men of means and men of trade—the very men the Member for East Mayo wished to drive away from the country. The country in the south-west of Ireland was of a barren character, and it was hardly possible under any circumstances to extract a living out of it; but if they would encourage men of capital to come there, an entire change would be wrought. It would be the same as it had been with some parts of Lancashire and Yorkshire in the past. Men of trade and capital came and waved their wands, and, as if by magic, wealth and prosperity grew up. If they would encourage trade and commerce, especially in the south-west of Ireland, they might see mills and factories rise up on the banks of every stream, thriving populations throng the towns, the fleets of commerce passing in and out, and Ireland renovated throughout. That might be a vision, but it was a vision they could realize if they were to encourage the advent of capital and credit to Ireland. But it never would be realized if Ireland did not understand the "things which belonged unto her peace." The National League were the greatest possible enemies to the peace and prosperity of Ireland, for peace and prosperity would blot them out of existence. They throve in misery, they made a living out of poverty, they drew their incomes from distress, and were clothed, fed, and lodged by rags, starvation, and destitution. The National League in Ireland was like the cholera, which throve and flourished and spread in the midst of squalor and discontent, want, and wretchedness; but, where it was confronted by healthier, purer, and more wholesome conditions of life it dwindled and disappeared. Therefore, if prosperity was to return to Ireland, the National League must be exterminated with a strong hand. It might be a long struggle in which they were engaged, but it was one in which they did not mean to be defeated. He considered they had more on their side than had their opponents. Had the Home Rulers numbers? So had they. Had they enthusiasm? So had they. Had they unity? So had they. Had the Home Rulers a cause? So had they—a greater one. The Home Rulers were fighting for a country; they were fighting for an Empire, and they did not intend to lay down their arms until the cause for which they contended was safe from attack.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford, W.) said, he looked upon the observations of the hon. Member for York, N. R., Whitby (Mr. Beckett) in regard to Ireland as of a fossilized character; indeed, it seemed that the hon. Member, like the rest of his Party, appeared to have learnt nothing and forgotten nothing concerning Ireland. The hon. Member had undertaken the defence of his absent Leader (Lord Randolph Churchill). That noble Lord had left this country, and it was to be regretted that he had been obliged to do so on account of his health. It might, however, be that it was necessary, in the absence of the noble Lord, that there should be young and fiery speakers like the hon. Member to speak in his behalf. The hon. Gentleman declared that the noble Lord had resigned not only his Office, but the Leadership of the Party, on the score of the disposition that was shown to avoid retrenchment, to which he was committed by his utterances at Dartford and elsewhere, and to which not only he, but the whole Conservative Party were deeply pledged. Well, that was the most joyful news which had been communicated to the House for some time past. The hon. Member had pointed to the wicked Liberal Party and its deeds when in power. He (Mr. Illingworth) did not intend to make himself the apologist of the policy of the Liberal Government when in power, for he was bound to confess that, with regard to the Army and Navy, it had been extravagant, and had forgotten its duty and traditions. It should be observed, however, that in the attempts which had been made in the past by a small minority to bring the Liberal Party back to its duty and professions of policy in regard to retrenchment there had never been the slightest assistance given in aid of those efforts by a single individual in the Tory Party. The hon. Member had rejoiced that the Tory Party had been responsible for no European war since the Great War of 1815; but the Tory Party had been so seldom in Office that their opportunities had happily been few. When they had been in Office, we had always been trembling on the verge of serious European complications. As to the Crimean War, both parties were responsible for it, and there had only been one or two individuals on the Tory side who had not hounded on Lord Aberdeen's Government to undertake the war, even sooner than he had felt himself obliged to do. However, let bygones be bygones. He hoped that the Government would soon and sincerely make an attempt at retrenchment in the expenditure. If they did, they would find on that side of the House as cordial a cooperation as they could desire; for his own part, however, he must confess he did not place much reliance on the cheeseparing attempts at economy as coming from the Government side of the House. An arbitrary proposal of a reduction of £1,000,000 or £500,000 was a most unsatisfactory method of approaching the question. After a year or two the permanent staff of the different offices would force on an increased expenditure, on the ground that the Services had been starved. As had already been stated, it was in the question of foreign policy that any relief to the taxpayer must be found. Complaints had been made in certain quarters, and among others by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), that, as far as they could see, the present debate had been of no interest or value to the business of the country. He (Mr. Illingworth) had no doubt that that was the feeling in certain quarters; the appreciation of hon. Members opposite for the time of the House depended largely upon what side of the House they sat. For his own part, he denied that under the circumstances under which they had met the time of the House had been in any way wasted. Parliament had met in a fog, and the Conservative Party in the House of Commons had lost that head which had provided it with a programme and a cry at the General Election. The Government were in a minority, being indebted for their present position to the "crutch" they had found in the noble Marquess and other Liberal Gentlemen. Therefore, discussion upon matters of general policy could not be regarded as out of place at the present moment. He was anxious to know how far the policy of the Government had been altered by the resignation of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington. They had been told that he had resigned on the question of retrenchment; but in so far as that was concerned, he understood that none was to be effected; but were they quite sure that the noble Lord had resigned on the question of retrenchment only? Were there not some serious differences between the noble Lord and his Colleagues with regard to other and even more important matters? He (Mr. Illingworth) had serious misgivings that on foreign policy there was a serious and radical difference between the noble Lord and his late Colleagues. Lord Salisbury had made a speech at the Guildhall, on the 9th of November, with regard to the affairs of Austria and South-Eastern Europe, which had caused serious disquietude to many thoughtful people in this country. The noble Lord had since that time seen fit to modify some of the opinions which he had then expressed, when he said that Germany was not prepared to assist Austria in any perilous enterprize she might undertake. Lord Salisbury had told them that the opinions and judgment of Austria must be of enormous weight in the Councils of Her Majesty's Government, and would largely shape the policy which England would also pursue. That was a dangerous view for Lord Salisbury to hold even in his secret mind; but when spoken before a large audience it was dangerous to the last degree. Of all countries in Europe

Austria was the last for us to rely on. In the present state of Europe no one could be confident, seeing the extensive military preparations that were being made by both parties, that war between France and Germany might not break out at any moment, for it was hardly possible that the present system of enormous armaments could go on without making a collision inevitable. He should like to have seen Her Majesty's Government using their good offices with foreign nations in favour of disarmament; but, unfortunately, our home policy had been such as to considerably weaken our moral influence. He appealed to the Government—indeed, he thought it was their duty—to do all in their power in order to bring about a better state of feeling between Germany and France. There were people who said that the next collision between Germany and France would lead to the rapid discomfiture of one or other of the combatants. But for himself, he thought there was good reason for believing that the next contest would be far more protracted than the last, and that it would draw other nations into it. We, at any rate, ought to take care beforehand that we were not dragged into it. We were under Treaty obligations to safeguard 20 countries, or parts of countries, and it would be well to disentangle ourselves from such engagements, so that we should not be induced to take part in European complications; and he hoped that the House, by some expression of opinion on the matter, would safeguard the Government against falling into those complications. Turning to the Irish Question, he would point out that it was in the hands of a Government who had many difficulties to contend with, and who were mainly put in office by the landlord class; the result being Irish legislation in the past had all been in the interest of that class, and it was this legislation that was mainly responsible for the miseries of Ireland, which had so long hung over, and which even now continue to distress that country. In the past, laws were conceived in the selfish interests of a small and powerful class. They had been maintained, and had worked the impoverishment of the tenants of Ireland. It was, therefore, no easy matter for the Tory Party to originate anything that would be for the permanent benefit of Ireland. But Ireland, through the great majority of its Representatives, had formulated a demand which had happily found staunch supporters in the great body of the Liberal Party, and in the head of the Liberal Party. He (Mr. Illingworth), for one, wished to speak on the question of Home Rule with no uncertain voice. He admired the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale more almost than any other Member of the Unionist Party. The noble Marquess had laid down the terms on which he was willing to go back to his Party, and upon which he was determined to support the Party opposite. He (Mr. Illingworth) for once thought, with the noble Marquess, that it was infinitely better that there should be a fair understanding between the two sections of the Liberal Party. It seemed to him, however, that the noble Marquess was just at the "8*s.* duty" stage of this question. Those who were for Home Rule had founded themselves upon a rock—the principle of all or nothing. They must either treat Ireland as a Crown Colony, or grant her Home Rule. He hoped that the "Round Table" would soon be put up for sale. As a relic, it might be interesting, and he wished to bespeak it on his own account. He had had some misgivings with regard to the use which it had been put to; and, as he had said, he admired the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale for keeping himself disengaged in the matter. To show how little progress had been made with regard to Ireland, he would quote from a debate in that House in 1844, when Lord John Russell moved for a Committee of the Whole House to take into consideration the state of Ireland. That debate showed that since then they had been moving in a vicious circle, and had not made the slightest progress. What were the points with which Lord John Russell then contended? Why, one of them was the state of the magistracy, and the gross injustice done to the great majority of the people in excluding them from any share in the magistracy. The question of packing juries was also prominently dealt with; and there were some Gentlemen conscientious, but mad, who did not hesitate to say that it was unsafe to trust Papists, and that the policy of legislation and administration of law in Ireland must go upon the determination and plan of treating them still as aliens and as untrustworthy. He would like to know whether any substantial advance had been made upon that position to-day? They were sometimes asked, why could not the Irish Members be satisfied with the equal rights with England and Scotland which they were now supposed to possess? But the treatment of Ireland, in nearly everything, was different from the treatment of Scotland and Wales. If the words which were uttered with regard to Ireland a few months ago by the right hon. Gentleman the present Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) had been uttered with regard to Scotland, the peace of England and its relationship with Scotland would have been within a week completely upset. Imagine a responsible Minister speaking, not for himself, but for the Government, declaring legislation in regard to Scotland should go on, utterly regardless of the great majority of the Members returned from it. Yet, with regard to Ireland, that was the avowed policy of the Government. There were such arrears to make up, that even with a well disposed body of Representatives in this House they could not put Ireland in the same position as Scotland. That was a work beyond their power. The Liberal Party had not the wish to undertake the task of regenerating Ireland. They wished to delegate the duty to Ireland herself. He believed that the proposal of Home Rule made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, which was accepted by the people at first as an article of faith, and because they trusted, as they had a right to trust, the right hon. Gentleman, was now becoming a conviction, and the masses of the people of England would gradually swing round to support the policy of the right hon. Gentleman, and would not allow him, or any Government, to give grudgingly, when it was determined to give at all, in returning to Ireland her filched rights and privileges. For his part, he wished the battle to go on, not only for the sake of the question and Ireland alone, but for the sake of the Empire at large, until a settlement was reached. Was there a man of any experience in the House who had any hope or expectation that the hands of Parliament would be free till this Irish Question was disposed of? There was, he ventured to say, only two alternatives upon the Irish Question. If the Government again asked the House to give them increased coercive powers for Irish Administration, there would be strenuous opposition to that proposal; but if right hon. Gentlemen opposite succeeded in gaining those powers, and in placing upon the Statute Book another evidence of the folly of this country towards Ireland, he (Mr. Illingworth) would tell them that they would be driven to the expulsion of hon. Members below the Gangway, and, in the most ignominious way possible, they would then have to govern Ireland as a Crown Colony. Since political power had been given honestly to Ireland, there had been two Elections; and the second was a repetition of the first, and an equally full endorsement by Ireland of the demands of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), and they were now in a position to regard those 85 or 86 Members for Ireland as the Representatives of the overwhelming majority of the people of Ireland. So far as that Protestant feeling which was opposed to those Representatives was concerned, he had never known anything more insane than the spirit which had governed the Orange Party; and should they refuse to learn good sense, taste, and consideration to those who, at least, so far as their treatment in Parliament was concerned, had hitherto been their inferiors, he should not object to see them brought to a better state of mind by the majority of the Irish people. The only other alternative was to give Ireland Home Rule; and he believed the happy moment had arrived when they might grant Ireland her demands, in order that there might not be left a vestige of the animosity that had prevailed between the two countries in the past. He was convinced that, if justice were done, the Irish would prove as warm-hearted and loyal friends of the Empire as any to be found in England or Scotland. Only one word, in conclusion, as regards this troubled question of the Plan of Campaign. Now, he was not careful to ask himself whether the policy of the Plan of Campaign could altogether be squared to the Statute Law of this country, or the Common Law. He was free to admit that it might be extra legal; and the Law of Conspiracy might be so construed that if they had a jury which had lost all feelings of sympathy with the masses of the Irish people, they might possibly get a conviction. [*Laughter.*] Ah! the smile that came from hon. Gentlemen on the Government side of the House showed the very unhappy frame of mind in which they were with regard to the masses of the Irish people—with regard to their troubles and their sorrows. All he could say was, that he would be very slow, indeed, to give to any Government any power which would enable them to escape the judgment of a jury upon any action the Irish Members had taken with regard to the Plan of Campaign. If it were a stretching of the powers and rights conferred by law, it was only to meet legalized injustice which had too long prevailed. The land system of this country was reaching a pass which would call for the serious attention of that House, with the view of a radical change.. If they had been as helpless in this country, if they had no other resources but to throw the surplus population upon the land, as was the case in Ireland; and if they had no other employment for the people, England would have dealt with the Land Laws and the landlord class long ago; and it was because Ireland had no other industry she was now reduced to this miserable plight; and he could not believe for one moment that the working classes of this country would condemn what Irishmen had been doing in Ireland in order to escape those horrid evictions. Considering the cruel conduct of landlordism, they might be obliged to be tolerant to some extent to the remedy—the only remedy which was open to them to help in saving their fellow-countrymen from the roadside and beggary. This being so, he was sure that it would only hasten a genuine and satisfactory settlement of the question. He, for one, believed that if he had been an Irishman, placed as these men had been, he would have gone heartily with them in the work they had been doing. They had so far his support as to say they were excusable in the action they had taken. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland told them that he had brought pressure to bear. Why had he taken that course? The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington declared, in the last Session of Parliament, that the Government were not convinced that the judicial rents were too high. How had they since found out that they were? What Commission reported in order to give them unerring guidance upon the question? Well, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Government succeeded, happily, to a great extent in the pressure they had employed. In the great majority of cases, the landlords of Ireland had given substantial reductions of rent, and in many other cases such reductions as showed a disposition to meet their tenants. But the Plan of Campaign had succeeded where the Government had failed. The worst and most extreme cases the Government had not been able to deal with, and they were obliged to hand them over to the Gentlemen who worked the Plan of Campaign. There were some landlords in every country who worked in such a way as to place themselves outside the pale of any sympathy whatever. He supposed he might say that as regarded some of the landlords in Ireland; but he would say this as regarded others—that their position was deserving of the greatest commiseration. They were themselves the victims of this vicious land system. They had tied up the land, and allowed such settlements to prevail that, with the reductions which had taken place under the judicial rents, and the events which had since taken place, these nominal owners of the land were without any income from their own estates. Their position was desperate, and they did not know which way to turn. The hon. and gallant Member for the Holborn Division of Finsbury (Colonel Duncan) said Party spirit had been the curse of Ireland. As had been suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), why should they not take the Land Question first, and leave for after consideration the question of local self-government? He believed that a separate Parliament would not eradicate the hostile feeling which was now entertained by a large portion of the Irish people towards England; and he believed that an Irish Parliament would not achieve the impossibility of enabling five Irishmen to live on a spot of land where Nature had made provision for only one. He believed that the Irish Question was the question of the hour, and from the necessity of the case must be made the question of the hour. Parliament suffered from paralysis, owing to the engrossing character of the Irish Question; and he believed that paralysis would continue until they had found a satisfactory settlement of the Irish Question. Any statesman who succeeded in effecting such a settlement would deserve and receive the gratitude of Parliament and of the country.

Mr. DUNCOMBE (York, E. R., Howdenshire) said, he must confess to a feeling of disappointment, in common with other Members, that year after year at the opening of Parliament the great Irish Question confronted the House; year after year they had reference in the Queen's Speech to Ireland; year after year they had abundant promises of reform; year after year they had earnest efforts to carry out those reforms, but still the much-looked-for settlement never arrived, and the woes of Ireland remained the pity and the despair of the civilized world. So much was this the case, that they were tempted to ask whether statesmanship had undergone a partial eclipse in regard to this matter, and whether it was no longer able to meet the demands that were made upon it? They were tempted to ask whether this question was destined to be settled by political parties in that House, or whether it was destined to settle itself in a manner that at the present moment was unforeseen and unexpected by political parties in this country? They might be sure of this, that there must be a settlement of some sort. The do nothing policy was rejected on all sides, and, if the nation last year refused to give its consent to the scheme of the late Government, they might be quite sure that it did not intend to give its confidence to those who were prepared to do nothing except assert that they would do something hereafter. He took it that there must be a settlement of this matter, and one proof of that was the very small minority of Members in the present Parliament who were not pledged to some alteration in the existing machinery for the government of Ireland. How was it that the spirit of the Legislature being so willing in connection with this matter, its flesh was so weak? It was the result of the predominance of Party spirit which had been the curse of Ireland. If only they could have laid aside the aphorism that an Opposition was bound to oppose, they would, he believed, have arrived at an adequate settlement of the question long ago. There were several precedents for political parties combining to settle a question. Only a few months ago there was a combination of parties to settle the important question of the Redistribution of Seats, and, if both political parties could meet in order to settle that question, he could not see how there could be any objection to their meeting together to settle this Irish Question, which was just as important and far more difficult. If the question could not be settled as a whole, why not divide it in the manner suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain)? Why not take the Land Question first, and then leave for after consideration the question of local self-government in Ireland? The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), said that the Irish Members would not consent to this course. He did not understand why they should object, because, after all, the Irish Land Question was not an exclusively Irish affair. It concerned English interests, and might possibly have something to do with English money. When the Land Question had been settled, then the opportunity would at once arise of dealing with the question of local self-government. He was one of those who were not in favour of that question resulting in a separate Parliament in Ireland, because he believed it was impossible to have a separate Parliament for that country. It was impossible to believe that one Parliament in Ireland could rule Ulster as well as Connaught. He believed a separate Parliament could not of itself institute that great system of manufactures which was necessary for the prosperity of Ireland. He believed a separate Parliament could not eradicate that hostile feeling which was now entertained towards England by a large portion of the Irish people; and in his opinion a separate Parliament in Ireland could not well accomplish the impossibility of enabling five Irishmen to live on one spot of ground where Nature had made provision for only one. He believed that when the Land Question was settled it would not be difficult to find a scheme of local self-government which would give satisfaction to what would then be a nation of freeholders. We needed to give Ireland more than verbal sympathy, and he maintained that that sympathy had been deepened and intensified by the sorrowful scenes which had recently occurred in Glenbeigh. Even if they granted that the evictions there had been carried out in strict conformity with the law, and that the utmost generosity had been previously exhibited by those who owned the property, it would always remain incomprehensible to him, why it was thought consistent with humanity to carry out those evictions in the depth of a most rigorous winter, which was trying alike to the ailing and the aged. He made no apology to the House for confining his remarks to the subject of Ireland, because he believed it was the engrossing question of the hour, and must from the necessities of the case remain so. What was the reason why our efforts in legislation were paralyzed at the present moment? It was because we were always thinking of, and perpetually dealing with Irish questions. Parliament was suffering from partial paralysis; and this state of things would continue to last until they had found a satisfactory settlement of the Irish Question. And, what was more, he believed that the demand for Home Rule—heard at present only in whispers—on behalf of the Scotch and Welsh Members, was owing to the fact that Parliament was suffering from this partial paralysis. The Scotch and Welsh Members were convinced—perhaps justly convinced—that Parliament was unable at present to pay sufficient attention to the wants of those localities with which they were especially identified. Hence it was, that the Scotch Members and the Welsh Members were proposing to come to Parliament in order to get powers to manage those affairs with which they thought Parliament could no longer deal. It was under this feeling, he had ventured to express the earnest hope that this question might be settled at once. If, in the meantime, Parliament should have its ancient powers restored to it, and there should arise some statesman—he did not care whether he was Irish or Scotch—who would find a way of settling this great question, he believed such a man would be entitled to, and would assuredly receive, not only the praise of Parliament, but the praise of all future generations.

MR. A. J. WILLIAMS (Glamorgan, S.) said, there was one fact which was being brought home to hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House since the rejection of the Home Rule Bill. It was to this effect—that, on the whole, it was a very good thing that the Home Rule measure of the late Government had not been passed. To his mind the rejection of that Bill, seen in the light of subsequent events, was to be regarded as a sort of revelation. It revealed, probably in the most remarkable way history could show, the radical soundness of the people of this kingdom. That Bill approached very nearly to the working of a miracle—the miracle of converting the whole people in a few months from a narrow policy of harsh repression to a policy of intelligence and justice. Conservative politicians and journalists, who were never satisfied, said that the Land Act of 1881 had been a failure. He thought they were a little hasty in saying so. No doubt it had been a failure in one direction; it had failed because the judicial administrative machinery was simply a mockery of justice to the Irish tenantry. The great bulk of the tenants in Ireland had been prevented from entering the Land Courts, and had thus not been able to get the advantages of the Land Act. But in another direction the Land Act of 1881 was a great and a conspicuous success. It first began to bring home to the minds of the people of this country the true conception of what property in land ought to be. What had occurred in Ireland during the past six months had given another practical lesson as to what property in land ought to be. What was property? Property had been defined as that which insured to all persons what they had produced by their labour. He was glad that one of the results of the sympathy which had recently been evoked for the Irish people had been to spread information, and to give rise to just conceptions of what property in land really meant. Although it had been maintained that the Bill of the late Government, and the Bill which the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) brought in last Session, would not have touched the cases of the tenants who had been recently evicted, yet he contended that the Irish Members pointed out what the troubles of the ensuing winter would be, and that the readiness they showed to accept the measures proposed, including the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork, proved the moderation of the Irish Party. He contended, also, that if the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in the last Parliament had been adopted — namely, that evictions should be stopped, and that, in the meantime, the landowners should receive a certain amount as a first charge on the rent, while a thorough inquiry was made into the condition of the tenants as to what they could pay — the present troubles. with all their attendant miseries, would have been prevented. The Government must take action with a strong hand to prevent evictions until a most searching inquiry was made throughout Ireland to ascertain what rent the tenants could pay and what rent they ought to pay. For his own part, he believed it would be found, when such an inquiry was made, and the true facts of the case were ascertained, that the rent which the tenants could pay was very much less than what was now demanded of them. He firmly believed that the wisest course to pursue was to leave the whole difficulty to be dealt with by an Irish Representative Assembly with a large responsibility.

Sir WILLIAM PLOWDEN (Wolverhampton, West) said, the hon. Gentleman on the other side—the Member for the Howdenshire Division of Yorkshire (Mr. A. Duncombe)—who had just addressed the House, had stated that Irish Members on this side were attempting the impossible task of making five persons live and thrive where Nature intended only one so to do. It seemed that, in forming this conclusion, the hon. Member was forgetting the facts. He must be well aware that 40 years ago or more Ireland supported 8,000,000. It would therefore appear that, under proper conditions, the country could certainly support 5,000,000, its present population. The hon. Member for the Whitby Division of Yorkshire (Mr. Ernest Beckett) had replied to the crutch simile which the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) had applied to the Liberal Unionists. The hon. Gentleman had spoken with such earnestness and energy that it was impossible to suppose he was a Member of the "crutch and toothpick brigade." But it was clear, from his own confession, he was a disciple of the political Gamaliel who led the Tory Democracy—and yet he was an insubordinate disciple, for he approved altogether of the Foreign Policy of the present Government, which the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington had emphatically condemned. They had been told by the hon. Member for the Southport Division of Lancashire (Mr. Curzon) that the great advantage of the present arrangement, whereby the present Prime Minister held two Offices, was that he held the Seals of the Foreign Office. Now, judging from the language of Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech relating to Foreign Affairs, it did not appear that this was an altogether unmixed advantage. He thought the reference to Prince Alexander was not couched in the happiest terms. Why was he now spoken of as Prince Alexander of Bulgaria? At all events, it would have had the advantage of conciseness, and would have been equally accurate if the words placed in Her Most Gracious Majesty's mouth on this subject by the present Government had run thus—"Events which compelled Prince Alexander to retire from the Government of Bulgaria." That, certainly, was shorter than the words used, and could not possibly convey offence. With regard to the question of economy and efficiency, he listened the other night with great attention to the speech of the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton), who caused some laughter when he said that not only were the Estimates of the Department very moderate, but he was surprised at his own moderation. That reminded him of the story about Lord Clive, who, having taken as much as he liked from the treasury of an Indian potentate, and being afterwards accused of rapacity, exclaimed that he was only surprised at his own moderation. He hoped the amount taken by the First Lord of the Admiralty would be administered with economy, but he confessed he had misgivings on the subject. As for the arrangement lately made by the Government to take possession of great merchant steamers in time of war, he was told that two vessels of the White Star Line and three Cunard steamers had been engaged by the Admiralty at £1 per ton per annum. That would entail an expenditure of £40,000, which, capitalized at 10 years' purchase, would be £400,000. These vessels would be perfectly useless for war purposes in their present state, and to make them into belted cruisers would cost £100,000 more. That would make, in all, £500,000. He contended that that was not an economical and advantageous arrangement, and that it would be better to build outright two vessels—and they could be built for £400,000—which should be all our own, and which might be extremely useful. Then, with regard to Ireland, it had been stated that Members on the Opposition side would not express their opinions on the Plan of Campaign. That objection must have fallen to the ground after the statements which had been made that night. He had, before his own constituents, condemned the Plan of Campaign, but he now retracted the condemnation. He had been under the impression that the money which the tenants had placed in the hands of trustees was to be used in the Courts to prevent the landlord from obtaining his rights. That seemed to him like seething a kid in its mother's milk. But now he was told that the money was held for the landlord as soon as he chose to come to terms with the tenants. It appeared to him that the case was analogous to one of salvage, when the terms agreed upon were afterwards found to be too high. In that case, the Court would go behind the contract, and decree that the sum to be paid should be considerably less than had been agreed to.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said, that every Irish Member who spoke after the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth) ought to thank him for the manner in which he had defended them. The Queen's Speech generally indicated what the Government intended to do, and in this case it showed that for the next three or four months they would live on three things—first, the Address; after that had been discussed, they meant to live on coercion, and after that, they would live on Parliamentary procedure. In the meantime anything might happen. There might be a Continental war; but, owing to the Coercion Bill and the new Rules, they would do nothing, and that was what they wanted with two such allies as the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) behind them, and the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) in their front. The moment they produced a new policy, it would be impossible for the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale to support them, and it would be impossible for them to satisfy the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington. It was a miserable thing for Ireland that she had become the sport of Parties, and that a Conservative Government should be attempting to hold Office by coercing her. By altering the procedure of the House, and by bringing in a Coercion Bill, the Government would occupy the attention of the House and of the country, and would thus be able to put off the reforms which they had pledged themselves to effect. He regretted that the Queen's Speech had not touched upon the subject of the means to be adopted for developing the material resources of Ireland by carrying out a scheme of general arterial drainage of the country, and by constructing railroads and deep-sea harbours. The Government were taking no steps whatever in that direction. No doubt the Royal Commission which had been appointed to consider these subjects would report towards the close of the year, and the Ministry might possibly bring in some measure dealing with them, which would not pass; and so the matter would go on indefinitely. Although politics had a very strong hold of the Irish people at the present moment, still the bitterness of the Home Rule Question would be largely mitigated if the people saw that the Government really intended to do something to develop the material resources of their country. At present, the arterial drainage of the country was in a most disgraceful state, principally in consequence of the fact that the landlords, who alone had the power under the existing law to deal with it, had no interest in improving it; whereas the tenants, who would be benefited by a proper system being carried out, had no power whatever in the matter. It was clear from the terms of the Queen's Speech, that the Government did not intend to do anything in this direction. The subject of railways was not of so pressing a character; nevertheless, a great deal of benefit would be conferred upon Ireland if the Government would guarantee 2½ per cent interest upon loans for their construction, to be repaid by the local authorities. Of course, this State guarantee would only be given in respect of lines which the Government thought would be of benefit to the districts in which they were constructed. A great step towards settling the Land Question in Ireland would be effected if the smaller tenancies were dealt with. There were 150,000 tenants holding under five acres of land. For £5,000,000—£4,000,000 of which would be a loan, and £1,000,000 a gift—all these small holdings could be purchased, and a great part of the Land Question would be settled. These holdings were too small for the tenants to live on, and the bold step ought to be taken of doubling them, and that could be done without loss to the Exchequer. To double all small holdings under five acres would cost £9,000,000, which would all be paid back to the Exchequer. If a Conservative Government were to attempt to settle the Land Question on such a basis, they should not stop at five acres, but should purchase all holdings up to 30 acres. Then the very small holdings could be extended without injustice to anyone. He believed that if a Conservative Government would boldly face the question of the purchase of small holdings, and would develop the material resources of the country, a great advance would be made in securing the peace and prosperity of the country. Not that the Nationalists would for a moment give up Home Rule.—[Mr. Johnston: Hear, hear!] The hon. Member for Belfast knew they would not do that.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said, that the paragraph of the Royal Speech to which he took special exception was that which referred to Ireland. It was said that the condition of Ireland still required anxious attention, and that grave crimes had been rare; but he maintained that, during the last four or five years there had been no such thing as grave crime, though there had been disturbances owing to the aggressive and unjust conduct of the landlords of the country. Outside those disturbances, those ebullitions of bad temper, he controverted the statement in the Queen's Speech that within the past four years there had been anything deserving the name of great crime in Ireland. It seemed a curious commentary on that paragraph that it was immediately followed by another stating that Parliament would be asked to amend the criminal procedure of Ireland. That meant that Her Majesty's Government intended to devote their energies and a considerable portion of the time of the House to the propping up of unjust rents in Ireland and preventing the natural action of the economic laws in regard to the prices of produce. In view of the answer of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) with reference to the Woodford evictions that evening, when he said that the cost of sustaining Lord Clanricarde's evictions had been £13,000, and in view of other recent events in Ireland, he thought he was entitled to argue that the paragraph in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech to which he had just referred meant neither more nor less than this—that come what might, and be the result to the tenantry what it might, impoverishment, waste of capital, turmoil, and disturbance, Her Majesty's Government were determined, at any cost, to prop up the system of rack-renting which prevailed over the greater part of Ireland. They had been told that a great deal of the time of Parliament had been devoted in the past few years to the question of Irish agriculture. No one who knew anything of the subject would deny that the maladministration of the Land Act of 1881, in the interests of the landlords, was at the root of much of the disturbance in Ireland. But, even with the best administration, the scope of that Act was so limited that it could not affect the cases of two-thirds of the tenants in that country. He thought, therefore, that the statement of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), that the tenantry of Ireland were surrounded with a wall of triple brass, had a very limited application indeed. He (Mr. Flynn) represented a constituency largely engaged in the manufacture of butter, and it could not be denied that his constituents were as much interested in the development of Irish manufactures and agriculture as any body of Members in the House could be, and he must express his regret and astonishment that an hon. Gentleman should have thought fit to cast the ungenerous stigma upon his Friends and himself that they had no interest in the industry, the honesty, and the thrift of the people whom they represented. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland was in his place, and perhaps he could convey to the Chief Secretary for Ireland the facts of one particular case which had come under his own observation of pressure put upon a landlord by subordinates of the Chief Secretary. He (Mr. Flynn) did not blame the Government, for the pressure in the circumstances was wise, judicious, and necessary. Near Clonakilty, in the county of Cork, the eviction was endeavoured to be carried out of a tenant named Tim Hurley. The rent was excessive, but the landlord was inexorable to have the full rent. Hurley made a resistance to the law; the eviction was not carried out on that day; and a great deal of disturbance in the neighbourhood resulted. Captain Plunkett, Resident Magistrate, acting, if not with the knowledge, at least with the authority, of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, went to the district and called upon the parish priest to make inquiries concerning the relations between landlord and tenant. On two occasions he had interviews with Father Lucy, and he also visited Hurley's farm and pronounced the rent to be a rack rent. Father Lucy was present when Captain Plunkett told Inspector Kerr, of the Royal Irish Constabulary, to ask Mr. Bennet, the landlord, to meet him. Mr. Bennet accordingly met him at the police barrack, when Captain Plunkett informed the landlord that the rent was excessive, and asked him to give an abatement. Mr. Bennet declined, however, to do so. Thus far, this was judicious and wise pressure. The Chief Secretary for Ireland denied that any evidence could be adduced of a threat to withdraw police protection; but Captain Plunkett gave Mr. Bennet a week to consider, and told him that if he did not make an abatement he (Captain Plunkett) would withdraw the police protection. Mr. Bennet then threatened the High Sheriff with an action for loss and damage, and the eviction was eventually carried out. They asked the Government to put such pressure on the landlords as would prevent them from evicting from their homes people who were unable to pay exorbitant rents. The Government then, in an underhand manner, did what they had refused to do openly. As to the alleged immorality of the Plan of Campaign, the answer of himself (Mr. Flynn) and his Friends was, that it was a legitimate combination against unfair demands, and had received the sanction of those whom they looked upon as more authoritative exponents of the moral law than those who denounced their proceedings.

MR. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton) said, he should be glad to learn what explanation the Government had to give with reference to the passage in referring to brigandage in Burmah. It was said, our

"Operations had been conducted for the purpose of extirpating the brigandage which has grown up during recent years of misgovernment."

He should like to know how much of that brigandage had grown up during the last year and a-half. He remembered the time when the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a speech delivered last year, encouraged Parliament to expect a speedy close to the disturbances in that country, that the population were glad to welcome us, and that a great revival of English trade would result from the policy the noble Lord had pursued. No doubt trade had begun to revive; but he failed to trace any of that revival to those operations in Burmah. Indeed, he could not see what they had done, except cost this country a considerable amount of English blood and treasure. If the late Chancellor of the Exchequer was so bent on economy, as he believed the noble Lord now was, he trusted that if, in the future, he should hold such a responsible Office as that of Secretary of State for India, he would avoid plunging the country into a policy which entailed that there should be an open end to our purse. On the question of retrenchment, he was glad that any Member of the Tory Party should have taken so strong a step in the direction, not only of economy, but of a peaceful policy. With regard to the Plan of Campaign, he remarked that he did not desire to treat the question in any narrow sense. He wished to look at it as it was likely to influence public events; they must look at the question in its broad issues. There was no doubt in his mind, viewing the question as he had indicated, that the Plan of Campaign was to be regarded as a combination on the part of the tenants to keep down or reduce their rents. It bore a great resemblance, in many respects, to the organization of the English Trade Unions—he did not say a complete resemblance; and this was the more suggested to him by the fact that the Tory Government were meeting it by an appeal to the same law with which, when it was applicable, they met the Trade Union combination. But he was aware that the Plan of Campaign was objected to, and to a certain extent rightly objected to, as involving some attack on property. No one felt it more desirable than he did, in the beginning of a democratic time, to see that the rights of property were duly protected; but, when they spoke of property, and especially that in Irish land, they were naturally led to ask the question, Whose property? An hon. Member opposite said that the Land Acts of 1870 and 1881 had initiated for the tenants in Ireland a property in land. He differed wholly from that interpretation of the Land Acts of 1870 and 1881. On the contrary, they were the first endeavour, after many years, to re-instate the Irish tenants in something of a legal claim to rights of which the Imperial Parliament since the Union had, to a large extent, by direct legislation deprived them. The Devon Commission had been referred to. There were recommendations made by that Commission giving the tenant some legal right to his own property in the improvements that he had made; but the recommendations were not listened to, and the only result of that Commission, so far as legislation was concerned, was the Encumbered Estates Act of 1849, which enabled the owners of encumbered estates to deal in a better manner with them. Under that Act there occurred a wholesale confiscation of the property of the tenant. It enabled and encouraged landlords to sell, along with their own property, tenants' property to an enormous amount to a new and untrammelled set of proprietors, who might justly maintain that they had paid for such property, although it was sold by those who had no right to sell. Within the first eight years after the passing of that Act, there was no less than £20,000,000 sterling worth of estate property in Ireland which changed hands. To take one typical fact in connection with an estate sold under that Act in 1866; the auctioneers' advertisement contained the phrase—"The tenants are respectable and most comfortable; the rents are extremely moderate, and may be readily increased." That meant increased on the tenants own improvements. He found that on a farm, the valuation of which was £19 per annum, the rental was raised under the new purchaser to £48. On that same farm, under the Act of 1881, the judicial rent had been fixed at £28. That that rent had been improperly doubled was, therefore, admitted by the Act of 1881. No doubt, the Acts of 1870 and 1881 gave a certain security to the tenants; but the landlords, it was well known, had got behind even those Acts by "decreeing" the tenants, and also by means of actions for ejectments, the result being that the tenants in many cases were not able to obtain the value of their improvements, and their property was confiscated. It was facts like these which showed how incompetent was the English Parliament to legislate for a country which it did not understand. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had spoken of tenants living in houses that did not belong to them, and when that phrase was objected to, he said that by law the dwellings were the property of the owner of the estate. That was exactly what was complained of. Our laws had been passed in ignorance of what were Irish custom and Irish law. To quote the words of Baron Pennefather—

> "The entire landlord and tenant code of Ireland goes to give increased facilities to the landlord. It never entered the head of the Legislature to make provision for the tenant, and all these enactments, at least 32 in number, are invasions of the common law."

By the 32 Acts referred to, and by such laws as those of 1816 and 1818, which there could be no doubt were for the facilitating of ejectments, and that of 1849, this House had swept away the old Irish land law, which had many points in it far more favourable to the tenant, like all other Celtic law, than either the Saxon or Norman laws under which we lived, and had substituted for it fragments of Saxon and Norman Law wholly unsuited to the circumstances of Ireland. They talked, forsooth, about capital being withdrawn from the country! Why, capital had left the agricultural parts of Ireland because the landlords, unlike English landlords, had never put their capital into Irish land, but had drawn it and spent it out of Ireland, and they did so to this day. He supposed there was at least £1,000,000 sterling sent out of Ireland every year to absentee landlords. [*Cries of* "More."] Right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite denounced as brigands and miscreants those who sent over money from America to further the cause of the National League, but they did not object when the money was sent by those same persons to help to pay rack-rents. It was well known that agricultural labourers came over from Ireland to earn money here in order thereby to pay their rent. It must not be forgotten that, to a very large extent, rent in Ireland differed from rent in this country; there it was in the nature of a poll-tax, and, as in the case of Glenbeigh, it was levied by what, in the biblical sense of the word, might be called publicans, who did not even pay a tithe of it to the National Treasury, but who cost a large sum of money to it in raising that poll-tax. With respect to the Plan of Campaign, however much they might endeavour to argue about it, or apologize for it, or even condemn it, there was one thing in connection with it which must be considered. When the Plan of Campaign was first struck at by the authorities in Ireland, the hon. Member for Mayo (Mr. Dillon), speaking of the prosecution against him, had said—"I shall in a very short time stand in a criminal dock, where almost every Irishman who has befriended Ireland has stood before me." When any man of high principle like that Gentleman—who was regarded by the whole nation as a patriot, and as fighting the cause of the poor against government by another people—brought against the Government an indictment so heavy as that, and could point to such a miserable state of circumstances, that was enough of itself to make that Government rotten and cause it to fall. With regard to the resignation of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), perhaps too much significance had been given to it, but, in conjunction with the Speech from the Throne, it was of some significance in relation to what he might call the cause of the Liberal Unionists. When the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (The Marquess of Hartington) had spoken at a certain great meeting in London, he had said that the Liberal Unionists would be able to obtain great Liberal reforms. The principal person belonging to the Tory Party who had promised those reforms had been the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. From the first it had seemed doubtful whether the noble Lord would be able to carry with him the rank and file of the Conservative Party, and now it seemed as if the rank and file of that Party, now that the noble Lord was out, had not got beyond what Lord Salisbury had indicated as their programme—that was to say, the carrying out of whatever they did on thoroughly Conservative principles. A great change had also taken place in the tone of the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale. There was no jubilant tone in the speech of the noble Lord at Newcastle about Liberal reforms, and he was content with keeping the pass as at a new Thermopylæ. At the last Election, he and his friends had contended that there was only one alternative to Home Rule—namely, coercion; and, even more, that it would be necessary to send the Irish Members out of the House, because the objection to Home Rule practically was that the Irish were not able to govern themselves; and, if so, why were they able to govern this country? They had been told that a middle course was possible—namely, that of governing Ireland by the ordinary law. But the proposals of the Government in the Queen's Speech amounted to a statement that the law by which they stood was unfit for the purpose they undertook to carry out. Last Session the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington had told them that whatever they did in the way of local government for England, Scotland, and Wales, they would do with similarity and simultaneity for Ireland. But the whole legal system in Scotland was different from that of England; the Education Act was different, and passed at a different time; and even its Registration Law was different. If they turned to the Colonies they would see that the Representative Institutions which we had set going were in no three cases exactly on the same lines. On the contrary, the principle on which this country had acted had been not any *doctrinaire* or new-fangled principle of similarity and simultaneity, but that they should give self-government where, when, and how it was needed. Now they were told that local government would be given to Ireland when circumstances rendered it possible. He would like some responsible Member of the Government to explain what that meant. They heard irresponsible Members of the Tory Party telling the gloss which they put upon it, and their gloss amounted to this—that if Ireland would keep quiet she should have some measure of local government. Was there ever a more hand to mouth policy? If Ireland were unfit for self-government it was because of the ill and evil growth of centuries—it was because of the misfortunes and misgovernment she had suffered under, and these were circumstances which, if true, could not be remedied by a passing quietness. The root of the Irish agrarian difficulty was to be found, not in the agrarian question, but in the question of the government of the country. It had been well said that the Irish people were like patients who were being administered to by a physician at a distance, who was a stranger alike to their constitution and the nature of their disease. We in this country were trying in vain to make ourselves acquainted with the circumstances of a nation different from ourselves, whose newspapers we rarely read, and whose circumstances were only occasionally brought before us by the tedious and continuous knocking at our door by persons to whom we refused to listen. He wanted the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) and the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) to understand that the belief of the Radical Party was that the fundamental difficulty of Ireland was her government. Let those right hon. Gentlemen know clearly that the contention of the Radical Party was, that there should be a Parliament for Ireland and an Executive proceeding from that Parliament. No amount of consulting around a Round Table would ever change that view of the Radical Party, to which they were determined to adhere. For his own part, he was not prepared to accept a little reform here and a little tinkering there. He was afraid that there were a few hon. Members in that House who had voted with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian on his Bill, who were only sitting upon the rail, and who would be glad to salve their consciences by granting the Irish people a little reform. It was, therefore, most important that their leaders should fully understand that the Radical Party intended to obtain a Parliament and an Executive for Ireland. He had heard it said that it was time that they made haste to solve the Irish Question while the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian was still alive. He trusted that the right hon. Gentleman might yet live to see the Irish Question solved upon his own lines; but, whether that was so or not, the cause of the self-government of Ireland, which was the embodiment of great Liberal principles to which they had adhered as a Party, would not die with the right hon. Gentleman, but would endure as long as those principles of justice on which their Party reposed.

Mr. WINTERBOTHAM (Gloucester, Cirencester) said, he did not think that the time of the House had been wasted in a debate which had brought so general and practical an agreement amongst all Parties and sections of the House with reference to two out of the three questions which had been the subject of debate on this occasion—namely, the questions of National Expenditure and Foreign Policy. With regard to the first he was glad to find that the old bugbear of efficiency had been sat upon, and that there was a general desire to cut down the National Expenditure and relieve the taxpayers. As regarded our Foreign Policy, the Jingo fever appeared to be at the very lowest ebb, and the principle of non-intervention had received general support from both sides of the House. He thought that the views which had been expressed with regard to our Foreign Policy would have a good effect, not only upon the Prime Minister, but upon foreign States, who would learn that we were not prepared to spend England's blood and treasure for the purpose of snatching the chestnuts out of the fire for the benefit of Germany and Austria. Upon the Irish Question there was, unhappily, great difference of opinion. He wished to say a word or two, from the point of view of a Liberal Unionist. He was one of those who had voted against the measure of the right hon.

Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian. He had never regretted that vote, and, if a similar Bill were to be re-introduced, he should vote against it again. But, on the other hand, he was strongly opposed to coercion. He could not shut his eyes to facts, and to the general course of events and the general sentiment in the country; and he did not believe that any return to coercion would ever be permitted by the electors of Great Britain until a fair and honest attempt had been made to allow Irishmen to manage their own local affairs under safe and proper conditions. The problem to be solved by every Liberal was, he thought, to be solved on the lines of conciliation and self-government. The old line of coercion would not do. On one point he wished to enter his protest. In the speech delivered by the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), at Leeds, he spoke of the new gospel inaugurated by certain parties in Ireland, saying that, for the first time in the history of the civilized world, a Party had arisen that did not scruple to preach the doctrine of public plunder. Hon. Members below the Gangway—he wished to do them justice—had not given up one plank in their platform; they had consistently preached the same gospel from city to city, and from hill-side to hill-side. Their converts had been many. The hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had naturally accepted the new gospel readily and greedily. It was in consonance with his ideas upon religion generally—[*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"]—that was to say, upon the religion of politics. It had been also accepted, with some hesitancy, by other hon. Gentlemen, who found in it salvation. We all had heard of salvation by works and by faith; but salvation by plunder was the newest form of doctrine—he was using not his own words, but those of the Leader of the Opposition. He ventured to say that thousands of people in this country learnt with feelings of intense regret, that this doctrine had been excused by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian, whose high standard of religion, virtue, and morality had ever been conspicuous. He (Mr. Winterbotham) could not apologize for, or excuse, the Plan of Campaign. He thought it illegal and immoral. But it was only one exemplification of the new doctrines which had found favour with the left wing of the Liberal Party. It was not new; the doctrine was preached by Mr. Henry George, and it taught that killing was no murder as applied to landlords, and that robbery was no robbery as applied to land. They had been told that no rent was an economic rent which was not actually obtained from the holding. To admit such a principle would be dangerous to those who like himself were interested in the question of allotments, and who wished to see thousands of agricultural labourers in England holding a one-acre allotment each. In a very few years the same gospel would be preached to them. If the doctrine were accepted, where was its application to stop? It was sapping the foundations of property, and destroying its legitimate rights. As a Radical he protested against it. It was a new gospel, and not the old Radicalism. No justification could be found for it in the speeches or writings of John Stuart Mill and Mr. Fawcett. The line of its application could not be drawn at any particular kind of ownership. The doctrine, if it should creep into recognition, would be applied to every kind of property. This new gospel showed itself in other ways. The other day at a Liberal meeting at St. James's Hall the National Anthem was hissed. As a Radical he protested against this as a new departure, and he protested against the conduct of others, who, holding similar views, had lately taken to going to church to hiss the Eighth Commandment. He was bound to say that he had heard no word during the debate which had been any sufficient apology to him for the evictions at Glenbeigh. It was quite fair to talk about the right of the landlord to evict tenants who did not pay, but he thought the evictions were carried out with a cruelty and heartlessness which deserved the reprobation of every honest man. Granting that the tenants had not paid rent for four or five years, it would not have caused any great hardship to the landlord to wait for the summer months before turning them out on the naked hill-side. It was our duty, now that there was a lull in the Home Rule controversies, to see if we could not come to some sort of agreement about these congested districts. There were 60,000 of these small holdings in Ireland which yielded no economic rent, and these people were so devotedly attached to their holdings that they contemplated emigration with dismay. One priest told him that, of 80 families who had emigrated to Canada, 30 had dribbled back by degrees to exist on the hill-side because they liked the life. With circumstances such as these a question was presented which hon. Members on both sides of the House ought to take up. Neither Home Rule nor the Tenant Relief Bill of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) would solve the difficulty which they presented. Nor could, nor ought it to be solved by the crowbar brigade and the flaming torch. He regretted that some hon. Members should say that the Land Question could not be settled until after the settlement of the government of Ireland question. To think thus was, he believed, an error. He did not understand how the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain), who must possess a secret which Maskelyne and Cooke might envy, was going to pay landlords the fair compensation which they ought to have under his scheme, if they were not to be paid in English Consols or gold, unless he imposed a heavier burden on the purchasing tenants. The question awaiting solution ought not to be approached from the point of view of Party; but he feared, nevertheless, that Ireland would continue to be made the shuttlecock of Parties, and that hon. Members would still be more concerned in fighting for the "outs" and "ins" than in striving to benefit the unfortunate Irish tenants. If they could but settle the Land Question, they would come to the consideration of the question of the government of Ireland with less prejudice in their minds, for they would approach it uninfluenced by the remembrance of outrages, differences between landlord and tenant, and inflammatory speeches. We had heard of a policy of the resolute government of Ireland for 20 years. We had heard suggestions of the turning of Irish Members out of the House, of the suppression of representative government in Ireland, and of government by a benevolent despotism. Nobody doubted that we were strong enough to govern Ireland in that way; but the difficulty was that our Government was based on the democratic vote, and the democracy would not agree to such a policy. The democracy might come to agree to it some day; but it would not be until we had tried generously to let Ireland, under proper conditions, manage her own purely domestic affairs. So he dismissed that policy; as he did also that of the old Fenian Brotherhood, which was that of making Ireland a separate nation or a Republic. The Irish now said they did not want that; and if they were to demand it we should give the answer the North American States gave to the South—"You are too near us; our necessities and our safety will not allow it." Dismissing these two alternatives, there were between them two middle courses, both of which were experiments. The first was to give to Ireland a Parliament and an Executive practically independent of this Parliament. This was what the Unionists said the scheme of the late Government was. He had not forgotten that on the night of the Division on the Home Rule Bill the hon. Member for Cork said that the Irish Party were willing that the Irish Parliament should be strictly subordinate to the British Parliament. All that the Unionists said was that that was not in the Government Bill. They said—"You may try any experiment you like as regards Irish self-government, if you will only uphold this Parliament, representative of England, Scotland, and Ireland, as the supreme authority." Leave the supreme authority in the British Parliament, and he did not care how soon we gave a subordinate Parliament and Executive to Ireland. That was the other course; and such an alternative he believed would be accepted by moderate men, Conservatives as well as Liberals. We could not go on governing Ireland with a miserable policy of half coercion. It had been tried, and had failed. The present Government could not do more than the Liberal Government had done and Lord Spencer had done. If the Irish Members were put in gaol they would have 85 successors to-morrow. Therefore, he beseeched the Government not to embark on any policy based on the old lines of coercion. Was it impossible for them to come to some sort of agreement as to another experiment? He knew that some Liberals did not like the idea; but the election addresses of the Gladstonian Liberals showed that nine out of 10 of them has said that what they were most anxious about was to maintain unweakened the supreme authority of the British Parliament. Yes! But what a pity they did not say it on the floor of the House of Commons. He did not believe that the issue had ever been plainly put as it was the other day before a Dublin audience by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), who spoke to a resolution that nothing would satisfy Ireland but an Irish Parliament, free from any control by the Westminster Parliament. But that was not the view of the great bulk of the Liberal Party of England and Scotland. He emphasized this because he was anxious for peace, and he desired to get the question settled, and to see Irishmen hard at work on their own local affairs. What was the objection to preserving the control of the British Parliament? If the Irish Parliament attended to its own local concerns, and did justice to the minority, which Irish Members said they were anxious to do—and he believed them—why should the British Parliament want to re-discuss Irish questions in detail because it had final authority? He had faith in the practical common-sense of the House of Commons, and in that of his own countrymen, and he did not believe there would be any such tendency or practice. If the objection were founded on the belief that the Irish Parliament would pass laws which the British Parliament would not approve, then there could be no stronger argument against the creation of any Irish Parliament. If Ireland had an Executive without any force behind it, how could the Imperial forces be employed to enforce laws in the making of which the Imperial Parliament had no concern or voice? The right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister, in his article in *The Nineteenth Century*, argued straightforwardly that the veto of the Crown was sufficient; but that was not the veto of the British Parliament, which was not sitting half the year, and would hesitate to impeach a Ministry for having advised the Sovereign to assent to an Irish Bill. No sham, no subterfuge would do; but the question could be settled if the Irish people merely wanted the management of their own local affairs, and if they would acknowledge in the words of an Act the supreme authority of the Imperial Parliament; and if Irish Members would continue to sit in this House of Commons on the same footing as English and Scotch Members. If the supreme control of this Parliament were maintained, he did not think there would be any difficulty about Ulster, because its people would know that they had the protection of this Parliament, which every citizen was entitled to. Such a settlement was necessary in the interests of England and Scotland, whose business had been too long neglected. To protest against reconciliation, and to talk of buying the Round Table as did the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth), than whom no one on this question had been more lucid and bitter—that was not the way to approach this question. It was not difficult to understand the feelings of Gentlemen who wished to shoot off their officers so as to give a better chance of promotion to corporals and sergeants; but he was afraid there was a little of that feeling at the bottom of some of their speeches. He appealed to Statesmen on both sides of the House whether Irish questions had not been too long the battle-ground of Party, and whether they could not agree that what was inevitable should be done by the collective wisdom of that House. We could not go on in this country as we had done for the last few years. Was it not possible to appeal to the patriotism of Statesmen on all sides of the House to try to find a solution of this question in the giving of some measure of safe local self-government to Ireland? He had not lost faith in the Liberal Party nor in its greatest Leader; if he would only listen to moderate counsels, and turn his back on the advice of his corporals and sergeants, he might close his illustrious political life by settling this the greatest question of our time, and by reuniting the great Liberal Party, which must be the great instrument of progress in the future of this country.

MR. T. E. ELLIS (Merionethshire): In the course of this debate a considerable number of speeches have been delivered in support of the policy of the Government. I have listened to them with great interest; but none of them excelled in interest the speech which we have just heard from the hon. Member for the Cirencester Division of Gloucestershire (Mr. Winterbotham). The hon. Member is in favour of a Legislature and Executive for Ireland on an elective basis; and the only complaint he seems to make of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) is that he does not give the control of the military to the Executive. Another important point in the hon. Member's speech was that he emphatically asserted the rights of property, and also the right of the landlord to extort the last farthing of rent; but, rather incautiously, when he came to speak of the evictions at Glenbeigh, which was an application of his general principle, he protested against them as barbarous and disgraceful. In five-sixths of the speeches delivered there has been an emphatic assertion of the necessity for maintaining law and order in Ireland; and, although some of them have been lively, and some of them even gay, most of the Government's supporters appear to be hurt at the description given of the Liberal Unionists by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), when he spoke of them as the "crutch" by which the Tory Party is supported in Office. The hon. Member for the Southport Division of Lancashire (Mr. Curzon) tried rather ineffectually to take the edge off this sharp description of the Liberal Unionists by calling them a "staff." But when the hon. Member talked of a staff, did he forget what has been written of the staff of broken reed whereon if a man lean it shall go into his hand and pierce it? If ever the Tory candidate for St. George's, Hanover Square (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) should succeed in getting a seat in this House, the Tories will, in all probability, find out how the pieces of a broken reed can pierce the hands of those who are unfortunate enough to lean upon it. It is remarkable, to say the least, to observe the kind and degree of union which prevails among the Gentlemen who call themselves Liberal Unionists. It is not many days ago that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) threw over the noble Marquess the Member for the Rossendale Division of Lancashire (the Marquess of Hartington); and only last night we see how, speaking at Newcastle, the noble Marquess has in turn thrown over the Chancellor of the Exchequer; while the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), with his usual and characteristic boldness, has thrown them all over together. It seems to me that the only momentary and artificial bond of union which keeps together these Gentlemen to whom I have been referring is the emphatic assertion of the necessity for maintaining law and order in Ireland. This insistance on the necessity of maintaining law and order means practically the passing of a series of Coercion Acts for Ireland; and I should like to point out that Coercion Acts in regard to that country have been due to a straining of the forbearance of the Irish people and the rejection of timely and moderate demands for reform. We are sometimes told that the Land Act of 1881 was a very drastic measure, and, in consequence, it has been denounced over and over again by hon. Members on the other side of the House. I should like to know how it was made a drastic measure. The drastic character of the Act is due to the fact that for many long years the House has refused to listen to the moderate demands of Irishmen like Sir Charles Gavan Duffy and Mr. Sharman Crawford. Last night an hon. Member opposite alluded to the fact that the present Irish Members are not continuing the policy of Sir Charles Gavan Duffy for uniting the North and South of Ireland. But what came of his moderate proposals when they were presented to the House of Commons? One after another were contemptuously rejected, until he broke his heart, gave up the work of Parliament in disgust, and emigrated to one of our Colonies. The Land Act of 1881 was passionately denounced by the very men who now cling tenaciously to its letter. They cling to its letter, utterly oblivious of the fact that during the last few years we have been passing through a vast economic revolution, which has well nigh crushed British agriculture, and which has almost placed many British farmers in the pitiable condition of the peasants of Glenbeigh. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington referred the other day to the generosity and magnanimous conduct of the landlord at Glenbeigh in foregoing several years' rent. But where was the generosity of foregoing four or five years' rack-rent when economic rent itself was impossible? We in this country are beginning to understand the sufferings of the peasantry in Ireland; the crofters of Scotland and the small peasants of Wales are beginning to understand why it is that the Irish tenants are clamorous. We sometimes hear now that a Conspiracy Bill has been drafted, and may, before long, be introduced into this House, applicable not only to Ireland, but to England and Wales. Why is it that there is any likelihood of a Conspiracy Bill? It is for this reason: That this House refuses to listen to the grievances, not only of those who suffer in Ireland, but also of those who suffer in Scotland and in Wales. We find that there are not only evictions in Ireland, but in Scotland as well. Scotch crofters have not only been evicted from their houses, but sent to prison. Considerable light has been thrown upon the condition of the crofters of Scotland by the Crofter Land Commission. That Commission has been instrumental in bringing about a large reduction of rents—in one estate of 52 per cent, and in another of 37½ per cent. And these reductions have been made, not on the rent of 10 or 20 years ago, but on reduced rents. For instance, one crofter formerly paid £16 a year as rent. It was reduced to £10 10 years ago, and it has been reduced, under the Commission, to £6. This is a sample of the reductions which have been made in the rents of the crofter holdings. It is not a matter of wonder, therefore, that the official conscience should have been touched, and that the crofters who had been sent to prison should have been liberated. We find that in Wales the same economic revolution has worked havoc. It is interesting to find that in the Queen's Speech we are promised a Bill for altering the mode of levying tithes in England and Wales. Some hon. Members — and especially those on the other side of the House—attribute the disaffection in Wales in regard to tithes either to Nonconformist ministers or political agitators, but in reality it is due to the first pinch of suffering and hunger in Wales. I should like, with the indulgence of the House, to call attention to the tithe agitation in Wales, not merely because it is an agitation against an alien Church, but because it is the beginning of a serious agrarian question. It is unfortunate that in Wales, as in Ireland, the landlords are almost all English speaking Tory Churchmen; while the tillers of the soil are almost without exception Welsh speaking Liberal Nonconformists. This estrangement in language, politics, and religion has brought about rather startling results, and has worked great injustice to the tenants in Wales in one respect—in a heavy increase of rent in prosperous years, and a very slight decrease of rent in ruinous years. In Ireland, from the year 1840 to 1880 the rents were raised 23 per cent; but in Wales, where the land is poorer, the rents, during the same period, were raised 34 per cent. And what about the decrease in rents now that Wales and England are suffering from agricultural depression? In England the landlords have made vast reductions. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House has reduced his rents by 40 per cent, and other landlords have reduced theirs by 50 and even 60 per cent. I find that the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, who are supposed to know everything about agriculture and agricultural prices, have reduced the rents of 75 farms from £41,480 to £30,000 a year. I heard only the other day that one Yorkshire landlord has remitted the whole of the last half year's rent. But what is the case in Wales? One landlord in Cardiganshire has reduced his rent by 50 per cent, and he is looked upon as a perfect marvel. A few other landlords have reduced their rents 25 per cent, but the vast majority, in spite of the representations of the farmers, have only made reductions amounting to 10 per cent. This is the way in which the Welsh landlords generally treat the farmers. A year and a-half ago one landlord was generous enough to give his tenants 5 per cent in lime. Before the next rent day he was asked for a further reduction, and he was so kind as to give 10 per cent to those who had not asked for a reduction, while he refused more than 5 per cent to those who had been bold enough to apply to him for relief. In short the farmers and peasants of Wales who till very poor land have a very hard lot. The Duke of Richmond's Commission reported that these men live a very much harder and more thrifty life than the English agricultural labourers. The tillers of the soil in Wales have been hard hit by oppressive rents and the estrangement which has existed between tenant and landlord, and they have been hard hit as well by the land hunger, which seems to be one of the characteristics of all Celtic people. Up to three or four years ago they were able to do fairly well. Of course, they lived a very hard life; but during the last four or five years their small black cattle by which they lived have fallen in price from 50 to 60 per cent, so that these men have in reality been paying rent out of capital. In Wales the justice of the landlord is not tempered with mercy as it is in England, and those men who do not pay their rent to the very day are often evicted from the soil which has been tilled by themselves and their forefathers. The Chief Secretary said the other night that the Irish tenants are protected by a triple wall of protection. He did not say what the three walls were; but hon. Members from Ireland must confess that there are three walls. One is the Land Court which is set up by the Land Act of 1881; the second is the Land League with its Plan of Campaign; and, whatever hon. Members opposite may say as to the National League, that organization draws its strength and power from the suffering of the people and from the unflinching determination of the leaders of the people that this suffering shall not last. But there is a third wall quite as effective as either of the others, and that is that the Chief Secretary for Ireland has, upon his own confession, spent the winter in Ireland as a preacher of mercy to the Irish landlords. I venture to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House and the present Cabinet, if they cannot afford to send the noble Lord the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners), who is supposed to represent agriculture, as a preacher of mercy to the landlords of Wales? We are asked to humbly thank Her Majesty for informing us that a Bill for altering the mode of levying tithes in England and Wales will be submittted to us, but speaking as I do for the Nonconformist farmers of Wales it would be sheer hypocrisy for me to thank Her Majesty for bringing in such a measure, the only effect of which would be to make the landlords of Wales tithe publicans. To hand the tithes over to the landlords would only occasion a battle against the landlords, and hasten a bitter land struggle in the Principality of Wales. I wish, also, to call attention to an omission in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne. We are told that with regard to Scotland we shall be asked to consider measures for the reform of the Universities; but there is not a single word in the Speech in regard to the glaring defects in the education of Wales. In the year 1881 Earl Spencer appointed a Departmental Committee to inquire into the question of education in Wales, and the noble Earl said then that it had been represented to Her Majesty's Government that the very best of existing educational institutions in Wales of a class above elementary schools were not only insufficient in number but inconveniently situated, and, in some cases, so fettered by denominational restrictions as to be quite inadequate to meet the wants of the people. This has been fully and abundantly confirmed by the Report of the Committee. We are told, on the authority of the right hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), that Wales has been making remarkable strides since the Education Act of 1870, for, whereas in 1870 only 674 schools existed, there are now 1,422. In 1870 only 77,000 pupils were receiving education, but now the number has increased to 188,000. In 1870 the grant earned by each child was 9*s*. 10*d*; the grant at the present moment is 17*s*. 2*d*, which is higher than the grant earned in any other part of the United Kingdom. Since 1870 the Welsh people, chiefly the working classes, have contributed nearly £120,000, in order to endow three University Colleges, and the Government every year gives a grant of £12,000 to help in the work. Those three Colleges have to do the work of intermediate schools, and education in the whole Principality is thoroughly crippled. Now, no reference whatever has been made to this in the Address. The late Earl of Iddesleigh, on the occasion of a public visit to Wales, admitted the urgency of the question; and Lord Salisbury, as well as other Gentlemen now on the Treasury Bench, when in Opposition promised to give attention to the matter. The neglect of intermediate education and of religious equality in Wales will, I am afraid, in a few years make the question a difficult one for the House of Commons. I should imagine that the consequences of neglecting Ireland would have been sufficient for the House of Commons, because the neglect of the affairs of that country has weakened the power of England at home and abroad. Foreign statesmen read your difficulties in Ireland between the lines of every despatch sent from your Foreign or Colonial Office; and they laugh at your fine phrases about the integrity of the Empire, when that integrity only means a blind adhesion of legislative juggle which, 87 years ago, robbed Ireland of its Parliament and of its prosperity. Your failure to settle the Irish Question, arising as it does from a refusal to listen to the Representatives of the Irish people, causes terrible neglect of most urgent legislation for Wales, Scotland, and England. This persistent neglect is wearying the people, and is bringing discredit not only upon successive Ministries, but upon your whole legislative machinery and, not least, upon this honourable House.

MR. JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street): Although I am afraid that the debate is becoming somewhat wearisome, I feel bound to say a few words; but what I desire to say will only occupy a very short time, and I do not think hon. Members will find fault with me for detaining them. I was much struck with the speech delivered the other evening by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) in explanation of his resignation, and also with his subsequent speech in the course of the debate; but I was disappointed at the character of his remarks, and at not obtaining more information from the noble Lord. The noble Lord stated that the ground which induced him to resign Office was the want of economy on the part of the present Government; but I think he ought to have given us much more information than he did on that subject. It is scarcely to be credited that the noble Lord's sole or main reason for resigning was the refusal of his Colleagues to cut down the Estimates by £6,000,000 or £500,000. I am sure of this—that had that been the real reason, he would have accepted the challenge of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury to point out any blot in the Estimates or any special extravagance that might be got rid of. As the noble Lord did not avail himself of that opportunity, I feel almost certain that the real reason of his resignation had more connection with the foreign policy of the Government than the want of economy. I am glad, however, to see—at all events, that is my opinion—that the resignation of the noble Lord has had some practical effect on the policy of the Government. I can see clearly that their policy is not exactly what it was when the noble Lord resigned; and I am certain of this—that although the noble Lord is no longer on the Treasury Bench, his influence will continue to have considerable weight with Her Majesty's Ministers, and that he will, to some extent, still continue to regulate their legislation in connection with home and foreign policy. The noble Lord gave us a quotation from a speech delivered by the Earl of Beaconsfield, in which that noble Lord told us that expenditure is very greatly affected by policy. I would add to that that there is a considerable amount of expenditure that is not affected by policy. There is a great expenditure of a permanent nature, and I hope the noble Lord will be able to point out to us some way in which that permanent expenditure can be decreased. As a new Member, I have been greatly struck by the easy way in which millions of money seem to be voted by this House, almost without question, and absolutely without information being given to hon. Members. As a private Member, I must say that it is quite impossible for the House to have any control whatever over the expenditure of the money. I believe that the proposal which has been made by the noble Lord for the appointment of a Committee to inquire into these matters is an excellent one, and would have a good effect; but the usefulness of the Committee would depend, in a great measure, upon the powers given to it. I am not going to enter into any details in regard to the expenditure of the Army; but I think there are one or two things which I am in a position to point out with regard to the Navy. During the last few years a serious depression has existed in this country and in other parts of the world. That depression, possibly, many of us have looked upon as an evil; and so it is, but not an unmixed evil. When manufacturers have low prices to contend with, they are compelled to take into consideration questions affecting the economy of production. They are compelled to inquire whether, by the application of new machinery or otherwise, they can reduce the cost of production; but that feeling, I regret to see, does not appear to affect the Navy to any appreciable extent. We find that whether there is depression or not, or whether the cost of production is high or low, the expenditure in connection with Her Majesty's Navy goes on increasing year by year. There is another matter to which I ought to call attention in regard to the Manufacturing Department of the Navy, and that is the want of competition. In all private shipbuilding yards, we find that prices and the cost of production are materially regulated by the competition of outside firms. There is a keen competition between all shipbuilding firms, and the result is that ships of every description are being constructed at the lowest possible price. We do not see anything of a corresponding kind in the Navy, and I cannot understand why some system is not adopted which should give to the country the benefit of competition. It is a common thing for the Government to decide upon the construction of three or four ships upon exactly the same designs, and upon the same lines; but the practice is to construct them in some Dockyard where it is impossible to test the expense of constructing one vessel with the cost of constructing another. I am of opinion that when the Government decide upon building three or four vessels of the same type, they should construct them in different Dockyards, by which means they would be able to find out which Dockyard works in the most economical manner. In future, when Her Majesty's Government have decided upon building three or four ships on the same lines, I think it would be a good plan to put out two or three of them to open competition among private contractors, and to construct one only in a Government Dockyard. They would then be able to compare the cost of the ships built by private contract with the cost of constructing a similar vessel in the Dockyards; and I think it would afford a good test as to whether they are getting the full value for their money or not. I feel quite satisfied that it would be to the interests of the taxpayers of the country if the Admiralty would take into serious consideration whether in future it is not advisable to take tenders for the construction of all new ships that are required for Her Majesty's Navy, and to use the Dockyards for repairs only. Where there is new work, it ought not to be a difficult thing to arrive at the cost of that new work; and I am quite sure that an invitation to the private Shipbuilding Companies to give tenders to Her Majesty's Government, would have the effect of cutting down the expenditure to the lowest possible point, because there would be keen competition among the different private firms in order to secure the Government custom. The advantage of appointing the Committee suggested by the noble Lord would be that it would enable the Lords of the Admiralty to satisfy the country that they are really getting efficiency for the expenditure they incur. There is another point which I think it highly probable has never been considered at all, and that is the position of the Dockyards themselves. We find that in all trades which are subjected to competition there is invariably a tendency for a particular manufactory to find its way into the district where it can be carried on most satisfactorily. I remember the time when there were a number of shipbuilding yards on the Thames, and also in other Southern ports of England. But those shipbuilding yards, owing to the competition of the North of England and of Scotland, where shipbuilding can be carried on more economically, have been obliged to close. I am satisfied that if Her Majesty's Government had carefully studied the question of competition, the shipbuilding yards would long, ere this, have been removed to some Northern District where the work can be more economically carried out. I trust that the Government will take that question into consideration. In the interests of economy, I hope that no further amount of money will be sunk in the existing Dockyards; but that the Government will seriously consider the desirability of removing the Dockyards to more suitable positions, by means of which they would save a large portion of the cost of carriage, which they have at the present moment to incur. I am satisfied that if the Government take this matter into consideration, the country will not be disappointed with the result. I do not propose to detain the House longer upon this matter, but I should like, before I resume my seat, to say a few words with respect to the question which at this moment is principally occupying our minds—I mean the condition of Ireland. There have been a good many hard words used in the course of this debate, and those hard words have not been confined to any particular part of the House. They have proceeded from the Treasury Bench, from these Benches, and from the Irish Benches; but I scarcely think that their use is the best means of assisting us in arriving at a solution of the existing difficulty. Last night I see that the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) made use of words which certainly very much surprised me. He is reported in *The Times* —alluding to the principles enunciated by his opponents, and by the main body of Members on this side of the House—to have expressed a hope that traitorous principles would not be in the ascendancy. If those words had come from the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), before he was promoted to the Treasury Bench, I should not have been surprised; but what are we to think of such sentiments from the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, occupying so important a position in Her Majesty's Government. My own opinion is that the use of such language would be disgraceful on the part of any person in this House, but more especially on the part of one who occupies so important a position in the Ministry. We have also heard very strong language from the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson). I confess that I was surprised at the contemptuous manner in which he spoke of the late Prime Minister. I felt that, as I am a Gladstonian, I suffered, to some extent, from the language of the hon. and gallant Member. One of the things he said was that the late Prime Minister had changed his mind. Now, I do not look upon it exactly in that light. The right hon. Gentleman has not so much changed his mind as that he has changed his policy. He has, for the last 30 years, been most anxious, and, perhaps more anxious than any hon. Gentleman sitting on the other side of the House, to bring peace and prosperity, and contentment, to Ireland. He has adopted various policies in order to effect that object, and he has brought in various measures, such as the Land Act of 1870, and of 1881, and the measure for the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. But, notwithstanding all the efforts which have been made by the right hon. Gentleman in this House, we are bound to admit that no satisfactory result has yet been arrived at. I think it is the duty of a statesman who has a particular work to do, when he finds that one method has failed, to try another. The right hon. Gentleman has now adopted the principle of Home Rule, by means of which he proposes to give to Ireland a Legislative Body sitting in Dublin for the purpose of dealing with Irish affairs. The right hon. Gentleman has adopted that principle, believing it to be the only solution of the Irish difficulty; and I am sure that his efforts to secure the passing of such a measure will meet with the support not only of Gladstonian candidates, but with the support of the great bulk of the people of this country. There have been many things said of the acts of Gladstonian candidates in connection with their support of this Home Rule measure; but I can scarcely understand what course the hon. Member for the Stroud Division of Gloucestershire (Mr. Winterbotham) proposes to take. He seems to approve of the measure of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone). He thinks that it would be right to constitute a Legislative Body in Dublin, to deal with Irish affairs; and the only point on which he hesitates is, that he thinks the plan of the right hon. Gentleman fails to secure the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. Now, that is entirely a question of opinion. We have had views expressed on that subject by some of the lawyers in this House; and I think that the majority of them—certainly the most weighty of them—have given a decision in favour of the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman has again and again challenged any Member to produce any other scheme that will effect that object—namely, the object of giving a Legislative Body to Ireland capable of dealing with Irish affairs; and at the same time maintaining the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, which will meet with the support of the Irish Representatives. So far, no such scheme has been suggested. I have read the speeches of right hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, and of Liberal Unionists sitting on this side; but I fail to gather from any of them a plan which will carry out what we believe to be the only solution of the difficulty in a better way than the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman. Until such a plan is proposed, I, for one, am prepared to support the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman in preference to any other. Hon. Gentlemen sitting on the opposite side of the House are of opinion that the best way to solve the difficulty is to give to the Irish people a measure of self-government similar to that which is suitable for local self-government in this country—a sort of County Government. Now, I cannot see the slightest use in producing such a scheme, when we know that it will not meet with the approval of the Irish people, and the support of the majority of their Representatives in this House. I fail to understand what advantage there could be in giving local government of that kind, which would simply place more power in the hands of the Irish Representatives, which power they would certainly not fail to use in support of their further demands. There have been grave doubts in the minds of many Liberals on this side of the House as to the policy of the Plan of Campaign; and I question whether the Plan of Campaign has met with the approval of many Members of this House, or many of the people of England, who are giving that cordial and hearty support to the efforts of the Irish Members to secure some measure of Home Rule. At the same time, I quite agree that, as the Plan of Campaign is put more clearly before the country, many of the doubts which have existed with regard to it are disappearing. I cannot see that there is any very serious difference between the Plan of Campaign and the plan which was proposed by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) last Session. The proposal of the hon. Member was that in cases where the tenants were unable to pay the rent, they should deposit 50 per cent of the amount due in the hands of some authority who should lawfully take charge of it until the tenants had an opportunity of treating with their landlords, or of bringing their case before a legal tribunal who would decide what was the amount of rent they ought to pay. I cannot but think that the House was ill-advised in refusing to accept that proposal. If it had been accepted much of the evil which has since occurred would have been avoided. So far as the Plan of Campaign is concerned, I simply see in it the same measure which was supported by a large number of Members on this side of the House last year, with this difference—that the plan proposed by the hon. Member for the City of Cork would have had the sanction of Parliament; whereas the Plan of Campaign is the same measure without the sanction of Parliament. I cannot see, that apart from that distinction there is any greater amount of immorality in the one plan than in the other. I know that many Gentlemen say that because no agreement has been arrived at between the tenants and the landlords, it would be wrong to interfere and prevent any tenant from carrying out his legal obligation. But it does not always follow that because an agreement has been made, that that agreement is a moral and a just one. I think that if hon. Members who heard the speech of the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. James Stuart) to-night, would think over the subject of that speech they would come to the conclusion that the tenants, in a great measure, are justified in the course they have adopted. Our own Courts are in the habit of setting aside agreements which have been entered into upon an unfair basis. Take the question of salvage. A ship is in difficulties, and gets another ship to come to her assistance. Before that vessel goes to her succour or attempts to take hold of the disabled ship, the crew asks for an agreement. An agreement is made; but hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House who are acquainted with law are aware that in many instances when such an agreement has been brought before the Courts it has been set aside, and the amount fixed upon for salvage has been altered, notwithstanding the fact that an agreement had been entered into practically by both parties before the work was done. I was very much struck with some of the remarks which were made this evening by an hon. Member close to me who recently addressed the House. Very few Members who have supported the Irish Party have advocated a policy of plunder; and the hon. Member to whom I refer remarked that, although he had heard of salvation by faith, he had never heard of salvation by plunder. I maintain, however, that the salvation we advocate is salvation by faith, and not salvation by plunder. In discussing the Irish Question, it is necessary to come down to this main point, which is the central pivot upon which everything else turns — namely, whether you can trust the Irish people or whether you cannot trust them. I am one of those who believe that in establishing a Parliament in Dublin we should not hand over that country to unscrupulous persons in Ireland, but that we should hand it over to the Irish people; and I challenge any man to say that the Irish people, as a body, are more unscrupulous than most men. I am afraid you may find a few unscrupulous people everywhere; but if you were to create a Representative Government in Ireland, I am satisfied that you would find men of honour—men who believe in the rights of property and in law, who would come to the front, and those are the men on whom you would have to rely. I am satisfied that, in supporting the Irish policy of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), we have been pursuing the right course. I believe the time will not be long in coming when many hon. Members, who have opposed that policy most strongly in this House and in the country, will rejoice at such a measure being carried, and will become strong and useful Members of the new Legislature to be established in Ireland.

SIR JOHN SWINBURNE (Staffordshire, Lichfield): I feel bound to express my surprise and indignation at not having heard from some right hon. Gentleman on the Front Bench that Her Majesty's Ministers have been able to see their way to some interference which would have the effect of protecting the tenants of Glenbeigh from the shocking atrocities—for I can call them by no other name—which have been, and are being, perpetrated there. If the law did not apply, why did not the Government ask for an Order in Council in order to put a stop to these atrocities which have been taking place in the South of Ireland during the last month? It has been my lot to live, for many months, in the South of Ireland among some of the very poorest of the agricultural tenants in the county of Cork, who are similarly situated to those of the county of Kerry. I have seen in that county, women and young girls struggling with the ocean for the means of subsistence. I have watched them going down to the sea at low water in order to gather seaweed to make bedding for their cattle, to manure their land to provide food for themselves, and to enable them to secure the means of paying their rent. I have seen them carrying up the sand from the sea, in order to manure the land upon a farm scarcely the size of the floor of this House. The fences were built of the stones gathered from the land, and no one who has not been there can appreciate the difficulty they experience in raising the small stock of potatoes which are necessary to their existence. Let me contrast with this my experience as an English landed proprietor. Twenty-five years ago I had two farms adjacent to each other. Both were worth 7*s.* an acre. I spent something like £30 or £40 per acre upon one, and raised its value to £3 10*s.* an acre. The other remained on the tenant's hands, and never advanced in value, nor could it have done, unless the farmer had taken the place of the landlord. Then I maintain that those tenants who effect the improvements are entitled to six-tenths of the whole value of the land. I was surprised at the attitude which Her Majesty's Government took up last Session in regard to the Bill of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). Having told us that exceptional circumstances would prevent the tenants from paying the rent, and having issued a Royal Commission to inquire and report upon the subject, they found themselves unable to assent to a Bill the object of which was simply to stay evictions until that Report was received. What has been the consequence? Why, that tenants who morally owned nine-tenths of the farms they tilled have been evicted, and left to starve by inches on the road-sides. I would ask hon. and right hon. Members on the Front Bench opposite, who have travelled abroad, to say how such a state of things would be regarded in Russia, Poland, or in any other part of the civilized world. Her

Majesty's Government, who are in Office, but not in power, appear to be conniving at atrocities which were supposed to have become extinct, at least 200 years ago.

Mr. P. J. POWER (Waterford, E.): Like other Members on this side of the House, I supported last Session the Bill of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) in the belief that it would have met the exigencies of the coming winter. That measure unfortunately was rejected by a majority in this House, and the tenants of Ireland were left face to face with the great and serious difficulty of an agrarian crisis. We endeavoured to show the House that the prices of agricultural produce had fallen in an enormous degree, and we pointed out that that was the reason why the rents that were fixed between 1880 and 1884 had become impossible rents now, but hon. Members scouted that Bill out of the House. On our part, we were most anxious that the House should accept it because, we believed that it would enable the landlords to receive, at any rate, some portion of their rents. When the Bill was rejected, the tenants found themselves face to face with a serious crisis. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland was one of the first to recognize that fact. He went over to Ireland, and having stated that there were no grounds for the Bill of my hon. Friend, one of his first acts was to bring pressure to bear upon the landlords in order to induce them to accede to the demand for reduced rents. Unfortunately for the country, he had not the courage of his convictions. He endeavoured to put forward a Plan of Campaign of his own, and he left the tenants face to face with panic. Now I ask what was the duty of the Irish Representatives under those harrowing circumstances? Were they to allow the scenes of 1848 and 1849 to be re-enacted? Were they to allow famine to stalk through the country, or was it not their imperative duty to stand between the people and the famine that was then threatened? We have it on all sides that this Plan of Campaign, which the Irish Members find it necessary to promulgate, does not mean the non-payment of rent. Hon. Members are labouring under a great mistake who entertain that view, because the fundamental principle of the Plan of Campaign is that a fair rent must be paid by the tenants. In every instance we pressed upon the peasantry the necessity of making a moderate demand; and, having made that moderate demand, we impressed upon them the necessity of sticking to it. The tenants, as a rule, have adopted that advice, and by the moderation of the figures they have demanded, they have gained on their side the conscience not only of their own countrymen, but of every thinking Englishman, Welshman, and Scotchman. No doubt in some cases, there might be men who would take advantage of the situation to levy black-mail, but in the majority of cases the demand put forward by the tenants was moderate in the extreme. They have simply invited harsh and cruel landlords to consent to moderate terms. They have desired to bring such landlords as the Marquess of Clanricarde and Lord Dillon to reasonable terms, such as those which the Duke of Devonshire, of his own accord, has granted. No doubt we did endeavour to bring harsh landlords to their knees, and to make them submit to the reasonable arrangement we offered to make. I maintain that there is no greater justification for the Bill of the hon. Member for the City of Cork than the conduct of the Government in endeavouring to force landlords to do that by pressure which they were not prepared to do by the enactment of this House. We are accused of being parties to political agitation in Ireland; but I would ask those Gentlemen who make this charge against us, what reform has ever been granted to Ireland, except by agitation, either within the last 20 years or long before that? Let me go back many years ago, and call attention to some of the bribes that were offered to the Representatives of the Irish Parliament in order to bring about the Union—bribes which were never realized until the country was on the eve of a revolution. Let me refer to a period of agitation in my own county, which was instrumental in bringing about one of the reforms which were promised prior to the Union. Hon. Gentlemen who have read the history of Catholic Emancipation will be aware that although that concession was promised to us, it was never made until the Duke of Wellington declared, on hearing that the Beresfords were defeated in the County Waterford, that Catholic Emancipation should be granted, or England should be prepared to meet civil war in Ireland. You have taught us the worst of all lessons; you have taught us that you will refuse our just demands, but that you will give in to an imperative agitation. It is, no doubt, an unfortunate lesson to teach; but having taught it to us, I do not think the Irish people would deserve to be treated as slaves and serfs, if, having been taught that lesson, they refused to act accordingly. We acknowledge that the carrying out of this Plan of Campaign has caused many landlords to suffer to a certain extent, and that at the first glance it appears to act unfairly towards them. It is quite clear that what would be a reasonable reduction on one farm upon a particular estate, would not be a reasonable reduction upon another farm on the same estate. But we sought to pass a measure which would have adopted, to some extent, the principle of a sliding-scale, and would have enabled a different course to be pursued in regard to different farms. You rejected our suggestion, and then it became our duty to ask for a uniform reduction, which, no doubt, might inflict some hardships upon some landlords. But leaving out of the question the measure which the House rejected last autumn, let me point out that in the unfortunate circumstances of Ireland, a few months before the Irish people and their Representatives proposed to make large sacrifices for the sake of peace, they were prepared to give a very large sum to the landlords for their estates. There, again, you rejected our terms; and if to-day the position of the landlords is one of extreme difficulty, they have themselves, and themselves alone, to thank for what has followed. According to the arguments we have heard from the opposite side of the House upon that measure, and many others, it appears to me that the principal argument relied upon by our opponents against listening to the voices of the Irish Representatives is that the Representatives are now, to a great extent, of a different class from the Irish Representatives who have heretofore been Members of this House. I think that hon. Members who will, apart from Party feeling, judge the case dispassionately, will see that the Irish people only did their duty in selecting from themselves those who are to represent them in this House. The landlords long enjoyed the representation of Ireland in this House. What did they do for the people? They simply used their position for their own advancement. They did nothing for the country; but they sat here quietly voting for coercion. Surely English, Scotch, and Welsh landlords who act dispassionately, looking upon this agrarian question, and study it calmly, will acknowledge that the Irish people were compelled to have recourse to drastic remedies. Again and again we returned Irish landlords to represent us in this House; and those landlords, so far from using their position for the advantage of Ireland, used it for their own advancement. The Irish people were, to a large extent, a Conservative people. But they tried that system long enough; and they have now had recourse to another plan, and they have done so because those in whom they trusted formerly, and who by birth should be at their head, have neglected to take up that position; but, on the contrary, have sold their constituents, and sold their country. Their exclusion now from political life in Ireland is due alone to the wretchedly small spirit which they have displayed. I think the words which fell from the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. James Stuart) will have a re-assuring effect upon us Irishmen, and upon the Irish people. He stated, in no uncertain words, that the Party, of which he is a brilliant Member, are prepared to forego none of the demands which they put forward here last Session; that they are prepared to be guided by no Round Table Conference; that they have made their stand, and, like men, they intend to abide by that stand. We, the Irish Representatives, are glad to hear those words, and we re-echo them. I know that they are re-echoed by the people of Ireland, and by their friends beyond the seas. No Local Government Bill which the Government can prepare will meet the Irish Question. I can assure hon. Members that it is an entire mistake to suppose that a mere Vestry Board will meet the Irish demands; we might accept it; but we should simply accept it as the platform from which to demand greater concessions. We should accept your Local Government Bill as a lever with which we could work for an Irish National Parliament; and we should accept ultimately nothing but a measure drawn upon the lines of that which was introduced last year by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone). The Irish National demand is one which unites Irish people the wide world over. The people of Ireland are united with their fellow-countrymen they have never seen; and those who speak of Chicago Conventions, and hurl the "Almighty dollar" at the Irish Representatives, will do well to consider that those who were formerly the bitter enemies of England have, by one touch of sympathy on the part of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian, been changed into the firmest of friends. I think that those who advise further coercion—which no doubt the ambiguous words in the Queen's Speech mean—will do well to remember what coercion has done in the past. It has simply embittered the feelings between this country and Ireland. We have tried it long enough. Is it not time to try the other *rôle* of conciliation? I do not think we could have a better specimen of the advantage of that *rôle* of conciliation than the change of feeling which has taken place in Ireland towards England in the last few months. Those who are conversant with Irish political life could have hardly imagined how a few words of sympathy and kindness, instead of the bitter taunts we have been accustomed to, could have wrought so marvellous a change. The words of comfort and encouragement expressed towards us by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian have had a powerful effect. We believe that the solution of this great question lies in your hands; that if you adopt a wise and conciliatory attitude towards us, you will reap your own reward; and that the people whom you have, by your bitter persecution, made your enemies, will in the better state of feeling become fast and lasting friends. The Irish National League has been accused by various Members of inciting to crime and outrage; and that charge has also been made against the Plan of Campaign which the Irish Parliamentary party have forwarded. I think that those who make this charge should look unto the statistics, and there they will find that in districts where the Plan of Campaign has been adopted, excesses on the part of the tenantry have been few and far between; and, what is most important, that excesses on the part of the landlords have also been few and far between. But in the districts in which there has been disorder it will be found that the Plan of Campaign has not been adopted. In Connaught, where the Plan of Campaign has been adopted, the excesses on the part of the tenants have been *nil*, and the same remark applies to excesses on the part of the landlords. The Irish National League has, in point of fact, during its existence, been a curb upon popular feeling. Hon. Gentlemen who take their information from the English papers may doubt the accuracy of that statement; but those who have been connected with the working of the League know that its branches, scattered throughout the country, have done everything in their power to decrease crime, and bring about a proper settlement between landlord and tenant. Let me give an instance which occurred in my own district. We all know that land-grabbing has been largely the cause of crime in Ireland, and we have been told that the National League are perfectly indifferent whether crime is committed or not. Now, in the district to which I refer we investigated five cases of land-grabbing, and in one instance we decided that it was a case of land-grabbing, so that the tenant had to give up the land he had grabbed and the lease he had entered into. But with regard to the other cases, we decided that they were not cases of land-grabbing, and the tenants were allowed to remain in the peaceful occupation of the property. Now, if these cases had not been investigated a great deal of crime would have arisen; but the National League were able to exercise the vocation of peacemakers between the tenants and the landlords. It is very easy to bring forward accusations against political organizations and hon. Gentlemen in this House; but hon. Gentlemen have no information about Ireland themselves, and they are entirely deceived and misled by the information which they derive from the London newspapers. I shall not trouble the House with any further remarks except to say that those who rely on the polluted sources of the London Press, and make these serious charges against Irish Nationalists and the Organization of which they are members, should see that they are accurately informed. I think it is proved that we in Ireland laid before you a measure which, if it had been passed, would have enabled you to get over your difficulty. You rejected that measure; the people of Ireland were left to their own resources; and I think they would have been to blame if they had not taken steps for their self-preservation. They have done so, and I am happy to say those steps have been effective in Ireland, and that the Plan of Campaign has kept in their homes many families who but for it would have been on the roadside.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): During the time I have sat in this House it has been my privilege to hear three Addresses emanating from Tory sources. The first Address showed that the Government were at the time forging fetters for Ireland, which fetters, I am glad to say, were broken by a right hon. Gentleman whose name is associated with the ever-memorable cow, and who may be said to have tossed the then Government over his shoulders. The second Address was merely an *apologia*, and it was chiefly conspicuous by its want of conception and its vacuity of purpose. We all recollect the Address which this Government brought in last autumn on their coming into power; which showed that, as is usual with Tory Administrations, they only wanted to spin out the time. Tory Administrations have always been associated in the minds of the Irish people with a well-known personage who figures as one of the characters of Dickens—Mr. Micawber. They are always waiting for something to turn up, and failing that they fall back upon their usual policy of coercion. It is satisfactory to hear from one hon. Member to-night that the "crutch and tooth-pick" Party are not going to bring in coercion for Ireland; and I recommend that announcement to the serious consideration and attention of hon. Gentlemen opposite, because we know that if they are lame and halt they cannot get on without the crutch; and because it is certain that they cannot stand if they intend to take up the position shadowed out in Her Majesty's Speech. The third Address resembles one of those fogs common in the Metropolis in November; it is hard to pierce, but when one gets through he finds that there is actually nothing in it. This Address commences with the statement that "my relations with foreign Powers continue to be friendly." I will ask the House if that is true, and particularly I ask those right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench if it is true with regard to America? During the last fortnight we have heard and read many facts connected with the administration of affairs in America and in Canada, as well as in this country; which show that there is at the present time existing a state of great and abnormal tension between this country and America. I have in my hand some extracts relating to this subject. It appears that at Washington on the 24th of January, the Senate discussed a Bill authorizing the President to protect and defend the rights of American fishing vessels and fishermen, and the trading of other vessels in certain cases; which Bill, after debate, was agreed to by 46 votes to 1. This debate was characterized by such language as we seldom hear in this House; but what was the character of the remarks made? Were they friendly to this country? No, sir; they were of a directly opposite character. Mr. Frye (Maine) pointed out that the object of the *rôle* played by Canada was to obtain reciprocal Treaties, and expressed the opinion that the operation of the Bill would end the troubles for the United States and Canada. He accused Canada of committing outrages and inhumanities which would disgrace the Fiji Islanders; and declared that the purpose of the proposed legislation was to notify to Great Britain that if she continued in her present course, it would be at her own peril. He declared that Great Britain knew the utter inhumanity of its action in the recent fishery cases, and referred to England's approval of the recent Canadian Statute, which he said destroyed the hope that she would do what was fair and just. Mr. Frye particularized the outrages against American vessels, and cited the case of a vessel of that nationality which conveyed to a Canadian port 17 shipwrecked Canadian sailors, and was refused the right to purchase a barrel of flour to avert the starvation of the crew. I commend that to the consideration of right hon. Gentlemen opposite. We have heard a great deal about "boycotting" in Ireland, but here is a case of boycotting with a vengeance; and we know that those who were boycotted were Protestants and were dependent upon their fellow-men in the part of the world where it took place. This is a case of boycotting in the extreme, and how can Her Majesty's Government avoid rising in their places and condemn it? ["Oh, oh!"] We know that right hon. Gentlemen opposite like to jeer occasionally; but the salient point of this is that we should apologize for what has taken place, and take care to prevent its recurrence. Then Mr. Ingalls, of Kansas, said that the fishery difficulty must be settled "either by negotiations or by war." This, Sir, comes to us from the American Senate, and Her Majesty's Speech tells us that everything is in a perfectly peaceful state. Mr. Ingalls went on to say that, before the Vote on the Bill was taken, the Foreign Affairs Committee should state whether the measure was intended to be pacific or hostile, and whether in effect it was an invitation to negotiate or a practical declaration of war; that a feeling of irritation prevailed, the real party being Great Britain, and not Canada. These are most important words. He went on to declare that England had always been—

> "a ruffian, a coward, and a bully among nations; insolent to the weak, tyrannical to the feeble, and cringing and obsequious to the strong;"

and he added that her rulers were unfriendly to the United States; that her course was in the direction of wrongs, insolence, and outrage; he thought there was no special reciprocity of good will in America towards her, and that England desired to render it impossible for free and friendly reciprocal relations, political or otherwise, to exist between Canada and the United States. Mr. Hoar (Massachusetts) said that Canada's object was to secure the right to sell fish in the United States without the interference of the tariff; and he regarded it as an attempt of a Foreign Power to force upon the United States, against her will, a certain domestic policy, and—

> "as one of the most emphatic and flagrant acts of hostility which it was possible to commit short of actual war."

When I consider this language, expressed by the Senate and endorsed by a large majority in the Senior House of Representatives in America, I can by no means reconcile it with what is said in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne as to the position of our relations with Foreign Powers. Finally, Sir, we learn, through Reuter's Agency, that the Canadian Minister of Marine thinks the question is now, whether Canada shall wholly abandon her fisheries, or persist in a policy which, he asserts, "has received the approval of the Imperial Government;" and his Colleagues are apprehensive as to the possible effect of the debate in the American Senate upon the approaching Canadian elections. What has happened with regard to other countries? We are all aware that, not very long ago, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) made a journey abroad; and although we have heard that it was not connected with political events, still it is noteworthy that the feeling of hostility between Russia and Austria was initiated about the date at which that journey took place. Well, Sir, what does this mean? Does it mean that we are friendly with Russia, or that we are friendly with Austria? I ask that, because it is perfectly clear that we cannot be friendly with both Powers at a time when they are armed to the teeth, and are standing like two muzzled bull-dogs waiting for the lachets to be unloosed. Is it not that we favour Austria? It was to promote the claims of Austria *versus* Russia that the policy which the Government have been endeavouring to carry out was initiated, and which has brought affairs to the present crisis. And, again, do we not know that, a short time since, Austria was told by the present Prime Minister that in case of war she should not stand alone? If it be true, as we see in the public Press, that a crisis of affairs has been reached; if it be true that we are prepared to back up Austria; then I say that the position is indeed serious, and that the statement that our relations with Foreign Powers are friendly, is hardly correct. There are some remarks with regard to Egypt which I shall defer to another opportunity. I recollect what took place in this House last Session with regard to Burmah. I obtained information from gentlemen who had served in the country, and knowing something about the malaria after the floods had subsided, I begged to call attention to the fact that the country was most unhealthy. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen laugh at my having given utterance to what has practically turned out to be a fact. But what has happened since? The Commander-in-Chief — the senior officer in Burmah—has died of that malaria. I do not think that a very laughing matter. We were told at that time that everything was perfectly quiet in Burmah; that there were only a few dacoits straying up and down the country, but that they could soon be settled by sending out a small force. But what has occurred? Practically speaking, General Roberts, the Commander-in-Chief in India, has been obliged to go over and take the command of the troops, and matters are very far from settled. Finally, with regard to Ireland, the remaining portion of the Queen's Speech deals with the condition of that country. Throughout the course of this debate, we have heard a great deal about the unhappy condition of things which has existed there. We have been told that since the inauguration of a Tory *régime*, affairs in Ireland have been very quiet. For my own part, I believe it. I go further, and say I know for a fact that those affairs are extremely quiet: the Irish people were never more quiet in their lives. But what has brought about this reign of tranquillity in Ireland? It has not been the Tory Administration, it has not been the commencement of a 20 years' "firm government." No; on the contrary, the present peaceful condition of Ireland is solely due to the introduction of a measure of justice by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone). It is that measure which enables Irishmen to come forward and say, "Well, at last we have found that there are good points in Englishmen, and we have at last found a large number of English Members—almost a majority" [*Laughter*]—hon. Members may laugh, but we were only 30 votes behind—they will say, "We have at last found almost a majority in this House who are ready to go the utmost length in their endeavour to provide adequately for the wants of our native land." That is practically what has promoted this feeling of peace and good-will in our country. When we go into this Land Question, what did the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) say down at Dartford not so very long ago? He told people there that dual ownership of land was impossible. What does that mean? It means that the present existing system of landlord and tenant cannot go on any longer. The noble Lord, it must be remembered, was at that time a most responsible Member of Her Majesty's Government, probably one of the most responsible Members of Government sitting on the Benches opposite—aye, even at the present moment. When such a person as the noble Lord makes such a statement as that, I think it is time even for a Tory Government to take the matter into their serious consideration—I mean the fact that dual ownership of land is impossible. But we also find that clearly set forth in the reports of Land Commissioners. If any hon. Members will take up the Report issued by Mr. Walters, or that written by Mr. McCarthy, he will find it stated by both of them—as indeed it is laid down by many other gentlemen—that the judicial rents that were fixed two years ago are impossible, and are really rack-rents at the present moment. These gentlemen, it must be remembered, are authorities who have been charged in Ireland with the duty of judicating between landlord and tenant. If they come to you and say that the rents which they have fixed are at the present time impossible, I think it is high time for us to give the subject careful consideration. Now, Sir, with regard to the Plan of Campaign, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) stated not long ago in a letter he wrote that the plan was perfectly legal. We have heard from the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington, that it was both illogical and illegal. That is not the view of Irish Law Officers of the Crown ["Oh, oh!"] Well, the Attorney General for Ireland has been here night after night, and surely he would have contradicted the allegation which has been repeated over and over again if it were not true. We all know that what has been written still remains; the letter written by the right hon. and learned Gentleman remains to this very day and cannot be denied. However, I myself know something about this Plan of Campaign. I know that the people are in earnest in carrying it out. I have seen it initiated several times. I have seen it commenced by the tenants, and perhaps it would amaze people sitting in this House to know that really the Irish tenantry are most moderate in their demands. We all know that when any body of men combine together for the purpose of carrying any point, there are some amongst them who will go in for stronger measures and for a higher reduction than others; but I can assure you, Sir, and this House, that in all the instances where I have seen the Plan of Campaign initiated—and they have not been few—certainly the majority of the people have gone in for a minimum reduction of rent. I recollect a case within the last fortnight, where two or three of the tenants wanted to get a reduction in their rents of 40 per cent, but the majority of the other tenants said "We won't have that; let us have a fair medium;" and, accordingly, 25 per cent was agreed to by the majority. All these people are very much abused from time to time, and abused, I am afraid, by Gentlemen who know very little about them. It has been my privilege, both in the exercise of my profession, and since I have become acquainted with the Nationalist Members occupying these Benches, to mix intimately with the people, and this I can safely say, as the result of my experience, that intolerance and bigotry, and that extreme method of dealing with the landlord which is supposed to be characteristic of the Irish people, do not really exist. I can assure the House that if you take them in bodies you will find them tolerant and ready to deal in the fairest way with their landlords or any people set over them. Fortunately we have got a hearing in England. It is satisfactory to find that those who have opposed this measure of peace and good-will to Ireland are gradually beginning to see the error of their ways; and I think that in the course of this debate no one could have helped being struck with the language which has fallen from the Leaders of the Unionist Party in the House. I myself was perfectly sensible of the moderation they showed in their speeches, especially when referring to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), whose name will ever be enshrined in the hearts of the Irish people. As the hour is late, I must apologize for having trespassed so long upon the time of the House. I will only say this much, that if matters go on as they are going on at the present time, I sincerely hope that that measure of policy and of peace promoted by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian will shortly be again taken up and carried to its full completion.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I beg, Sir, to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Cremer.*)

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster): If it is the intention of the hon. Member to make his speech on the Amendment of which he has given notice, I shall make no opposition to the adjournment. I understand that to be the intention of the hon. Member, but I wish to appeal to the House, now that we have at last reached the first stage of the consideration of the Address, to proceed with as much despatch as is consistent with the due consideration of the important questions before us; and to remember that we have a reputation to maintain as the Chamber for the conduct of the Public Business of this country, as well as for the adequate discussion of public affairs.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *to-morrow.*

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) BILL.—[BILL 1.]

(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Jackson*).

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into the said Committee."—(*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach.*)

MR. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.): I feel I shall have to move an Amendment to the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman on the Question of the day for going into Committee on this Bill. This evening, I and some of my Colleagues felt it to be our duty to put down on the Paper several very important Amendments, and two Instructions to the Committee; and I think it only reasonable that these Amendments and Instructions should be circulated for at least two or three days before the House resolves itself into Committee so that hon. Members may have an opportunity of discussing the matters amongst themselves, in all their bearings upon the Bill, before the measure goes into Committee. The Bill is a very important one; and, without going into the subject of it, I may mention that at present the judicial system of Ireland is conducted in a most extravagant manner. I do not think the House can even have the slightest idea of the enormous extravagance that obtains in connection with the judicial system in Ireland. For all these reasons, I would move that the House on Thursday next resolve itself into Committee on this Bill.

Amendment proposed, "to leave out the word 'To-morrow,' in order to insert the words 'Thursday next,'"—(*Mr. Chance,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'To-morrow' stand part of the Question."

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I have already stated that the attempts of hon. Members to extend this measure, so as to make it a general Irish Judicature Bill, will lead to its withdrawal; and if that is done the vacant Judgeship in the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland will have to be filled up. If that takes place the fault, of course, will lie with hon. Gentlemen opposite, and not with us. I cannot undertake to put the Bill down on a day when it will be reached before half-past 12.

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): I know no necessity for the appointment of a new Judge to the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland, except it be to give a place to the present Irish Attorney General, who has been most unfortunate in the discharge of the functions of his present Office.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): Sir, I am more or less astounded at the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Does he really and seriously mean to say that he is going to throw away the money of the State in the way he suggests, in a moment of petulance, merely because he fails to obtain a certain stage of the Bill on the day he desires? This is a measure which requires very careful consideration and considerable amendment, and, certainly, is not one that we should endeavour to pass through the House in a great hurry. We are told that a very able Member of the Government has left it on the score of economy, and I would, therefore, appeal to the Government to say whether it would not be more discreet not to fill up the vacancy in the Common Pleas, than to incur an altogether unnecessary expenditure in the adoption of an opposite course? They should say that there should be no appointment made in the room of Mr. Justice Morris, who has been moved from the Court of Common Pleas to the Court of Queen's Bench. I can remember when it was customary for Queen's Counsel, in cases of necessity, to sit as Judges; and when it was customary also for a Judge of Appeal, in case of pressure, to go on Circuit. I therefore trust that, as no inconveniences are likely to arise, that the adjournment moved by my hon. Friend will be agreed to.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland has thrown out to us what I can only describe as a threat. He has said that if the House is not pleased to pass this Bill by a certain time, he will proceed to fill up the vacancy in the Court of Common Pleas. As I understand it, the reason he gives for that view is that, unless some such step is taken, and unless the vacancy is filled up in some way, the Court of Common Pleas will not be able to sit for the transaction of the business before it. But I would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that that is not the case. Under the Judicature Act one Judge constitutes a Court, and one Judge can sit as a full Court, and has authority to act and give decisions. Not only can one Judge sit, but if one can sit, two can. As the House is aware, there is only one vacancy at present, and there are two Judges of the Court of Common Pleas still in being.

MR. SPEAKER: I must draw the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that the Question before the House is that the words "next Thursday" be substituted for "this day," and that, therefore, general remarks on the subject of the Bill are irrelevant.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: Then, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with this: There can be no urgency for this Bill, inasmuch as the Court of Common Pleas will be fully constituted without the third Judge—the two Judges will be fully competent to sit in the name and with the authority of that Court. I venture to say that nine out of every ten decisions given by the Court of Common Pleas since it was created, now nearly 10 years ago, have been by two Judges and not by three.

Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I hope the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland will reconsider his decision, and without, perhaps, consenting to postpone the Committee stage until Thursday, will fix Monday for it in order that there may be an interval of more than 12 hours for the Amendments on the Paper to be considered. I cannot believe that he is altogether serious in the course which he intimated would be taken in the event of the Committee Stage being postponed beyond "this day," as I feel convinced he will not allow this opportunity to slip by without taking advantage of it to bring about a very much needed reform. If I have an opportunity of speaking on the Bill, I shall endeavour to show that it would be a monstrous waste of public money to fill up this vacancy in the Court of Common Pleas at all. I hope hon. Members below the Gangway on this side of the House will be content to allow the Committee Stage to be taken on Monday, and I would ask the right hon. Baronet opposite to name Monday instead of "this day."

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The matter is, perhaps, not worth wrangling about, and if it would be more convenient to hon. Members, I should be glad to adopt the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. If all hon. Gentlemen want is discussion of that which lies within the scope of this Bill, I shall be willing and ready, and even anxious, to give an opportunity for it. But if hon. Members from Ireland wish to turn the measure into a general Irish Judicature Bill, it would, as I have said, be impossible to proceed with it. If we cannot pass the Bill with expedition, we shall be obliged, though much against our wish, to fill up the vacant Judgeship. I merely state this as a fact, and not as a threat. I am, however, quite willing to defer the Committee stage until Monday.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I think it would be found that Thursday would be a more convenient day. [Sir Michael Hicks-Beach: No; I will not consent to a postponement until Thursday.] Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to state my reasons. In all probability, the very important Amendment to the Address, which stands in the name of my hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), will come on on Monday; and it is extremely unlikely that that Amendment will be disposed of at such a time as it would be proper to take up the consideration of this Bill. This Bill raises a very important Constitutional question—the question of the promotion of Judges; and therefore it ought to be considered at a time when the House is able to give proper attention to it. The warning or threat which the right hon. Gentleman casts out to us, that if the Bill is not passed immediately it will be necessary to fill up the Chief Justiceship, does not impress us very much, because, after the valuable opinion which the present Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) has given of the Plan of Campaign, we think he would make as good a Chief Justice as anyone else.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member press his Amendment?

Mr. CHANCE: I fear I must press it.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

——o——

COLONIAL SERVICE [PENSIONS.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the extension and amendment, in certain cases, of the Colonial Governors' Pensions Acts, 1865 and 1872, and of "The Superannuation Act, 1859."

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

NATIONAL PROVIDENT INSURANCE.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the best system of National Provident Assurance.—(*Mr. Rankin.*)

CHURCH DISCIPLINE AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Colonel Sandys, Bill to regulate Proceedings under "The Church Discipline Act, 1840," and the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874," and to amend the same, *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel Sandys, Mr. Wardle, and Mr. Joicey.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 156.]

CONTUMACY IMPRISONMENT ABOLITION BILL.

On motion of Colonel Sandys, Bill to abolish Imprisonment for Contumacy in proceeding under the Church Discipline Act of 1840 and the Public Worship Act of 1874, *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel Sandys, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Wardle, and Mr. Joicey.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 157]

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 4th February, 1887.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — Standing Orders Committee, *appointed* and *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Appellate Jurisdiction * (15).

Second Reading—Pluralities Act Amendment * (14).

Third Reading — Christchurch (Southampton) Charter (Correction of Error) * (4), and *passed.*

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to amend the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876—Was *presented* by The Lord CHANCELLOR; read 1ª. (No. 15.)

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Appointed: The Lords following, with the Chairman of Committees, were named of the Committee:

E. Cadogan.
(Ld. Privy Seal.)
M. Winchester.
M. Bath.
E. Lathom.
(Ld. Chamberlain.)
E. Devon.
E. Lindsay.
E. Carnarvon.
E. Milltown.
E. Belmore.
E. Powis.
E. Verulam.
E. Morley.
E. Amherst.
E. Camperdown.
E. Ducie.
E. Sydney.
E. Wharncliffe.
E. de Montalt.
V. Hutchinson.
V. Hardinge.
V. Eversley.
V. Oxenbridge.
L. deRos.
L. Clinton.
L. Saye and Sele.
L. Balfour of Burleigh.
L. Boyle.
L. Digby.
L. Thurlow.
L. Hopetoun.
L. Foxford.
L. Colchester.
L. Silchester.
L. Kintore.
L. Sudeley.
L. Belper.
L. Hartismere.
L. Wolverton.
L. Sandhurst.
L. Colville of Culross.

PRIVATE BILLS.

All Petitions relating to Standing Orders which shall be presented during the present Session referred to the Standing Orders Committee unless otherwise ordered.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 4th February, 1887.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — Elections (Intervention of Peers, &c.), *appointed* and *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolution in Committee* — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Colonial Service (Pensions) * [158].

Ordered—First Reading—Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) (No. 2) * [160]; Foynes Harbour (Transfer) * [159].

QUESTIONS.

—o—

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—IMPROVED POSTAL SERVICE AT KINSALE.

MR. HOOPER (Cork, S.E.) asked the Postmaster General, What steps have been taken to secure an earlier arrival and delivery of the evening mails in Kinsale; and, whether, in view of the near approach of the fishery season, he will take the matter into his immediate consideration, and endeavour to provide an improved postal service, at all events during the fishing season?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): For the day mail to and from Kinsale the Office makes use of such trains as the Railway Company run for traffic purposes; and trains more closely fitted at Cork to the Dublin Day Mail could only be obtained at a large additional expenditure altogether out of proportion to the postal benefit to be afforded. Steps were taken recently with a view to accelerating the delivery of the letters in Kinsale after arrival, and this was as far as the Department felt warranted in going; but if the hon. Member can put me in possession of further information on the subject, I shall be very glad to consider whether any further improvement can be effected.

POST OFFICE CONTRACTS—CONVEYANCE OF MAILS TO NEW YORK.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked the Postmaster General, When the current contract for the conveyance of Her Majesty's mails to New York will expire; and upon what conditions and terms the service is thereafter to be maintained?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): The current agreements for the conveyance of mails to New York will expire on the last day of this month. Negotiations are in progress for the maintenance of an efficient service after that time; but the actual conditions have not yet been determined. I hope, however, to make a further statement on this subject in the course of a few days.

Mr. SEXTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman say now whether it is intended to continue the tri-weekly service *viâ* Queenstown?

Mr. RAIKES: I think it would be premature for me to offer any observations on the matter; but I hope in a few days to do so.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EX-CONSTABLE MARTIN JOYCE.

Mr. D. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.) (for Sir Thomas Esmonde) (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If ex-constable Martin Joyce, who left the Royal Irish Constabulary in November last, has served 30 years of general good conduct in the Force; if for the last eight years there have been no complaints or punishments of any kind against him; and, if, under the circumstances, the provisions of the Inspector General's Circular of 9th May 1883 will be permitted to apply in his case, so that he may draw his full pension of £64 a-year?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The constable mentioned was several times guilty of serious misconduct, including drunkenness, and was once actually warned for dismissal. Under these circumstances, the Discharge Board properly recommended him for a reduced pension. The Circular referred to does not preclude such a course. Not only does the Statute empower the granting of reduced pensions, but it has been the invariable practice to exercise that power in proper cases.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND)—LENZIE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Mr. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether it is the case that in the Lenzie Public School, under the Cadder and Kirkintilloch School Boards (the only public school in Lenzie), the lowest school fees charged for infants is 7*s.* 6*d.* per quarter, rising to £1 10*s.* per quarter in Standards V. and VI.; what number of children, if any, of the Railway servants and of the working-classes attend said school; and, whether Lenzie Public School is on the list of State-aided schools in Scotland, in receipt of Government Grant and the benefits of local taxation?

The SECRETARY (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): The Lenzie Public School has not yet been placed upon the list of schools credited with annual grant. Some correspondence has taken place with regard to the scale of fees; and while my Lords have sanctioned, under reserve, a scale of fees corresponding with that adopted in other schools of a similar class, that scale is subject to revision, and the payment of grant will depend upon the proportion which the whole fees bear to the average attendance. My Lords have no means whatever of knowing anything as to the class of children attending the school.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—THE PETTY SESSIONS DISTRICT OF BOYLE.

Mr. COX (Clare, E.) (for Mr. O'Kelly) (Roscommon, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention had been called to a report stating that the conduct of Messieurs Webb, Whitby Lynch, and Kirkwood caused a disturbance in the Boyle Borough Court; whether these gentlemen are Justices of the Peace for the Petty Sessions District of Boyle; and whether they are in the habit of hearing and deciding cases in which one or other of them is interested; and, if so, whether the Government will call the attention of the Lord Chancellor to the matter?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I have no information which would enable me to make any communication to the Lord Chancellor with regard to the Justices named in the Question. I would point out to the hon. Gentleman that persons aggrieved may themselves make complaints to the Lord Chancellor.

PRISONS (IRELAND) ACT, 1877. — MR. HEALY, GOVERNOR OF CLARE COUNTY PRISON.

MR. COX (Clare, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that, after a few years' service as Governor of Clare County Prison, Mr. Healy was awarded a yearly pension of £117, charged upon the county rates, and that the Clare Grand Jury were not consulted on the subject; upon what authority this course was taken; and if Mr. Healy still holds a salaried position as a public servant?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Seven years ago Mr. Healy was granted a pension of the amount stated; £102 per annum of this sum is payable by the late prison authority, and the balance by the Treasury. The pension was awarded, in the usual course, by the Lords of the Treasury, who had all the facts before them. It is not usual to consult the Grand Juries with reference to prison officers' superannuation, as the matter is regulated by statute—(Section 32 of the Prisons Act, 1877). I am not aware how Mr. Healy is now employed.

MR. COX asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that Mr. Healy held exactly the same position with regard to the Mullingar Prison, and got the same salary?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I am not aware. If he returned to the Public Service, the general rule would be, that he would no longer receive a pension; but I will inquire into the matter.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY— EXTRA POLICE IN COUNTY CLARE.

MR. COX (Clare, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is a fact that the county cess in the County Clare is from 40 to 50 per cent higher than that of the adjoining counties of Galway, Tipperary, and Limerick; if it is a fact that the charge for the maintenance of the extra police force in the county amounts to over £4,000 a-year levied off the overburdened occupiers of land in the county; and, if, having regard to the peaceable state of the county, the Irish Government will withdraw at an early date the extra police force?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): There is no doubt that the county cess in County Clare is much higher than in the adjoining counties mentioned by the hon. Member, and, having regard to their comparative size and valuation, this can hardly be wondered at. With regard to the extra police, they have been reduced within the last two years from 172 to 130. The subject is constantly under attention; but I regret that the Government cannot at the present time make any further reduction. The latest Returns as to their cost show something under the figure mentioned by the hon. Member.

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS — CHURCHYARD BOTTOM WOOD, HIGHGATE.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the hon. Member for the Epping Division of Essex, Whether the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have adopted or prepared any plan involving the appropriation, in whole or in part, of the Churchyard Bottom Wood, at Highgate, for building purposes; whether they have had any correspondence or negotiations with the Hornsey Local Board relative to the purchase of such Wood; and, if so, whether such correspondence or information as to such negotiations will be laid before Parliament; and whether the Commissioners will give an undertaking that, before the appropriation of the Wood to building purposes is determined upon an opportunity will be afforded to Parliament of expressing an opinion on the subject?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON (Essex, Epping): The Commissioners have made an offer to sell the property to the Hornsey Local Board, and the period for which that offer is available has not yet expired. The Commissioners have not adopted any other plan for appropriating the land. They have no objection to produce the correspondence. They are not prepared to give the undertaking asked for in the last paragraph of the Question.

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS—ST. MARY, HORNSEY.

Mr. PICTON (Leicester) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has any objection to lay upon the Table a Return of the property held by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in the parish of St. Mary, Hornsey, in addition to Highgate Woods; and, of the annual income derived therefrom?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) (Sheffield, Hallam): The hon. Member must see that a Return granted in respect of one parish could scarcely be refused in respect of others. Disclosure of the Commissioners' landed income in separate parishes would cause great expense, and, in many cases, would amount to a disclosure of sums received from individual tenants or lessees. On these grounds, I feel unable to consent to the Return for which the hon. Member asks.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—MR. HILLAS, HIGH SHERIFF, SLIGO CO.

Mr. P. M'DONALD (Sligo, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Mr. Hillas, the present High Sheriff of the county of Sligo, has, since the commencement of his year of office, evicted tenants on his own estate at Templeboy; and, if so, whether in so doing he acted illegally in officiating as High Sheriff in his own interest; whether these tenants, who owed two years' rent, offered to pay one and a-half year's rent last October, and the remaining half year at Christmas following; and, whether Mr. Hillas refused this offer?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol W.): On the 26th of last month three tenants were evicted on the estate of Mr. Hillas, two of them owing two years' rent, and the other four years' rent. Mr. Hillas has not yet been sworn in as High Sheriff for the county of Sligo. It is said by the tenants, I understand, that they made an offer to Mr. Hillas which was not accepted; but I do not know whether the statement is accurate.

Mr. P. M'DONALD asked, if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that it was a fact that Mr. Hillas had acted at the evictions in the capacity of High Sheriff, and that, on a representation made to him by the Rev. Father Conway, he retired when he found it was illegal?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Mr. Hillas was not High Sheriff at the time.

Mr. P. M'DONALD: He is for this year.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—PULLENDIVA PIER.

Mr. P. M'DONALD (Sligo, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Pullendiva Pier, Dromore West, is still unfinished, though the grant for its erection was made in 1880; and, if so, whether it is intended to issue a further specification for its completion, as the original plan, though duly carried out by the contractor, has been found totally inadequate for the requirements of the fishermen of the district?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): These works were only carried out by the contractor in accordance with the original plan, and were handed over as finished to the care of the Grand Jury. I am informed that further works were applied for under the Sea Fisheries Act of 1883; but the Commissioners of Public Works were unable to comply with the application. The matter is rather one for the Treasury than for me.

MERCANTILE MARINE—LIFE-SAVING GEAR ON "KAPUNDA," AND CERTAIN CASUALTIES IN 1886.

Mr. HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, What life-saving gear in the shape of boats, folding boats, rafts, life belts, and life buoys was carried by the lost emigrant ship *Kapunda* when she left Plymouth on December 17th with 313 souls on board, and for how many persons in the aggregate this provided floating apparatus in case of accident; and, further, if he can state how many lives were lost from British ships during the year 1886, and what proportion of shipwrecks to the whole number were caused by collisions?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The *Kapunda* had on board two life-boats and four other boats, of a total capacity of 1,637·5 cubic feet, which would give, at the rate of 10 cubic feet per passenger, accommodation for 163 statute adults. She had no folding boats nor rafts. There were 18 life belts and six life buoys on board. The law on the subject was complied with, and the inspecting officers have no authority and no power to require more. I am not yet in a position to give particulars of the number of lives lost during the year 1886; but during 1885—the last year for which the figures are complete—there were lost 278 passengers and 1,797 crew. The proportion of shipwrecks caused by collision to the whole number of shipwrecks in 1885, was 10·25 per cent.

MR. HOWARD VINCENT said, in consequence of the Answer given, that there was not boat accommodation for one-half of the number on board, he should ask the right hon Gentleman the Leader of the House ——["Order!"]

REDUCTION OF RENTS (SCOTLAND)—TRUSTEES OF LANDED ESTATES.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY (Forfarshire) asked the Lord Advocate, Whether he intends to bring in a Bill to authorize trustees of landed estates to grant reduction of rents when they think it would be for the interest of the trust to do so?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities): Trustees at present have power in Scotland to grant reductions of rents, subject to their being responsible for their action, if beneficiaries can show that it was not justifiable in the circumstances. I shall consider whether it is advisable to encourage the action of trustees in this direction by enabling them to get protection by approval of a Court at the time the action is taken, so as to save them from the risk of their action being afterwards impugned.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) — FISHERMEN OF LOUGH NEAGH.

MR. BLANE (Armagh, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he be aware that the fishermen of Lough Neagh are put to considerable expense in repairing their boats, by reason of their having to drag them on the shingle a great distance to land their fish, and if the Conservators of Fisheries will cause wooden jetties and pontoons to be made at Derryadd, and other bays in the Lough, to remedy the grievance of which the fishermen complain?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): No complaints of this kind have been made to the Inspectors of Fisheries. The Conservators are not under the control of the Government; but the Inspectors will communicate with them. They do not think, however, that that body have any funds at their disposal out of which they could defray the cost of the suggested work.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE ASSIZES—ORDINARY JURORS.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether he is aware of the hardship attendant upon the summoning of ordinary jurors to serve at the Assizes in Ireland; and, if it is the intention of the Government to take any steps by which men who are totally unable to meet the expenses involved in continuous attendance at said Assizes shall be reimbursed their actual expenditure?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): I have long been aware of the hardship which jurors of small means are subjected to by attending Assizes at a distance from their homes. It is, however, a necessary consequence of our jury system that individuals in the discharge of their duty are often obliged to suffer serious inconvenience. It would be hardly possible to re-imburse them for their actual expenditure without violating some of the principles on which the jury system rests. The subject is a difficult one, and I am afraid I cannot promise anything; but I will consult my Colleagues on the matter.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTION AT RATHKEALE.

COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, S.W., Bootle) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been drawn to the following telegraphic report of the state of Ireland, dated 29th January—

> "An attempted eviction near Rathkeale had to be abandoned owing to the large force of people assembled there; the houses were well fortified, and several men arrived armed with scythes and pitchforks. The occupants of the houses threw boiling water upon the bailiffs when they ventured to approach the dwellings;"

and, if this report is substantially correct, what directions will be given to the police as to their action against armed resistance to the Law, until such resistance is broken?

Mr. W. ABRAHAM (Limerick, W.): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers the Question, I wish to ask him whether he is aware the attempted eviction was that of a poor widow who owed an exorbitant rent; and whether, previous to proceedings being taken against her, she made an offer to submit the amount of rent to fair arbitration, which the landlord declined to do?

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): In reply to the Question of the hon. Member (Mr. Abraham), I have to say, in the first place, that Mrs. Scanlon had been evicted long ago—so long ago as August, 1885—and was replaced as caretaker, and that, while holding possession as caretaker under the Petty Sessions decree, this last eviction was carried out. In reply to my hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Sandys) I would say that I hope he will not form his opinion as to the state of Ireland from isolated occurrences of this kind. The report mentioned in this Question contained a grossly exaggerated account of the circumstances to which it relates. It is true that on the first occasion when the eviction was attempted it was not carried out. This was because the Sheriff had not provided himself with implements to enable him to effect an entrance into the house. There was no assemblage of persons outside of any kind. On the second occasion the eviction was carried out; and I am informed that a settlement was subsequently arrived at between the landlord and the tenant, and that the tenant was re-instated as tenant, under a new agreement, at a reduced rent. The case does not appear to show any necessity for new directions to the Constabulary; but, with reference to other reports of the same kind as this, I may say generally that, where an attempt to carry out an eviction has failed, it has always been carried out at a later date; and while I have the honour to be Chief Secretary for Ireland I will do my best to secure that it always shall be.

LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)— WILLIAM CRIBBIN, MULLINGAR LUNATIC ASYLUM.

Mr. TUITE (Westmeath, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether William Cribbin, late Storekeeper in the Mullingar Lunatic Asylum, was at the meeting of the Governors of that Institution, held on the 16th of November, 1882, awarded a pension of £25 10*s*. per annum, being seventeen sixtieths of his salary and emoluments, the amount to which he was duly entitled by Act of Parliament; whether this award was subsequently reduced by the officials in Dublin Castle to £12 10*s*. per annum; and, whether they acted legally in so doing?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): William Cribbin's pension was reduced on the ground, among others, of incompetency, and the Governors are legally justified in the course they have taken.

THE HAYTIAN GOVERNMENT— CLAIMS OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

Mr. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Mr. Hill, of the Foreign Office, has made a Report of the result of his investigations made last year into the case of Mr. Frederick B. Coles, imprisoned by the Haytian Government, and into the cases of other British subjects having claims upon that Government; and, if so, whether that Report will be laid upon the Table of the House?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, E.): Mr. Hill has made a Report on the case of Mr. F. B. Coles, and on the cases of other British claimants in Hayti. Some of the claims have not yet been disposed of, and Her Majesty's Government do not propose to present any Papers on the subject, as the negotiations are still pending.

EGYPT—MILITARY EXPEDITION— SCIENTIFIC REPORTS ON THE SOUDAN.

Mr. NORRIS (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has any objection to publish the Scientific Reports made to the War Department by Major Parrott, New South Wales Engineers, whilst serving with the Australian Contingent, and attached to the Staff of General Graham in the Eastern Soudan, relating to the discovery of sources for fresh water supply, and mineral products in that country?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): I am afraid I cannot publish this Report, which is accompanied by drawings of great interest in themselves, but of which the reproduction would be very expensive; and I am not aware that any public interest would be served by its publication. But I shall be happy to show it to my hon. Friend.

EAST AFRICA—THE LONDON CONFERENCE—THE SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR.

MR. F. S. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is able to confirm the truth of the statement contained in *The Times* of the 11th of December last, to the effect that the recent Conference in London with regard to East Africa has resulted in a complete agreement as to the frontiers of the Sultanate of Zanzibar, as well as in an understanding between England and Germany as to their respective spheres of interest in that part of the world; whether the said agreement has received the assent of the French Government and of the Sultan of Zanzibar; and, whether Her Majesty's Government are prepared to make any statement, or to present any Papers relating to the work of the Delimitation Commission, and of the London Conference?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, E.): A complete agreement has been arrived at between England and Germany as to the frontiers of the Sultanate, and as to the respective spheres of interest of the two countries. The French Government and the Sultan of Zanzibar have assented to those portions of the Agreement in which they are interested. Papers are in preparation, and will shortly be presented.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS—FEES.

MR. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, in raising the fee for the naturalization of aliens from £1 to £5, he is aware that it had been £1 for many years prior to 1880, and that it was reduced again to £1 in May last by the late Home Secretary, after the presentation of a Memorial, signed by 93 Members of the House of Commons of all shades of political opinion, pointing out that the charge (with stamps and Law expenses amounting to between £8 and £10) prevented many respectable foreigners from becoming British subjects, although by the Juries Act of 1870 they are compelled, after 10 years' residence, to serve on juries, and praying for the reduction of the fee to £1; and whether he will state the grounds on which the fee was again raised?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): The facts are as stated in the hon. Member's Question, and I was fully aware of them when I decided to raise the fee again to £5. In 1880, the decision to raise the fee from £1 to £5 was approved by Sir Richard Cross, and afterwards adopted by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir William Harcourt). I do not consider that sufficient reasons exist to justify a departure from the decision of these right hon. Gentlemen, for I am not satisfied with the reasons which were urged upon my immediate Predecessor (Mr. Childers) last year, and which finally induced him to lower the fee. I agree with the Royal Commissioners of 1869 in thinking that, "to be a British subject is a valuable privilege, and to be considerately imparted," and £5 does not appear to me to be too large a sum to pay for the privilege, and for the inquiries which are necessary before a certificate of naturalization can be granted.

MR. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether information has reached him that on the understanding that the fee was to be £1, 200 aliens in the East of London, whose average residence in England has been 15 years, have been associated together since last October to pay their naturalization fee and costs by weekly instalments; and, whether, in the event of his maintaining the fee at £5, he will permit those persons, provided their references prove to be satisfactory, to be naturalized at the lower fee?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS)(Birmingham, E.): Information has reached me that Associations exist such as the hon. Member referred to in his second Question, in which the rights of British nationality are secured to the members by drawing a winning number in a lottery. I can make no exception in favour of members of these Associations or of any other person.

POLICE BILL (SCOTLAND)—LEGISLATION.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY (Forfarshire) asked the Lord Advocate, Whether he intends to introduce and proceed with a general Police Bill for Scotland at an early date?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities), in reply, said, it was intended to introduce a Bill at an early date; but he might mention, for the information of the hon. Member, that any delay that took place was only in order that the numerous very important suggestions which had been made by Public Bodies and others in regard to the terms of the Bill might be well considered, and that the Bill might be introduced in such a form as should make it certain to pass during the present Session.

ARMY—CONVERSION OF HORSE AND FIELD ARTILLERY.

CAPTAIN COTTON (Cheshire, Wirral) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether those officers belonging to the batteries lately converted from Horse to Field Artillery may, in addition to retaining their uniform, be allowed to draw forage for the authorized number of their chargers until their re-absorption into the Horse Artillery?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Yes, Sir; this concession has been granted to the officers of the batteries of Horse Artillery lately announced for conversion to field batteries.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE VOLUNTEER CAPITATION GRANT.

COLONEL LAURIE (Bath) asked the Secretary of State for War, If the Committee appointed to report upon the proposed increase in the Volunteer Capitation Grant have recommended any allowance in connection with marching columns; and, if such recommendation will receive his sanction?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Yes, Sir; the Committee have recommended that a daily allowance of 2*s.* a day per man, as in the case of camps, should be given to such corps as preferred to join an organized marching column for three days. I understand that it would be a great convenience to many Volunteer corps who are now making their Spring arrangements to have early information as to this recommendation; and therefore I may say at once that is one which we intend to propose for adoption.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—RETURNS.

MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will lay upon the Table a Return relating to the Royal Irish Constabulary for 1886, similar to that ordered by the House on 12th May 1886 for 1885, and presented 20th August 1886?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): These Returns were ordered last year. In the event of such Returns being moved for again, I will offer no opposition; but their preparation will take considerable time.

EAST AFRICA—MASSOWAH—DEFEAT OF AN ITALIAN EXPEDITION.

MR. LEGH (Lancashire, S.W., Newton) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government are in possession of any information, beyond that which has appeared in the daily papers, respecting recent proceedings of the Italian Government at Massowah, and the reverse lately sustained by the troops in the vicinity of that port?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, E.): We have no other intelligence than what has been stated in the Italian Chamber by Count Robilant—namely, that according to a despatch received from the Commandant at Massowah, and dated January 29, a serious conflict had taken place with the Abyssinians, who were driven back after four hours' combat; and that next day a column sent to re-victual Saati was attacked by the Abyssinians and destroyed. Sir Evelyn Baring has telegraphed to say that there are a considerable number of wounded at Massowah; and he has been authorized, with the concurrence of the Lieutenant General Commanding the British Forces in Egypt, to offer assistance in the way of sending medical officers and stores.

LUNACY ACTS AMENDMENT—LEGISLATION.

MR. W. J. CORBET (Wicklow, E.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is intended to introduce the Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill which passed the House of Lords, and was read a first time in this House last Session?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. STUART-WORTLEY) (Sheffield, Hallam) (who replied) said: The Lord Chancellor has introduced into the House of Lords an Amendment Bill and a Consolidation Bill. Both of these were circulated this morning.

ARMY—ARMS OF OFFICERS—THE REVOLVER.

MR. BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he is aware that no revolver or pistol of any kind is at present included in the equipment of officers of Her Majesty's Army; and, whether, such being the case, he will permit this generally recognized as indispensable weapon to be officially recognized and prescribed for officers by regulation?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF THE ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): The revolver is officially recognized as an arm for officers to take into the field, and ammunition for it is carried in all ammunition columns. Although not positively ordered to do so, as a matter of fact most officers do carry revolvers; but it is considered best not to prescribe positively that an officer should carry a pistol, because if we did so we should have to lay down the pattern; and it is desirable he should select for himself, when ordered on active service, what he considers to be the best and handiest pattern of pistol.

COAL AND IRONSTONE MINES—REPORT OF INSPECTORS, 1886.

MR. PICKARD (York, W. R., Normanton) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will, on an early date, lay upon the Table of the House an Abstract of the Report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Coal and Ironstone Mines for the year 1886?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. STUART-WORTLEY) (Sheffield, Hallam) (who replied) said: There is no Chief Inspector of Mines. No Inspector presents a Report in behalf of the others. The collected Reports of all the Inspectors, under both Coal Mines and Metalliferous Mines Acts, are presented to Parliament in one book in or about the month of April. That publication contains an abstract similar to that for which the hon. Member asks. To present to Parliament such abstract in advance would, therefore, lead to the presentation twice over of the same matter. The abstract is, however, printed in advance, usually about the middle of March. Copies of it are issued to the Mining Press and to some Associations connected with the mining industries. These have not hitherto included any Associations specially representative of working miners. I shall be glad to increase the number of copies to be printed of such abstract with a view to its wider circulation, pending the appearance of the collected Reports, and shall be glad to receive the suggestions of hon. Members specially connected with the mining industry with regard to the enlargement of the list of persons or Associations to whom copies should go.

COAL AND IRONSTONE MINES—DAYS OF DRAWING.

MR. PICKARD (York, W. R., Normanton) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If it is within his power to order Her Majesty's Inspectors of Coal and Ironstone Mines to insert in their Annual Report the number of days on which each mine draws coal or ironstone; and, if so, will he give instructions that this information shall be given in their Report for 1886?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): The Inspectors have no power to compel owners to give them information as to the number of days on which each mine draw coal or ironstone, so it would be futile for me to give them instructions which they would be unable to carry out. I will, however, bear in mind the hon. Member's suggestion, and consult the Inspectors on the subject.

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND)—LOANS TO CROFTING PARISHES.

MR. C. S. PARKER (Perth) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether arrangements are completed for enabling the Fishery Board to make advances by way of loan to persons engaged in the fishing industry in crofting parishes in Scotland?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): The rules in respect to the loans, referred to in the Question of the hon. Member, have been determined and returned to the Fishery Board for Scotland. The Order in Council required to give effect to the provisions of the Sea Fishing Boats Act is now being prepared; and its terms will, I hope, be adjusted in the next fortnight. The Order will, necessarily, be of a somewhat complicated character, as it deals with a new system of Registration for Fishing Boats; and it has to be carefully considered by the Treasury, Customs, and Board of Trade, as well as in my own Department.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS.

MR. WOOTTON ISAACSON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he could state the number of actual tenants evicted on the Glenbeigh property, and the number evicted who merely had illegal possession?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): There were 31 cases, some being cases of joint tenancy; 45 tenants in all were evicted. So far as I have been able to ascertain, 18 cases were for non-payment of rent, and 25 on title. There were two cases of sub-tenants, which are included in the 45 above mentioned.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES

MR. HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether it is the practice at Assizes and Commissions in Ireland for Crown Solicitors to make inquiries, subsequent to each criminal trial where a jury has disagreed, for the purpose of ascertaining who the jurors were who were in favour of an acquittal, so that such jurors may in succeeding cases be ordered to stand by; and, whether, if so, he will direct this practice to be discontinued?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): No, Sir; no such practice exists as that referred to by the hon. Member.

INLAND REVENUE—INCOME TAX—FOREIGN FIRMS.

MR. HOWORTH (Salford, S.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether a foreign Company, or firm, represented in this Country by an agent only, pays any Income Tax upon the profits it makes in this Country?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Yes; and the liability in such a case has been affirmed by the High Court of Justice.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SEVENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January.]—[See page 84.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston), in rising to move the following Amendment at the end of the 4th paragraph:—

> "And humbly to represent to Her Majesty that, inasmuch as the expenses of the prolonged occupation of Egypt by a British Force have to be borne by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, the great majority of whom have no direct interest in the Government or affairs of Egypt, and that the retention of our Troops in Egypt is a cause of suspicion and irritation to Continental Governments, and calculated to weaken the influence of this Country in the Councils of Europe, humbly to pray Her Majesty to take immediate steps for recalling the whole of Her Forces in Egypt,"—

said, it was difficult for him to read through the history of our doings in Egypt without feelings of amazement and shame. Outside of that House he had not met anyone who would undertake to defend our policy in Egypt. There was a feeling of intense hostility on the part of the working classes in this country to the occupation of Egypt, and indeed of all classes who were not either bondholders, financiers, or contractors who supplied swords that would not cut, bayonets that were easily bent, guns that would not go off, shells that would not burst, and trusses of hay stuffed with bricks and shavings. There were millions of people in this country who considered public questions, and judged public men in a somewhat rough and untutored fashion. These people had, however, to be reckoned with. They had not learned to distinguish between annexation and stealing, nor did they interpret a temporary occupation as meaning four and a-half years; and the difference between military operations and war was to them quite incomprehensible. Nor did the workmen of this country understand why they were to keep our troops in Egypt to compel the working people of that country to pay exorbitant interest on loans which they never sanctioned or contracted. Such ignorance on the part of our masters was, no doubt, very lamentable and very inconvenient; but we should have to face the fact. He (Mr. Cremer) did not propose to discuss who was answerable for our original occupation of Egypt; but he maintained that our present unfortunate position in that country had resulted from the Dual Control, which Lord Derby had wisely refused to countenance, and against which the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) had duly cautioned us, but which Lord Salisbury had unfortunately sanctioned. What had been the net result of our armed intervention in Egypt? The weight of taxation had not been removed from the shoulders of the people, justice was not simply and fairly administered, the conscription had not been abolished, and there was no security for life and property in the country. Doubtless, something had been done in the interest of the bondholders who had made advances to the Egyptian Government; but what had been done to better the position of those patient drudges—the poor people of Egypt besides imposing upon them an additional burden of four millions to re-build a city which we had wickedly and wantonly destroyed. Many answers had been given to the question why we had interfered in Egypt at all. One answer was that we had interfered because the Suez Canal was in danger; but when our soldiers went there it was discovered there was no danger whatever. Another answer was that Arabi Pasha was a rebel, and ought to be put down. The result had been that we had put down Arabi Pasha as a rebel, and had made him into a hero who was worshipped by the mass of the people in Egypt. We abolished the Chamber of Notables in Egypt; but with splendid consistency we carefully preserved the unrepresentative Chamber of Notables at home. What was the Egyptian difficulty? The best answer to that question was contained in the statement made by the present Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury) on the 5th of February, 1884, in which he said—

> "A loan of £1,000,000 has been advanced by the house of Rothschild to the Khedive. . . . By the Firman which placed the Khedive on the Throne the Khedive has no power of contracting loans except on the permission of his creditors. . . . If it be true that the Khedive has borrowed this sum of money from the house of Rothschild, I do not believe they have advanced it upon insufficient security, and I am driven to the conclusion that Her Majesty's Government has practically secured Messrs. Rotheschild the repayment of the loan."

This was the whole Egyptian difficulty in a nutshell. Financiers and bondholders had been powerful enough to obtain a guarantee from British Governments for the repayment of Egyptian loans with interest; and if the financiers and bondholders disappeared the problem of the Egyptian Question would be easily solved. But the important question now was how long were they going to stop there? Up till now all the answers that had been vouchsafed to them had been of the most illusory and unsatisfactory kind. He considered he had good warrant for moving his Amendment, seeing that the Prime Minister, four years ago, declared that he and the world were waiting to know what were the intentions of the Government of the day, and whether they meant to withdraw our troops. The world was still anxiously waiting for the information which the noble Marquess complained was not in the Queen's Speech in 1883.

Why had the noble Marquess not repaired the omission; and, now that he was Prime Minister, why did he not gratify the anxiety of the world? It was the professed desire of public men to do what was right when they were out of Office and leaving it undone when they were in Office which caused the masses to lose faith and confidence in them. He (Mr. Cremer) had heard that the Government had resolved upon diminishing our garrison in Egypt, and that in a very short time it would not exceed a corporal's guard; but while the British Flag floated in Egypt, and only a handful of our troops remained, the nucleus of future mischief would be there. As successive Governments had professed a sincere desire for the evacuation of Egypt, and yet for some cause or other had never carried those desires into effect, he trusted that the House, by clearly manifesting its will, would help the Government to make up their mind and would cause a withdrawal not only of a part but of the whole of our troops, and clear out, bag and baggage, not next year or the year after, but forthwith; and that the power and influence of this country would no longer be employed to enforce the claims of the bondholders. In using the word "immediate" in his Amendment he did not intend to imply that a telegraphic message should be sent ordering the troops to return within 48 hours. What he did mean was that they should have some definite period fixed for the evacuation. It might be three or six months, or he should be perfectly satisfied if the Government gave a pledge to terminate our occupation by the end of the present year. If some definite period were stated he should be perfectly satisfied, and not press his Amendment; but they had been so repeatedly deceived by so many vague promises that he must insist on some absolute pledge. The hon. Member concluded by moving the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the 4th paragraph, to add the words "and humbly to represent to Her Majesty that, inasmuch as the expenses of the prolonged occupation of Egypt by a British Force have to be borne by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, the great majority of whom have no direct interest in the Government or affairs of Egypt, and that the retention of our Troops in Egypt is a cause of suspicion and irritation to Continental Governments, and calculated to weaken the influence of this Country in the Councils of Europe, humbly to pray Her Majesty to take immediate steps for recalling the whole of Her Forces from Egypt."—(*Mr. Cremer.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth) said, the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) had expressed a wish the other night to have some definite issue stated, and he (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), therefore, was glad they had at last reached a distinct and definite issue, and one upon which they would ascertain the opinion of the House before that evening closed. He would not refer to our previous action before the year he was about to refer to; but he had taken a great interest in the Egyptian Question so long ago as 1882, when, for the first time, we were seriously involved—by which he meant by force of arms—in Egypt. He saw at that time the injustice of what we were doing, and had anticipated the evils at which we had now arrived by our interference, as he thought any hon. Gentleman who had gone carefully into the matter would have done. He should like to give what he would call a bird's-eye view of how things had gone on in Egypt during the last 11 years. He did not think we had had much to do with Egypt prior to 1876. In that year Mr. Goschen went out to Egypt, and he was armed with a letter from the Foreign Secretary of the day, which was his credential. In that letter the Foreign Secretary declared that Mr. Goschen was a Member of the late Government, and "a person of high position and reputation in this country." Mr. Goschen went out with the avowed object of putting pressure upon the Khedive to pay off the Egyptian Loans of 1862 and 1864, which had been issued by Mr. Goschen's London firm. He originated and obtained from the Khedive the establishment of what is known now as the celebrated Dual Control. One of the arrangements under the Dual Control was that £1,500,000 should be raised from cultivators' estates under the name of "Anticipatory Collection of Land Tax," to pay off the loans he had mentioned; but there was a consideration for that, which was that the Land Tax of the Fellaheen should be gradually lessened until, in 1886, it would be permanently reduced by 50 per cent. No part of this had been done, yet the £1,500,000 had been paid. When Mr. Goschen left the country, after sanctioning and determining that arrangement, a rather curious incident occurred. There was a man called Sadyk Pasha who was the Financial Minister of Egypt, and he objected to that arrangement, because he said the Khedive was plundering the country in concert with Europeans. That Minister was sent off to the White Nile, which was equivalent in that country to a sentence of death. There was a popular story told and believed in Egypt, to the effect that he, having been sent to the White Nile, was there put in a box alive and dropped to the bottom of the river. However that might be, it was certain that he had never been seen or heard of since, and he was just as likely to be at the bottom of the Nile as anywhere else. Mr. Goschen had done one of the most remarkable things in history, for he went to Egypt and put that country into commission for the benefit of the usurers who lent money to the old Khedive. That was a great deed, and fully entitled him to be what he was now—the Chancellor of the Exchequer in this country. Things went on very well for a time; the people were whipped, tortured, and taxed, and by the exercise of those forces they were compelled to pay the amount. Then came the crowning crime of all. These Egyptians had a kind of House of Commons—a Representative Assembly —and they decided to vote that portion of their Budget which did not interfere with the funds out of which the Debts were to be paid. Our officials in that country did all they could to prevent it, sending at last an ultimatum, the rejection of which led to the bombardment of Alexandria — one of the greatest crimes ever committed by this country during the century. Then back came all the hoard of European locusts, screwing and grinding the taxation out of the people. In spite of assurances they had heard in that House, the use of the bastinado and the torture seemed still to be employed in Egypt. ["Oh, oh!"] He had heard, on good authority, that Egyptian Government officials now used the cane for purposes of torture. If that were so, it would appear that we had improved the position of the Egyptian people to the extent of abolishing the kourbash, and introducing the cane. If we were to remain in Egypt, it was worth while to consider what good we had already done there. He should state the case in this way: We had raised the Funded Debt from £90,000,000 to £100,000,000; we had slaughtered many thousands of Egyptian soldiers; we had badly crippled, if we had not crushed, the National Chamber, the only Representative Body they had; we had bombarded their principal commercial city under circumstances of the greatest horror; and, on the whole, it was clear we had increased their taxation, although it was sometimes asserted that we had reduced it. We had promoted the most horrible vice and debauchery in Cairo; we had sown dissension between the Khedive and his people; and had succeeded in crushing out the first little spark of liberty and independence which had been seen in an Eastern nation for generations past. That was what we had done for Egypt. What good had our occupation of Egypt done to ourselves? It had excited against us the anger and jealousy of all the other European nations; it had cost the taxpayers of this country millions upon millions of money, and led to those horrible battles in the Soudan. That money and the lives of our soldiers had been spent in slaughtering a people "rightly struggling to be free." The result was that we had another Ireland some thousands of miles away; just as if one Ireland was not enough. He did not know of any human being who had benefited by the proceedings in Egypt, except Sir Garnet Wolseley and Sir Beauchamp Seymour, who had got their Peerages and their pensions. Our policy in Egypt was now condemned, although he was sorry to say that it was initiated by Members on that side of the House, and supported by Members on both sides. They were all guilty. He was glad, however, to see in the Address which the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister (Mr. Gladstone) issued as his election manifesto in 1885, the following passage:—" We must not expect recompense for all we have done in Egypt; what we must expect is retribution." In what the right hon. Gentleman had said, it seemed to him (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) that he had spoken truly. It was most certain that the longer we went on in national crime the greater would be our national punishment. It was because he wished to put an end to that crime as soon as he could that he cordially supported the Amendment.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.) said, the hon. Member for the Haggerston Division of Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) had introduced an Amendment which, while founded on a desire for the withdrawal of the British force from Egypt, had traversed incidentally the whole question of the British occupation of Egypt. He was glad the hon. Member had so connected the subjects, because this would render his task very much easier. He had here to admit that the maintenance of a European force in Egypt was closely bound up with the propriety of our influence over the government of Egypt, and the presence of our troops there must stand or fall by the propriety of our presence there, and the benefit of our presence there to Egypt, to this country, and to the world. He should hope to satisfy the House that our presence in Egypt was not productive of the mischief which the hon. Member and the hon. Baronet described. So far from our object there being for the benefit of the bondholders and with disregard of the interests of the people, he maintained that the interests of the bondholders were the smallest portion of the considerations of the Government. National and international interests were our objects, and a necessary condition of the fulfilment of those national and international objects was the amelioration of the condition of the people of Egypt. He was quite content to rest his opposition to the Amendment on the question whether our presence and control over the Government of Egypt had been and were likely to be for the benefit of the people of Egypt. No doubt there were other considerations which had not been stated to the House, but which must be present to their minds in considering a subject of such great importance. He was far from objecting to the proposition that the people of this country had a right to a full explanation of so great a matter of public policy, and he thought Her Majesty's Government would be the last to deny to them that full explanation. It was quite true, as was stated in the Amendment, that any expenditure by this country must be borne by the taxpayers. It was useless now to go into matters of ancient history, but the question was whether our presence in Egypt was justifiable. He might remind them that no act of the Government in regard to Egypt had been repudiated or censured by that House. The reason why our occupation of Egypt had been productive of heavy charges to this country was on account of the expenses of expeditions and undertakings for objects which he was quite sure the public opinion of the country approved at the time.—[" Hear, hear! " *and cries of* " No!"]—Did not public opinion approve the expeditions to relieve General Gordon and the beleaguered garrisons of the Soudan? It was to those expeditions that the great military expense of the British occupation was due. He could not omit noticing an attack which had been made on an eminent Member of Lord Salisbury's Government. The hon. Baronet the Member for Cumberland (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) had gone out of his way to go into a matter which had more than once been the subject of debate in the House. The charge brought against the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been utterly contradicted and dispelled.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON (Cumberland, Cockermouth): What charge?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON said, the charge was that Mr. Goschen went to Egypt in the interest of the bondholders for whom his firm had contracted a loan. Mr. Goschen absolutely denied and dispelled that accusation. Mr. Goschen went to Egypt, he believed, on a mission to advise for the restoration of the financial equilibrium, which was then seriously threatened.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: The loan ——[*Cries of* " Order, order! "]

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: Mr. Goschen, in going to Egypt, had no private interest or object whatever. That he has before stated publicly in this House, and that charge ought to be buried in oblivion. It is utterly unworthy of the hon. Baronet.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: May I ask what the charge is?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON said, the charge was that he went to Egypt in the interest of his own firm.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: What I said was that he went in the interest of the bondholders.

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON said, that was so; but the hon. Baronet added that it was in connection with a loan to be negotiated by his own firm. He maintained that Mr. Goschen went to Egypt in the interest of the Egyptians, to place the finances on a better footing, and the result of his visit was that the burdens of Egypt were lessened. The hon. Baronet might well have waited till the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a seat in the House—which would not be long. When the right hon. Gentleman was there he would be well able to maintain his own position. Meantime, he repudiated the charge on the right hon. Gentleman's behalf. He had now to deal with the part taken by the present Government in the occupation of Egypt. It should be remembered that Lord Salisbury, when he took Office in 1885, succeeded to the position then existing, and inherited the engagements previously undertaken. He was much mistaken if the people of this country were not anxious that a Government should fulfil its inherited obligations, even when they became onerous. Her Majesty's Government had steadily set their faces to reduce the British Force in Egypt, and the consequent charge upon the British public, to the utmost of their power. Last May the British Force amounted to 11,000 men; in the autumn it was reduced to 9,000; and now, by the altered state of circumstances, it was in course of reduction to about 5,000. While every Government had been anxious to reduce the Force, circumstances had occurred which necessarily postponed the fulfilment of that wish. Last autumn intelligence was received that a considerable force of rebels was coming down the Nile. There was much dissension among their troops, and considerable difficulty was experienced in preventing the best of them from deserting to the Egyptian lines. But, so far as the British taxpayer was concerned, he ventured to tell the House that, when they were able to bring down the number of British troops to 5,000, the cost to this country would be only about £50,000. But, whether the cost had been large or small, it had been justified by the circumstances. The hon. Member said that the great majority of the taxpayers had no direct interest in the government and affairs of Egypt. Of course, it was quite true that few English taxpayers, beyond the bondholders, had a direct interest in the affairs of Egypt. But the great body of the people were units in the body politic, and, as such units, they were affected by our relations with the Great Powers, and, in that sense, everyone was interested in our occupation of Egypt. There was no country in the world which had foreign interests more wide and varied than those of this country. He was glad to find by the words of the Amendment—that the occupation of Egypt "weakened our interests in the Councils of Europe"—that the hon. Member did recognize that the Government ought to have influence in the Councils of Europe, and that he put far from him that theory of parochial politics which held that Great Britain ought to have no such influence, and ought to pursue a course of absolute isolation. But he denied, on three grounds, the allegations of the Amendment that our presence in Egypt was a cause of suspicion and irritation among foreign Governments. First, we were there with the consent of the European Powers. In March, 1885, a Convention was signed in London with the five Powers for the loan of £9,000,000, part of which was applicable to the payment of our troops. It was clear, then, that at that time the Powers recognized the presence of our Army in Egypt, and our control over the government of the country. The Leader of the Opposition had spoken emphatically on this assent of the powers to our continued presence in Egypt. Secondly, not only were we there with the consent, and by the mandate, of Europe, but the Great Powers had abstained from pressing the Government on the question of the duration of our stay, and from raising objections to it, and with the increasing recognition on their part that our objects in remaining in the country were not selfish, much had been effected towards the removal of all cause of jealousy and ill-will. We were there for the good of Egypt and the world, and were ready to enter into solemn engagements for the neutralization of the country, and of the great highway which traversed it. To nothing was this improved state of things more owing than to the conciliatory and dignified attitude of the late Lord Iddesleigh. It had always been a great satisfaction to him to have assisted his noble Friend's labours, and it was a pleasurable thought that it was by Lord Iddesleigh's wish that he was at the Foreign Office. Thirdly, we were in Egypt also with the consent of the Sovereign Power. Previously to the Convention signed at Constantinople in October, 1885, we had not the sanction of the Sublime Porte. The presence of a European Power in the Turkish dominions was naturally a source of uneasiness to the Porte. But when the Sublime Porte appointed a distinguished Turkish officer to act with a British statesman, it became clear that we had obtained the authority of the Sovereign Power, and one source of jealousy both in Turkey and the rest of Europe was removed. He denied, therefore, that suspicion and irritation were aroused by our presence in Egypt, and he hoped the Government would more and more justify the occupation. He would ask the House not to revive past discussions, which could only serve to increase our difficulties. Our military occupation was only a means to an end, and if our force was entirely withdrawn there was nothing immediately to take its place. The memory of those contests in which British soldiers saved the country from supreme disaster was so fresh that they could not leave the Egyptian army, wonderfully efficient as it undoubtedly was, without the support of a British reserve. The considerations which the Government had in view in their occupation were well known to the world. Egypt was an inherent part of the Turkish Empire which it had been the policy of this country to maintain and support. We desired, therefore, to make Egypt strong and a strength to the Turkish Empire. Our first object, therefore, was to re-establish financial equilibrium, to organize a sound system of administration, and to ameliorate the condition of the people. By the creation of an effective army and police, we hoped to establish a strong Government which should recognize the supremacy of the Sultan as the head of the Mahommedan world. ["Oh, oh!" *from the Opposition.*] He was surprised to hear that objection. It would be contrary to all traditions of the British Government if we were to be in Egypt without the fullest recognition of the supremacy of the Sultan. Aided by the co-operation of the Turkish Government, unprecedented success had attended our control of Egyptian affairs during the last year and a half. The ferment caused by Arabi's insurrection had calmed down, crime had diminished, and brigandage had almost disappeared; justice was now well regulated and honestly administered, punishment—which had often failed to attend grave offence—was now impartially administered, and punishments were moderate in amount. The prisons, which had been in a scandalous condition, were also well managed, and there had been no increase of taxation; and, indeed, the burdens of the people had in some respects been lightened, although he regretted that it had not been found possible immediately to reduce the Land Tax, which was a heavy burden and more oppressive even than it was in India. It had been reduced by the partial abolition of the *corvée*, which really operated as a heavy impost on the cultivators, and last year the Revenues of Egypt were able to bear a charge of £200,000 for this work. Then the Expenditure of the country had been regulated. There was no longer any waste, and the finances had been put in order. Enormous advances had been made towards that end. Last September in Committee of Supply he told the House that there was a good prospect of the Revenues rising in 1885-6 being sufficient to repay the 5 per cent coupons deducted from the debt. The Revenues had been amply sufficient for that purpose. More than that, they had sufficed to pay in full the interest on the Suez Canal Shares. Then there was the £200,000 he had mentioned in relief of the *corvée*, and there was a surplus of about £60,000 over all. Since that Estimate had been made out they had heard that on the Domain and Daira lands the loss on the year had not been £350,000 as estimated, but only £200,000. This showed that the finances had attained an equilibrium, and that by the economy with which they had been administered and by the improved condition of the country. A very curious circumstance struck one on looking at the Customs Revenue, which had risen 20 per cent in the last three years. The exports had been diminished and the imports had increased. More wheat had been imported than exported, and this had taken place in spite of a poor cotton crop. Instead of the people subsisting on the coarser kinds of grain, they were now large consumers of wheat. There was a surplus estimated for next year, and that after cutting down every Estimate that seemed to be excessive, and providing for every charge that could possibly come against the Revenues of Egypt—providing for, among other things, £400,000 for the loss on Domain and Daira lands, although this year the loss had been only £200,000. The hon. Member asked, "What are you doing for irrigation?" A million of money had been devoted to irrigation with the best results. Not only was the land better supplied with water, but the area of cultivable land was increased. He had seen something of the country, and, like Scinde, it only existed by irrigation. That eminent engineer, Colonel Scott Moncrieff, had directed the irrigation works of Egypt with the best results. He wished the revenues were able to admit of much more money being spent on irrigation and other works. But, unfortunately, they were not. In the course of years, no doubt, more revenue would be available; for instance, when the interest on the Suez Canal Shares fell in; and it could only be by the application of all the surplus revenues that any great advance could be made with those public works which were so urgently required for the development of the resources of the country. The hon. Member asked what the Government had done for Egypt? He replied that order had taken the place of cruelty; that taxes were raised without exactions; the Civil Administration was working thoroughly well, and public security was maintained by a police which, though not perfect, was very promising, and was gradually taking the place of the Native Army, which was in course of reduction. It had been reduced in the present quarter from 17,000 to 10,000 men. But he freely admitted that much remained to be done. They had organized and improved administration, no doubt; but they had to see that it was so permanent that it would not fade away like an exotic, as soon as the atmosphere of British counsel was withdrawn. A country which had so long been the victim of much misgovernment and oppression could not attain in a few years such an administration as could be regarded as permanent. No doubt there had been mistakes in our administration of Egypt. It might be that we tried to do too much for the Egyptians, and too little by them. He thought it a great mistake, especially in governing Oriental nations, to humiliate the Rulers in the eyes of their subjects. Their object should be to guide the Natives that they might be capable of governing themselves—to enlist their sympathies and feelings in the honest administration of their country. Perhaps we had sometimes erred by hurrying on the Native Administration too fast; and, secondly, in not guiding them to do that which they were willing to do, instead of doing it for them with the best intention. Among the chief difficulties they had to face in Egypt was the intolerable and pressing Debt. He could not admit that it was unable to bear it; but it was a very terrible thing that the margin of revenue available for the development of the country should be so narrow, and that it should be a source of constant anxiety to us whether the country would be able to meet its engagements; but, as a proof of the improved state of the country in the last few years, he might mention that within the last two years the amount of surplus upon the assigned revenues to the service of the Debt was £900,000, and it would have been £1,100,000 but for the application of £200,000 for the relief of forced labour. That was to say that there had been a surplus of £450,000 in each year and there was a surplus estimated for the present year of £435,000 on the assigned revenues applicable to the general administration of Egypt, and which enabled the Government to make both ends meet. Egypt was not like India, where three-fourths of the money borrowed by the Government or guaranteed by them was applied to works profitable and remunerative to the country. The Debt of Egypt had been too much wasted, and perhaps had been made the means of plunder. The country had not reaped by any means the full advantage of that expenditure, and it must remain a load on the country for many years to come. For himself he might say that he believed, if Europe had only in view the improvement of the condition of that country as much as possible, it would be easy to lighten the burden of that Debt on the country by the co-operation of the Powers, greatly to reduce the burden of interest, and to provide such a sum as would carry out the works of development in Egypt which would make the incidence even of such a Debt as that comparatively light. The House was aware how grievously the Capitulations pressed upon Egypt. That a large number of persons should be entirely free from the laws and exempt from the taxation was a great injustice, which no one could contemplate without regret. The jealousies of the Powers indeed prevented many things from being done which were most necessary, but it could not be right that those living by and in a country should be neither subject to its laws nor contribute to its revenue. He hoped that in the future, when confidence in our doings and intentions should be fully established, we might accomplish something for the removal of this blot upon civilization, this shame on the acts of the European Powers, and this undoubted hindrance to any real improvement of the country. Hon. Members spoke about the vice and the misery caused to the country by our presence there. Who were those people so obnoxious? They were the scum of the Levant—men who, whatever might be their conduct, were not amenable to the police of Egypt. That was a disgraceful state of things, and was not due to the British occupation. He had said that the efforts of the Government were directed to arriving at a full understanding with the Sovereign Power, not, indeed, for the purpose of perpetuating our stay in Egypt, but to secure the establishment of such relations as might render our ultimate retirement consistent with the interests of this country, of Egypt, and of the Ottoman Government. If they were enabled to carry on their work unhampered, they might fairly expect to render Egypt entirely self-supporting, and to bring great relief to the industry of the country, and all this without any charge on the British Exchequer. Egypt would reap all the advantages of her geographical position without being the shuttlecock of speculators or the object of the jealousy of foreign Powers. But in order to the accomplishment of this object it was surely necessary that England should enjoy the confidence of the Powers. That confidence they hoped to deserve and to receive; but it had been stated in this House, and never more clearly than by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), that under no circumstances could we depart from Egypt until we had fulfilled our engagements and responsibilities there. The time would not be long, but our duties there, though in course of fulfilment, were not yet done. He believed that if we went on in the course that had been pursued with so much good to Egypt we should render that country, still so rich in resources, self-supporting and prosperous, and in that happy result Egypt would owe something to the circumstances of the British occupation, which, however we might regret its having imposed a burden upon this country, was being turned to the advantage of Egypt with perfect honesty to the rest of the world, and with no desire to the selfish advantage of England.

Mr. CAINE (Barrow-in-Furness) said, he had hoped that the statement of the Government in reply to the Amendment before the House would justify him in voting against it; but, having listened with great attention to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir James Fergusson), he was bound to say that, unless further assurance were given by the Government, as to their intention to retire from Egypt at some reasonable time, he should be obliged to vote in favour of the Amendment. If the right hon. Gentleman, in one of his sentences, correctly defined that intention we should never get out of Egypt at all. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that the determination of the Government was to stay in Egypt until we had removed "insuperable" difficulties; but if we had to remove insuperable difficulties, we should be there till the crack of doom. Why were they in Egypt at all? Were they there to establish good government, sound finance, and a Native Administration, or were they merely bum-bailiffs to the bondholders? They had had a clear answer to that question from the right hon. Baronet the Under Secretary of State, who had told them that the interests of the bondholders were, and should be, the smallest object of their consideration, and that their main purpose was the amelioration of the condition of the people. If, in response to the Amendment, the Government were at once to evacuate Egypt, everyone knew that with the British Army the present Government would also evacuate, and the present Khedive would go with it. That fact must be taken as a clear admission that, so far, they had failed in the object with which they began to occupy Egypt. Now, he had no hesitation in saying that the reason why they were not succeeding in their efforts to get out of Egypt was because they had never got into Egypt. They had not a free hand, and if they could not get that free hand, which was so much wanted, then, he thought, they ought to come out. The House had not heard that night that the Government were making any effort to bring about an agreement among the Powers of Europe to give them a free hand. With a free hand, he believed they could accomplish everything that the Government seemed to desire, and leave the affairs of the country in the hands of a Native Administration, with some prospects of success. One of the first wants of the country was a Code of civil and criminal law; and he wished to know if any attempts were being made to introduce such a Code in accordance with European models. He was not aware of any such attempt. There was a case of a Belgian, who was tried on a charge of murder and convicted, and, on some technical plea, he received a sentence of only four months' imprisonment; but, on its appearing that the man had been five months in prison, without trial, he was let off at once. If that was the sort of administration of which the Government were proud, he could not congratulate them upon it. There were offences committed against the Egyptian Government itself, and yet the offenders escaped punishment altogether. The reason why Her Majesty's Government could not get on in Egypt was simply because of the Capitulations, which had been so eloquently denounced. What was wanted in order to ameliorate the condition of the people was, that national prosperity itself should be improved; but he saw no chance of that improvement being effected until the burden of taxation could be shifted from the oppressed Fellaheen to those who, more than any others, were thriving upon Egypt—the scum of the Levant, a class with which it was impossible to deal, owing to these Capitulations. The taxation was nearly all got from the peasants, while all Europeans—English, French, and Italian traders—and the scum of the Levant escaped scot free. Until the Europeans were taxed, it would be impossible for any Member of the Government to get up and say that they were doing what they ought to do to bring about a happier condition of life for the Egyptian people. There was one item he should like some information about from the Government—namely, that there was about £250,000 received for exemption from military service. Now it seemed an extraordinary thing that, in a country which could be content with an army of 10,000 men, they should have to tax the poor people for relief from military service. It was a ridiculous tax, and ought, if possible, to be removed. One source of taxation from which a considerable revenue might be derived in Egypt was the liquor trade, which was chiefly in the hands of Greeks and the scum of the Levant, who sold most poisonous and deleterious liquor. There was no country in Europe which did not derive some profit from the sale of intoxicating liquor; but in Egypt, if the question were left to the Native Government, it would make short work of the traffic and prohibit it altogether. If these liquor shops which so extensively prevail in Cairo and most of the great towns in Egypt were to be allowed to continue, he could not see why £200,000 or £300,000 might not be made out of them by a heavy licence duty. The reason which prevented it at present was the Capitulations with the Greeks and others. We ought to ask the Powers of Europe, whether or not they would consent to let us tax foreigners as they ought to be taxed; and, if not, we should go out and leave the country to itself. Unless we had a free hand we should never get out, and sooner or later we should get involved in a war with one of the Great Powers, which might insist on our going out. Unless he heard a very distinct statement from the Government that they intended to use every effort in their power to get the Powers of Europe to consent to the abolition of the Capitulations, and to get a free hand in Egypt, he should feel it his duty to vote with the hon. Gentleman the Mover of this Amendment.

Colonel DUNCAN (Finsbury, Holborn) said, that he was in a somewhat difficult position; because, while he differed from the hon. Gentleman the Mover of the Amendment (Mr. Cremer), he was, at the same time, dissatisfied by omissions in the speech of the right hon. Baronet the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, detailed as it had been. They had heard, among other things, that £250,000 was to be devoted to the abolition of the cruel *corvée*, but, in the papers that morning, he had seen that, owing to the interference of the French, that money could no longer be devoted to the purpose.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON: I did not make that statement. What I said was, that £200,000 of last year's expenditure had been devoted to the partial abolition of the *corvée*, and that it was the intention of the Government of Egypt to dispense with the *corvée* altogether as soon as it was possible to do so.

Colonel DUNCAN said, he thought that the explanation of the right hon. Baronet left the matter very much as it stood before, as they had heard that morning that the money which had been devoted to the abolition of the *corvée* was no longer to be used for that purpose. He trusted that they would hear from some Member of her Majesty's Government, whether some steps were to be taken to persuade the other Powers to allow this money to be so employed; certainly no better purpose could be chosen for its expenditure. He had also hoped that they would have heard of the scheme which had been brought forward allowing the Domain and Daira lands to be sold in lots to the cultivators. He would also have liked to have heard from his right hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State something more as regards proposed economy in the administrative charges in connection with the Government of Egypt. The truth was, that he feared that, in order to collect the interest on the Debt a very large European staff, highly paid, had been appointed; that in each department the best paid men were foreigners; that these offices were, therefore, practically closed to the lawful ambition of the Natives, so that we were not only political Shylocks, taking our pound of flesh, but making the victims pay for the price of the butcher's knife. To make ourselves popular it was necessary to enlist the brains of the best Natives, who had, at present, no chance of serving their country in its administration. When he had first seen this Amendment on the Paper, he had regretted it as being unnecessary, and leading to a purely academical discussion; and he could not say that his opinion had been changed. In his opinion the debate had been unnecessarily prolonged, and was peaceful even to dulness, and he believed the Amendment was one which would defeat its own purpose. Those hon. Members who, like himself, were most anxious to see the deliberate withdrawal of the British troops from Egypt, felt that such an urgent Amendment would do more than anything else to defer or postpone that desired result. Again, it was hardly a fair attack on the Government. Let them consider what changes had taken place in the last year. At this time last year Suakim had been garrisoned by English and Indian troops; at the present moment there was not a man of either; it was entirely kept by Egyptian troops. We then had men fresh from battle 100 miles to the South of the Southern Frontier of Egypt. Now we had not one there, or at Wady Halfa. In a very short time our troops in Egypt would have been reduced to 5,000 men. Then, again, they had seen changes such as had been described in the cheering statements of the right hon. Baronet; they heard that the revenue was increasing, that the people of the villages were living on better, and enjoying greater quantities of, food than they ever had before, and that the state of the Native Army was most satisfactory. On the whole, then, they had heard that the state of Egypt had decidedly improved. That had been done under Her Majesty's Government, and he thought that it seemed like spurring a willing horse to bring forward an Amendment such as this. There was one suggestion which he thought should be made to Her Majesty's Government with the view of creating a trustworthy National Government, and that was with regard to the use of our Forces in connection with a Native Government. After such an event as the battle of Tel-el-Kebir, it had been necessary to bridge over the interval between the old Government and a new one; but there came a time when the Government was not strengthened, but weakened, by foreign bayonets, and when the people were apt to think that their Native Rulers were merely puppets in the hands of others. He would suggest that a further withdrawal of 1,000 men might be made, and that 2,000 men should be stationed at the end of the Southern Railway at Assiout and 2,000 at Alexandria, the end of the Northern Railway; so that, while within easy reach of Cairo in case of disturbance, the presence of British bayonets should not remind the people that their Rulers were mere puppets in the hands of a foreign Power. At the same time, Cairo would be left entirely in the hands of the Egyptian troops of the Khedive. He believed that this would be a wise thing to do; he had confidence in the loyalty of the Egyptian Army, and until foreign soldiers ceased to be seen in Cairo, there would not be a real Native Government. The best Egyptian statesmen had refused to share in the councils of a Government propped up by foreign bayonets. The two positions of Assiout and Alexandria would be retained for strategic reasons. He believed that by taking such a course we should unite the country in a shorter time than we could if we kept our soldiers always visible before the eyes of the people. They all knew that the time must come when our withdrawal should be completed. No Party in that House desired that our occupation should be a permanent one, and our only method was to give the country a National Government, with a free hand to a certain extent; and not to insult that Government in the eyes of the people, but to use our soldiers for military purposes only. He must say, in conclusion, that he objected to the criticisms which had been passed upon the Services. During the course of this debate, allusion had been made to a body of men to which he had for many years had the honour of belonging; and he could testify that when the evacuation of Egypt did take place, there would be no memories brighter to the Egyptians than those connected with those soldiers who had lived among them for so many years, and whose conduct to the Natives had been beyond all praise. From General Stephenson—a man without fear and without reproach—who had endeared himself to the people of all nations in Cairo, down to the youngest private soldier—all had realized that they were bearing, not their own reputation only but the reputation and honour of their country on their shoulders. He could speak of one sad experience of his own. It had been his lot to superintend the carrying out of the evacuation of Dongola, and to conduct 13,000 homeless people through English camps, near which and in which they sometimes rested; and he never heard during the whole of that long and weary march of a single complaint against an English soldier of assault or insult. Was that not enough to make them feel proud of the Services which had been criticized in this debate? If it was not, he did not know what was. It had been said, "The Services are becoming our masters." Well, if there was a country in the world where, in time of political danger, the people had not to ask, "What of the Army?" it was our country, and the proudest boast of the soldiers and sailors of England was that they were the Services. Like a man's arm, which hung motionless by the side until moved by the will, the Army did not act until prompted by the National will; and the powers given to it were given by Parliament, which declared whether and where its services should be actively required. It was not the Army, but Parliament that declared war, and those soldiers who had seen most of war and its hurts were by no means anxious to see their country involved in it. The Army rejoiced to do its duty when called upon to do so by the nation; but to accuse it of forcing the country into war was both an intolerable and a most unjustifiable accusation. He felt proud of the results of English work in Egypt, and he felt confident that that work would continue while England remained in Egypt. But in the interests of the Egyptian people, for whom he pleaded when he first entered the House, he now pleaded that the evacuation might not be too long deferred. Even if we had the mandate of Europe, he cared far more for the interests of the Egyptian people, and he believed that we might build up a prosperous and happy nation if we only allowed them to be free.

Dr. CLARK (Caithness) said, that in the month of April, 1876, the Khedive issued an order, by which the loans were changed from their original position and were placed in another category. Mr. Goschen called on Lord Derby, then Foreign Secretary, with regard to the matter in August of that year. Bondholders who objected to the new decree met, and asked Mr. Goschen to go out to Egypt to represent them. The French bondholders also met, and appointed a representative. They went out to Egypt for the purpose of modifying the new decree. Lord Derby sent out a despatch regarding the matter, dated August 2, 1876, stating that Mr. Goschen had undertaken to represent the interests of English bondholders of Egyptian Stock, with the view of obtaining some modification of the late decree of the Khedive in favour of the bondholders; and instructing the British representatives to give such unofficial assistance as they properly could to Mr. Goschen in bringing his protest under the consideration of the Khedive; and informing his Highness that Mr. Goschen was a member of the late Cabinet, and a person of high position and reputation in this country. The official information, therefore, fully justified the statement made by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson). In the Queen's Speech they were told that the objects for which we went to Egypt had not yet been attained. He had been anxious for some time to know what these objects were, and still he was as much in the dark as ever. In his opinion the real object, and the only object, for which we went to Egypt was simply to put down Parliamentary Government in that country. And what we remained there for he did not know. The late Khedive of Egypt, Ismail Pasha, wanted money, and he borrowed it on his own personal security. A claim was made by the Chamber to vote one-half of the Budget. We opposed it; we prevented it. And we had crushed the attempt made by the Egyptian people to govern themselves. He thought the Egyptian people ought to have repudiated the burden laid upon them. These were not engagements entered into by the Egyptian people, or by the Egyptian Government. They were the personal loans of the Viceroy of Egypt; and the people of Egypt were not responsible for them. Our representative in Egypt wired home that armed intervention would be necessary if we tried to prevent the Chamber from voting the money. We did prevent them, and by and by armed intervention was necessary. That was the beginning of all our troubles in Egypt. We had crushed the Parliament which Ismail called together for the purpose of getting a sum of money. Lord Dufferin was sent out as a Special Commissioner, and he made a valuable Report, in which he suggested that a new Chamber should be appointed. That Chamber had never met, and never would meet, because we had interfered in Egypt, and had gone there contrary to the will of the Egyptians, and were remaining there contrary to their will. If we left Egypt to-morrow, the Khedive and the present Government must leave with us, because they only existed there in virtue of our presence. They were now told that our troops remained in Egypt in order that we might have an influence over the Government of the country, that our objects were both national and international, that we interfered to restore order, and, further, that we were there to strengthen the Turkish Empire. If Her Majesty's Government desired to benefit the Egyptian people, he would ask, would they allow the law of liquidation to remain in its present position? They were also told that we were going to remain in Egypt until we organized a stable Government that would last. If that was their intention, he thought they would remain, as the hon. Baronet (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) had said, until the crack of doom. We were maintaining in Egypt a Government alien in race, in language, and in religion to the great bulk of the people. And whenever we took away the force by which we maintained that Government it would tumble down, and the country would go back to the condition of things which existed before we interfered. As long as we remained in Egypt he believed we would do harm. We had crushed out the aspirations of the Egyptian people and of the Soudanese. We were spending our money in trying to establish a Government which would tumble to pieces whenever we took away the force which supported it. If Her Majesty's Government wanted to do something for Egypt they might, as had been done in the case of Belgium, neutralize Egypt and place it under the guarantees of all the Great

Powers. He could not see why we should throw increased burdens on the taxpayers of this country, and so diminish their comforts in order to benefit the Egyptian bondholders. As far as foreign influence was concerned, the present Government, as he had said, could not last after our troops had evacuated the country. We must allow the Egyptian people the right to govern themselves; for, as long as we kept up the bureaucracy in Egypt, contrary to the wishes of the Egyptian people, we were not doing any permanent good to the country. Another consideration which ought not to be left out of sight, was that our conduct was seriously irritating the French nation. The French Government had remonstrated with us about our prolonged occupation of Egypt. He thought it was a blessing to us that France had got Germany on her hands at the present moment, otherwise there would be more chance of war between France and England, on account of Egypt, than there was a chance of war between France and Germany.

SIR RICHARD TEMPLE (Worcester, Evesham): Sir, I rise, not to enter upon the controversial field of Egyptian policy, nor to follow preceding speakers into details, extracted from the Blue Book, which serve to confuse the House and to darken counsel. I intend only to state what I know regarding the country and its people. I have been acquainted with Egypt—or rather with the Nile Delta and Lower Egypt—on and off during a large part of my life. More particularly, after the military and political events of 1882, I visited the country in 1883. I then had access to the best sources of information, European and Native; and my Oriental experience enabled me to gauge the value of such information. I now propose to submit briefly to the House my evidence in this great case. Sir, the hon. Gentleman the Mover of the Amendment, the Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer), asked several very pertinent questions, which I will answer. He asks whether the landed interests have been promoted in that country? I answer, yes, largely. He asks whether property is really secure there? On the whole, yes. He asks whether the burden of taxation has been lightened? Yes, in some degree. He asks whether irrigation has been extended? Certainly, it has. He asks whether the Conscription has been abolished? Why, no; yet, inasmuch as the strength of the forces has been brought down to a few thousand men, the Conscription must sit quite lightly on the millions of the Egyptian people. He might have remembered, however, that this is a trouble which Egypt has in common with all the great European countries, except the United Kingdom. Lastly, the Mover asks virtually, whether the Egyptian Administration has improved under British guidance and supervision? Now, may I beg the House to consider with me, for a few moments, the matters on which that Administration has undoubtedly improved since 1882. In the first place, much has been done for the settlement of the Land Revenue, and all the landed interests connected therewith; a matter which concerns the people more fundamentally than any other. Some of the most highly qualified Anglo-Indian experience has been brought to bear upon it. The land tax has been more equitably assessed, and, at least, a beginning has been made of a registration of tenures in detail, such as many countries, more advanced than Egypt, hardly possess as yet. The miscellaneous imposts, though not abolished, have been mitigated in their incidence. The police has been advantageously re-organized; this work was begun by Valentine Baker, who brought to it not only natural aptitude, but experience gained in Turkey. It would be rash to say that distresses akin to torture have been wholly stopped; but such malpractices are certainly checked. The administration of justice, though still only imperfect, has been steadied, strengthened, and purified, in some degree, at least. Gaol discipline, a subject never understood in an Eastern country, has been humanely introduced, and the condition of the prisons is much less barbarous than before. Something has been said about the Liquor Laws; well, it is hardly for us to preach the doctrine of stopping this traffic by Executive force. But assuredly this traffic, and all that concerns it, is better regulated than before, despite the difficulties caused by the Capitulations to which preceding speakers have alluded. Then something has been done for sanitation in a most insanitary country The hon. Member for Hackney (Sir

Guyer Hunter) was, during the prevalence of cholera there, despatched on a sanitary mission, and, by his skill and devotion, did yeoman's service in the cause of humanity. Then much has been done to consolidate the ancient patriarchal system in the village communities, so that they may have some notion of managing their own local affairs. Thus the lesson of local self-government begins from the bottom. Although it may be impossible to resuscitate the defunct Chamber of Notables; although the able and sincerely-made efforts of Lord Dufferin to establish an electoral system may not as yet have borne fruit; still the foundations of local administration have been laid, and the people have been placed in a better position for managing their own affairs hereafter. The Native Egyptian officials have been sustained. To controvert this proposition, mention has been made of several Native statesmen who are in retirement. But a longer list might be given of those who are in active service. The extension of irrigation strikes every observant traveller. If it be impossible to abolish altogether the forced labour for the repair of the canals, still that labour is devoted to reproductive and remunerative works on the spot—works necessary to secure to the people their means of livelihood. This particular labour is not felt by the people to be oppressive. We may wish to substitute a better system, as has been done in India; but, if that cannot be done just yet, we may remember that the existing system is not an unmixed evil. Railways constructed by British engineers, of which the management has been greatly improved under British supervision, have done more than anything else for Egyptian civilization. From what was said by one preceding speaker, it might be almost inferred that railways had stopped the internal communication by water. But still many vessels ply on the Navigation Canal between Alexandria and Cairo. A good system of public accounts has been set up. Preceding speakers have declared the skilled officers employed therein to be too highly paid. But for financial administration it is the truest economy to have experts of standing and position, and that must involve expense. Lastly, we do something for the suppression of slavery. I fear that this evil still exists secretly; but it is rendered illegal, and is stopped so far as Government can stop it. Now, I entreat the House to think for an instant on all these matters—the land, the taxes, the police, the Courts of Justice, the prisons, the liquor law, the village system, the sanitation, the Native Service, the irrigation, the railways, the public accounts—and say whether the modest improvements claimed in all these respects do not make up an aggregate not unworthy of England? There is yet one particular to which I must advert. From the language of the hon. Mover and of the hon. Baronet the Member for Cockermouth (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), it will be inferred that, in 1882, we wantonly bombarded Alexandria. It was not, however, the city of Alexandria, but the forts that we bombarded. The forts were quite apart from the city. One or two shots might have reached the city, but that was all. No appreciable damage whatever was done to the town by the bombardment. I have been to the place and examined it for myself; and I affirm that the real destruction done by our iron-clads was to the forts alone. The destruction of these forts was a fortunate thing for British interests. These fortifications were strong and well constructed. So long as they were in the hands of the Khedive, or even of the Sultan, who may be assumed to be friendly to England, well and good; but if they had fallen into the hands of a European Power they would have been dangerous to us. Although this consideration afforded of itself no justification for destroying them—certainly not—yet the fact that they were destroyed was a fortunate thing for England. It is not just to England to say that we wantonly bombarded Alexandria, inasmuch as the forts were in one place, and the city in another. The partial destruction of Alexandria was caused by the Native mob. We might, indeed, have prevented that by landing soldiers or marines. Still, it was the Native mob, and not the British, who injured the city. Again, it was not the Native, but the European, part of the city that was wrecked. The quarter that suffered most was the noble square that had been built up by the Europeans during the last 30 or 40 years. I rode round the ruins of the houses, and know that to be the case. Again, the hon. Baronet the Member for Cockermouth referred to the Europeans in Egypt as a swarm of locusts eating up the resources of the country. Yes; but these metaphorical locusts pay for what they eat; whereas the real locusts do not! That makes all the difference, economically. Not only do they pay for what they consume, but they thus open up an additional market for the Natives of the country; they buy what the Natives have to sell; they create artificial wants; they cause prices to rise and wages to be augmented, and they thus give an impetus to industrial activity locally. Some disparagement has been uttered this evening, with some justice perhaps, against certain classes among these Europeans. Still, I believe the great majority of them, British, French, Italians, Austrians, Greeks, are respectable and industrious people, who repair thither to work, to thrive, and to prosper, promoting the prosperity of the Native population *pari passû* with their own. But I heartily agree with the hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness (Mr. Caine), in objecting to the system of Capitulations, and in affirming that all the European residents should obey the laws of the country and contribute towards its taxation. Further, Sir, something has been said—with what object I do not know exactly—regarding the Mahommedan dynasty and the rival sects of Islam. But the point, politically, is this. The course pursued by us towards the Sultan as Suzerain, and towards the Khedive of Egypt, has redounded to the credit of England throughout the Mahommedan world. For it is seen that it is England which sustains the status of these two Sovereigns—a status dear to the heart of Islam. Lastly, I maintain that we have yet to complete the performance of our duty towards the people of Egypt; a consideration weightier than anything urged on the other side in this debate. We have undertaken that duty by force of arms, and we are bound to carry it on to the end—not a bitter, but a happy end. If we teach the people as soon as possible to manage their own affairs, beginning with the village commune, and working upwards to the top of the administration, we may ultimately realize something of that Constitution which was foreshadowed by the beneficent Administration of Lord Dufferin, and so enable the people of Egypt to walk alone. Then, and not till then, can we quit our hold on Egypt with honour and justice. This time may be sooner, or may be later. It is probably rendered later by Motions such as that which we are now debating. These Motions have a bad effect in Egypt. They make the Natives think that the heart of England is not in the work. They make the Europeans think that the English administration in Egypt will not be continuously supported. If hon. Members opposite wish that Egypt should be evacuated by an early date, they will do well to support the execution of necessary reforms, refraining from the interposition of indirect obstacles. Such a policy would be as good for England as it would be for Egypt.

MR. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.) said, he thought the remarks of the right hon. Baronet the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs might be summed up in these words—that Egypt was a sort of paradise, and that England had a special mission, at an enormous expense to the taxpayers of this country, to take care of the people of Egypt. From that proposition he (Mr. Chance) most decidedly dissented, for he was not aware that any desire existed on the part of England to take over the control of the domestic affairs of Egypt; and still less was he aware that they approved of the expenditure of £35,000,000 which had been incurred since the bombardment of Alexandria, and which might have been better spent in attending to the affairs of England, Ireland, and Scotland, in lessening the burdens of the taxpayers. Indeed, he contended that our interference in Egypt was brought about by consideration for the interests of bondholders and usurers, rather than by any desire to benefit the people. He thought the existing complications were due to a ring of Jewish bondholders, whose object was to obtain a successful termination to a "bulling" expedition. The bombardment of Alexandria, too, was absolutely unjustifiable. It had been said, further, that we went to Egypt for the good of Europe; if that was so, it would be to the advantage of the British taxpayer if Europe paid a portion of the cost we had incurred in administering the affairs of Egypt. Then it was urged that we went to Egypt and remained there to organize the country, and place it in a safe and secure condition, and in this way to benefit the people of the country. It had been stated that there had been an improvement as regarded the land, and that property was much more secure. That was exactly what was said with respect to Ireland when coercion had been introduced. Then, as to taxation being relieved, that was done in the way which was known in private life as "flying the kite." But, sooner or later, the day of reckoning would come, and what had cost us £35,000,000 would cost the Egyptian people a good deal of suffering. As to the improvement of irrigation, he recollected that the progress of Lord Wolseley's Army was marked by the destruction of all the irrigation all along the line of march. Beyond that, all the improvement was said to be due to the eminent British officers employed in the country. That was just what was said of Ireland. It seemed to be a cardinal maxim of Her Majesty's Government that they could do everyone else's business better than anyone else; and the only business which they were delicate in tackling was the business of the English nation. It was only in Egypt that the Government seemed determined to adopt any measures. In England and Ireland they promised them and suggested them; but they usually disappeared during the Parliamentary Session in the dim and distant future. The English Army in Egypt had been compared to an army of locusts; but the right hon. Baronet opposite said that whereas locusts did not pay for what they ate, the British Army did. He (Mr. Chance) did not know, however, whether that covered the desperate outbreak of immorality and drunkenness which had marked the occupation of Egypt by the British troops. Then, as to the alleged improvement in the prisons, last year Mr. Clifford Lloyd had been sent to Egypt, and he reintroduced into the prisons an instrument of torture which even the Sultan of Turkey had prohibited. We had not yet re-established the Chamber of Notables; but, happily or unhappily, in the case of Egypt, the Birmingham programme with regard to Ireland seemed to be in full force, for they had made some small village councils there.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is not speaking to the Amendment. He is not entitled to make those constant references to Ireland on the Amendment now before the House.

Mr. CHANCE said, he was only doing so by way of illustration; but he would drop that line of observation in obedience to the ruling of the Chair. He wanted to know what advantage the British taxpayer was receiving in return for his money? Already we had an Estimate of £31,000,000 for the Army and Navy. But the cessation of our interference with Egypt would in a very short time lead to a reduction of the Budget, and of the taxes which the British taxpayer had to pay.

Mr. C. DALRYMPLE (Ipswich): The strangest charge that could have been brought against the statement of the Government earlier in debate was made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for South Kilkenny (Mr. Chance) just now.

Notice taken that 40 Members were not present. House counted; and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. C. DALRYMPLE said: The charge the hon. Member for South Kilkenny brought against the statement made on behalf of the Government was a strange one,—namely, that it was wanting in detail. Whatever else the statement may have contained, it certainly contained a great deal of detail; and the speech of the hon. Member for South Kilkenny was proof of that in itself, because it followed the speech of the Under Secretary of State (Sir James Fergusson) in details, until the abundance of the illustration in which he indulged was ruled out of Order, and brought his speech to a termination. The hon. Member complained of the statement on the part of the hon. Baronet the Member for the Evesham Division of Worcestershire (Sir Richard Temple), to the effect that improvements had occurred in the condition of Egypt. The hon. Member denied the existence of improvements there; but the hon. Baronet was able to say that he had travelled in Egypt; and he has this advantage over many Members of the House, that he has the widest possible acquaintance with Oriental customs, and is able, by general knowledge, to testify that Mahommedan nations, throughout the world, regard with great favour the manner in which this House has upheld the authority of the Sultan and the Khedive. The attacks made on the Government are inconsistent one with the other; therefore, it seems to me the probability is that the course followed by Her Majesty's Ministers is the right one. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark), who spoke early in the debate, was severe on our presence in Egypt, and upon all that we had done there. I took down his words. He said, "If you come away from Egypt now, things will go back again to where you found them"; and yet he is going to support an Amendment that suggests that we should come away at once. I should have thought that the statement he made was an argument for remaining in Egypt longer, and not for coming away. We had a strange speech from the hon. Gentleman the Member for Barrow-in-Furness (Mr. Caine). I take it that the hon. Member came down to the House for the purpose of speaking in favour of the Amendment; and he made his speech, it seems to me, not because, but in spite, of the statement of the Government. The hon. Gentleman has travelled in Egypt, and he has found—what I am not aware that anyone has denied—that there are evils existing there. All that is contended is that progress is being made in the direction of the removal of the evils. The hon. Member condemned the Government of Egypt, and it seemed to me that he proved too much. Would he, as well as the hon. Member for Caithness, say what Government should be left in Egypt if we go away? If he takes such a very low view of the Government of the country, surely that is a reason why we should continue there. We should remain until a better Government is established. Taking it at his own estimate of its merits, it seems to me that the hon. Member has supplied us with an argument for remaining there, rather than for coming away. Has anyone said that our work in Egypt is done? No one has said so. The Speech from the Throne distinctly says that our work is not yet accomplished. The best argument of all for our remaining there is that we propose to finish our work before we come away. Then, the hon. Member was very severe on the condition of Revenue, but all that can be said about that is that there is improvement taking place, and figures were quoted to prove that such is the case. The hon. Member is severe on the *octroi*. But who has ever said that there are not abuses connected with these matters? It appears to me that one of the results of our continuing in Egypt at present will be that these evils will be remedied. And the hon. Member, still speaking as if no statement had been made on behalf of the Government, referred in tones of the greatest contempt to the scum of the Levant. But an expression of opinion has already been given on behalf of the Government with regard to this matter. The Under Secretary of State has condemned the immunity from trial under Egyptian laws which this scum of the Levant possesses. The Capitulations were strongly condemned. Then, again, the hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness recommends that Revenue should be derived from the liquor shops in the future; but says that the Capitulations stand in the way of that arrangement. The Government have asserted that the Capitulations are at the root of many of the evils which exist; and there, again, they are in agreement with the hon. Member who is about to support the Amendment. Lastly, the hon. Member argued in favour of the Government having a free hand in Egypt; which is exactly what the right hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs hinted would be of great importance if we were to deal more successfully with Egypt in the future than we have done in the past. But, surely, even the hon. Member, though he has made his speech, and, as I understand, is going to support the Amendment, is for all that of opinion that progress has been made to some extent. I gathered that from his speech, and therefore it seems to me that the course he proposes to take is directly inconsistent with the opinion he has expressed. Let me say one word with regard to an expression which occurs in the Amendment moved by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer), as to the great majority of taxpayers of this country having "no direct interest in the Government or affairs of Egypt." I think that that is one of the most mischievous and misleading suggestions which could possibly be made. I think it was perhaps the most mischievous statement made in recent years, and there have been a great many mischievous statements made latterly—that it is not desirable for the people of this country to take interest in foreign affairs. The House would remember where the illustration was used that, as Pericles said of women, "The less they are heard of the better," so, it was said, the less this country heard of foreign affairs the better. That view has been at the root of the mischief that has occurred in many parts of the world; and, to my mind, it is the reverse of a wise teaching to suggest to the people of this country that they should not concern themselves about foreign affairs. I do believe that considerable progress has been made in Egypt, and I am convinced that one great cause why there has not been even greater progress, has been the constant reference which has been made in former years to our intention of coming away from that country as speedily as possible. I believe that if such statements had never been indulged in—I believe that if it had never been dangled before the eyes of Egypt and of the world that we were always on the point of leaving—much greater progress would have been made. Language of that kind, I contend, was calculated to undo all the good being done. It was calculated to encourage intrigue, the mists of which, we are told to-night, are continually rising in Egypt; and was calculated to paralyze the efforts this country was called upon to engage in. I believe the statement made in the Gracious Speech from the Throne describes with essential accuracy the real position—that we have not yet accomplished our task in Egypt, but that a substantial advance has been made. That statement is vindicated by the facts that have been laid before the House. Those facts are not small or unimportant in view of the great difficulties that we have had to encounter in Egypt—difficulties which will not be lessened, but will be greatly increased if the Amendment that is being moved finds acceptance in this House.

Mr. PAULTON (Durham, Bishop Auckland): I beg very respectfully to ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes, and I venture, Sir, to do so on two grounds—in the first place, because I have not yet trespassed upon its time or patience; and, secondly, because I do not desire or intend to prolong, as far as I am concerned, this debate by speaking for more than a very few moments. I wish, Sir, to explain, very briefly, my reasons for the vote which I intend to give on this Amendment. Although I intend to vote against the Amendment, still I feel great sympathy with the hon. Member who has moved it, and I hope and believe that the course he has taken will have a very good effect in drawing the attention of the Government to the highly important questions of policy involved in the Amendment—not that I think that the Government is not fully aware or cognizant of the importance of the subject; but because I think it very desirable that upon the attention of the Government should be impressed the fact that the people of this country do hold a strong opinion upon the question of our position with regard to Egypt. Sir, I should be very much inclined to vote for the Amendment to-night, were it not for the word "immediate" introduced into it. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Barrow-in-Furness (Mr. Caine) said we could not criticise too closely the wording of a Motion of this kind; but it appears to me that on this occasion the wording of the Amendment has a great deal to do with the opinion which we must form in giving our vote upon it. It does appear to me that the word "immediate" is of great importance on this occasion, and whilst I am strongly in favour of an evacuation of Egypt at the earliest possible moment, I do feel that before that evacuation can be carried out something must be done. I confess I am a great deal disappointed that nothing fell from the Government to-night whilst I was in the House in confirmation or support of what we have heard, and what we have seen in the newspapers, as to the withdrawal of our troops from Egypt. I have been led to believe—I did believe, and I do still believe, and I think it possible it was only through an oversight on the part of the right hon. Baronet the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs that he did not refer to the fact—that troops have already been brought to England, and that a further withdrawal is in progress. I think it was a pity that the right hon. Baronet did not impress that fact upon the House, because I think that to Members on this side it is a matter for great congratulation that a distinct step in advance has been taken

—a step we were not able to obtain even from the Government that preceded right hon. Gentlemen opposite, which was a Government with which we were in much greater sympathy than we are with the present Government. I do very humbly and respectfully offer my congratulations to Gentlemen on the other side of the House on the Government—which I may describe, without wishing to speak in any way offensively, as composed of stiff-necked Tories and weak-kneed Whigs—being the first Government to approach in any way the policy which we desire to see carried out in Egypt. Sir, I say I am very strongly in favour of the evacuation of Egypt; but there is something that must be done before we can carry out that evacuation. When an Oriental civilization is destroyed, it is almost, if not quite, impossible to restore it; and it seems to me that as we destroyed the civilization, such as it was, that existed in Egypt before we went there, upon us is imposed the duty of establishing some form of Government which will succeed, and be an efficient substitute for, that which we abolished. Sir, I rejoice to hear that, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, there is much improvement in the material and social condition of Egypt. The hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness (Mr. Caine) did something, I think, to destroy that optimistic view—perhaps not to destroy it, but to qualify it; and I confess that his remarks were, to a great extent, in accordance with my own small experience. When I was in Egypt I was not able to learn that our influence there was doing any very great good. I fully admit and fully recognize the fact that our Representatives, and the men holding important positions in Egypt, are men of great ability, and are doing the best according to their lights. But, Sir, it appeared to me, as an outsider, that these efforts were neutralized by the fact that, whilst all responsibility appeared to be thrown on the Khedive and his Government, we—that is to say, the English Government as represented in Cairo—did not allow them any real power or voice in the Government of the country. It may be—I believe it is—the fact that matters have improved very much since then. I think there has been a distinct improvement within the last two or three years. There has been an improvement, so far as I can judge; but I confess that I incline much more to the view of benefits which our rule is conferring on Egypt, which has been expressed by the hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness, rather than that expressed on behalf of Her Majesty's Government. Sir, I think it is very possible—I think it more than possible, I think it is extremely likely—that, if we had time, we could establish a good, stable, and, in every way a satisfactory Government in Egypt; but it appears to me that it would be too long a process to effect that. I hope we shall be able to evacuate the country in a shorter time than would be necessary to bring about such a state of things as that. We must establish, at any rate, a stable form of Government before we can leave, having destroyed the Government which existed there; and I therefore do not think that our own unaided efforts will enable us soon to leave the country with a satisfactory result. We have endeavoured, during the last five or six years, to work single-handed in competing against the influences around us in Egypt, without seeking—nay, without permitting—any assistance to be rendered to us by other Powers. I cannot help thinking, Sir, that this should be, not an English nor an Anglo-French question, but that it should be an European question. It does seem to me that it is the duty of Europe as well as of England to make satisfactory provision for the government of Egypt. I very much regret that there has been so long a delay in the reply of the English Government to the Commission which sat in Paris on the Suez Canal some time ago. I have not looked up the Report of the Commission; but, so far as I remember, the two grounds on which the English Representatives could not agree to the Report were, first, that the Representative of the Porte was to be President of the Commission; and, secondly, that a special Commission was to be instituted to deal with Egyptian affairs. The English Representatives considered that the European supervision then existing in Cairo was not only a sufficient, but a better means of considering those questions. I do not wish to detain the House by going into details; but this is a most interesting subject for examination, and I do believe that the points on which this Government could not give their consent, or adhere to the recommendations of the other Powers, were susceptible of modification, and were open to argument. I have said, Sir, that I do not think that this question should be an English nor an Anglo-French one. I think that here has been the mischief at the bottom of all our troubles in Egypt. The main cause, it appears to me, of these troubles lay in the Dual Control that was established. This question has been made far too much a duel between England and France; but I feel very strongly that it ought to be—first of all—an European, and, secondly, an Egyptian question. In the first place, why did we ever go to Egypt; and, in the second place, having gone there, why did we remain? I think the answer will be that it was on account of the importance to us of the Suez Canal. I do not deny the importance of the Suez Canal to us, but I venture to think that, in proportion to their commerce, the Suez Canal is as important to other nations as it is to this country; and that its neutral character, in time of peace, it is to the interest of every other nation, as well as to our own interest, to preserve. But in time of war, if, unhappily, the time should ever come when we are embarked in war—and I pray God it may not—our great object, it seems to me, would be to prevent hostile vessels of other nations either from passing through the Canal, or taking possession of it; and I am not at all sure that the best means we could adopt for effecting that would not be to take some of those obsolete ironclads which the noble and gallant Lord the Member for Marylebone (Lord Charles Beresford) is so anxious to relieve our Navy of, and sink them in the Canal. That would probably be a very effective method of overcoming the difficulty; and I am not at all sure that the noble and gallant Lord to whom I have referred would not agree that that is a course very likely to be adopted by the English Government, under such unfortunate circumstances. Well, I do not think that our interest in the Suez Canal is sufficient ground for rendering our intervention in Egypt continuous. The second ground on which I oppose this Amendment is, that it is an Egyptian, as well as an European affair—that we cannot leave Egypt defenceless. It may be matter for dispute whether or not our rule has been beneficial to Egypt; but of this I feel quite sure—there cannot be two opinions about it—that the substitution of French rule for English rule would only land the Egyptian out of the frying-pan into the fire. If our rule is bad for Egypt, I am convinced that that of France would be worse. We cannot blind our eyes to the fact that even with all her present complications and difficulties, it is not at all impossible that France might desire to step into Egypt, should we leave it. Sir, there is another danger to Egypt—namely, the danger of an Arab invasion. I really think, especially after the remarks that fell from the hon. and gallant Member for Holborn (Colonel Duncan), in that able and manly speech, if I may say so, that he delivered, that the Egyptian Army is now approaching a condition in which it can be relied on to provide for the defence of the country. The Egyptian Army has improved in a most rapid and remarkable manner, and the result is almost entirely due, I think, to the efforts of General Grenfell and those able men who have assisted him in doing the work to which he has devoted so much time and energy. One of the most painful and grievous sights I ever witnessed in my life was the shipping of the reinforcements from the Egyptian Army to the Soudan. I shall never forget the painful and horrible thing it was to see the panic-stricken, terrified mass of men and boys driven at the point of the sword, and with revolvers at their heads, into the trains and into the vessels, to be shipped off to the Soudan. I asked myself, "Is it possible that these men can ever make soldiers?" Two short weeks afterwards—I remember the day well: it was this day three years ago—these unfortunate people who were permitted by Her Majesty's Government—and I think it was to the shame of the Government that they were so permitted—to go with General Baker to the relief of Tokar, were massacred almost to the last individual by the Arabs on the field of battle. A more appalling and horrible sight than that field presented cannot be imagined. It will never fade from my memory. Sir, I cannot help feeling that an enormous amount of credit is due to the men who have raised up such a Force as the present Egyptian Army from such material as this. I believe that an Egyptian Army, officered by Englishmen, would be quite sufficient to repel any attack from Lower Egypt by the Arabs; and, moreover, the information I received the other day from the Government as to our opening up the trade of the Nile, will go much further to restore order and settle the Government in the Soudan than any of those miserable expeditions which Her Majesty's Government engaged in some two or three years ago. Then, there is one other point upon which I desire to say a word, and I refer to it with great diffidence; because, on the part of the Government, we heard to-night that there is no feeling against us in Europe on account of our Egyptian policy. I wish I could honestly believe that there is no ill-feeling towards us on account of that policy. I think all the information we are able to gather in a private capacity is to the contrary. I cannot help feeling that there is no subject with regard to which our good name has so much suffered in Europe, as it has in reference to this question of Egypt. There is, undoubtedly, a strong feeling against us in France. I say it with all submission to the words which have fallen from the Treasury Bench to-night. I should only be too glad if I could think that those words were an accurate statement of the case; but everyone who reads the foreign newspapers—even the Paris newspapers, which are no great indication of the real feeling of the country—anyone who endeavours to follow the political opinion of Europe, must come to the conclusion that there is a strong feeling in France on this Egyptian Question. The Paris Press does not scruple to accuse us of unworthy motives; and, moreover, it appears to me there is a feeling amongst others of the Great Powers that we are not acting quite straightforwardly—that is, that we say one thing and do another; or, at any rate, that we do not act up to our professions. Anything which in any way can tarnish our good faith in Europe is unworthy of our policy; and I do most earnestly hope that if this debate has no other result, it will have the effect of inducing Her Majesty's Government to do all in their power not only, as I believe they are now doing, to improve the material condition and prosperity of Egypt, but also to endeavour to settle the question by bringing the other Governments of Europe into participation in the responsibility and difficulties that surround it. I thank the House for the patience and attention with which it has listened to my remarks.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester): I am unable to join issue with the last Speaker in any of his observations from the fact that he has told us he is perfectly in accord with hon. Gentlemen on the Government side of the House, inasmuch as he intends to vote against the Amendment. The hon. Member's view is in sympathy with ours as to the word "immediate;" for, if that word had been eliminated the Mover of the Amendment would have received more support than I fear he will have. I think, if I may be allowed to say so, the House must have been very much struck by the admirable speech which fell from the hon. and gallant Member for Holborn (Colonel Duncan). The views he gave us could not fail to commend themselves to, and have great weight with, the deliberations and councils of this House. The scheme that he unfolded was an excellent one—that of having 2,000 men on the northern and 2,000 men on the southern point of the railway system, Cairo being the seat of the Egyptian Government. But it appears to me that hon. Gentlemen on the opposite Benches have lost sight of the fact that, although Egypt may be in their opinion but a secondary consideration in the Councils of this Realm, that country still forms a link, and a very important link, in that great political chain which, if I may use the metaphor, secures the British vessel of the State. In proposing suddenly and peremptorily to evacuate Egypt; in proposing to denude her at once of British troops, to deprive her of British protection, to abandon her entirely to probable internal dissensions, and possibly to anarchy and revolution; hon. Members are advocating a policy which may leave our interests in Egypt—which are of no small magnitude—at the mercy of Continental complications and Egyptian entanglements. Indeed, it seems to me that this would be the inevitable result of our leaving the country suddenly to its own internal Government. To hold his own in these troubled waters, the Captain who manages the British vessel of the State has to consider his position, and consider it very carefully in all its bearings. The contention of hon. Gentlemen opposite appears to me to be that we have no business in Egypt at this time, that we have no greater interest in the Suez Canal or in Egypt than other Continental Powers. It is easy to talk glibly—as I am afraid hon. Members do talk—of suddenly evacuating Egypt and of abandoning her by the withdrawal of all our troops, as though we possess no interests, national or international, in that country—as though India were at this moment in the hands of Russia, and not a Possession of our own, and as though we had no interests to protect or defend eastward of the Island of Malta. A great many Members—I cannot say all, because the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cumberland (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) admitted the truth—ignore the fact that it was not the Tory Party that originated this great trouble in Egypt. It was not the Tory Party that originated the war of 1882, which commenced with the bombardment of Alexandria. But, Sir, that bombardment of Alexandria had this effect—it pledged not only the Government of the day, but successive Governments, to a policy in Egypt which they cannot relinquish until they have obtained the objects for which we entered the country. That war was not the fault of the Tory Party, but was the product of the vacillation of the Cabinet presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). The Tory Party, however, having accepted the legacy left by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, are bound, as the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs very rightly pointed out this evening, to fulfil all the obligations, engagements, and responsibilities that were tied up in the covenant thus handed over to them. Sir, those obligations, engagements and responsibilities have not yet been fulfilled. Assuming for a moment that in order to carry out the view of the Mover of the Amendment announced in the House to-night, we withdraw our troops to-morrow from Egypt and finally evacuate the country; do hon. Gentlemen suppose for one moment that order and good government would spring up there in a night like a mushroom? It is impossible for us to quit that country until, what the hon. and gallant Member for Holborn (Colonel Duncan) very rightly suggested as necessary—a reliable Government is established on a firm and secure basis, and is seen to flourish there. At this moment such a Government does not flourish there. But, following out the idea of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, I do not think that Her Majesty's Government will throw any impediment in the way of that course being carried out. One other consideration is this, that if we evacuated the country very suddenly—for I know the country well—I do not hesitate to say that a very short time would elapse, after our peremptory withdrawal of troops, before a revolution would break out. Unfortunately, the present Ruler of Egypt is not a man of very strong or courageous character. There are a great many people who will go so far as to say that he is not altogether to be trusted. Certainly it is an open question that he is not held in very great respect or regard by his own people who, I believe, if they were asked the question would say they would infinitely prefer the return of their old Ruler Ismail to the present Khedive. Why is it that the people have no great regard or respect for the present reigning Prince? It is because Her Majesty's Government, through a misplaced humanitarianism, elected to try Arabi Pasha not by Egyptian law, and according to Egyptian customs, but under those of an alien European Power, depriving Tewfik of the Royal prerogative of mercy. I am afraid the latter owes his unfortunate position to that spirit of humanitarianism which sometimes sways the councils of Government and leads them into Quixotic actions. Looking into Egyptian History for the last few years, we see that all this trouble has arisen from the fact that the action of the Government presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), was in direct contradiction all the time to Ministerial declarations, instructions, and promises. But, Sir, having, as I said just now, accepted the covenant and legacy that has been handed down to us, Her Majesty's Government is obliged to make the best of it. At the same time we have now staring us in the face very heavy interests in Egypt, associated, in particular, with that great highway the Suez Canal. The hon. Baronet the Member for Cumberland (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) would not accept that argument; but I repeat it, because I know it is right. Her Majesty's Government must bear in mind that so far as they are concerned great responsibilities and interests are involved in this question of the security of the Suez Canal—interests which may at any time be affected and even imperilled. Therefore I cannot but think that until Her Majesty's Government can satisfy themselves that on the evacuation of Egypt, on the embarkation of the last British soldier from the pier at Alexandria, they can feel confident that a firm, stable, and reliable National Government has been established — and established permanently—they cannot, in my opinion, speaking as a humble Member of this House, be content to leave Egypt as its protecting Power, and to watch in future the course of events in that country from the congenial shores of Great Britain rather than from the muddy banks of the Nile.

MR. W. REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.): It is idle to talk, as has been done, of our disinterestedness in Egypt, which has been demoralized, as any country would be demoralized, by the presence in it of foreign troops for four years. The only thing we want is the establishment of a Government which shall be the tool of this country. The English have hunted Arabi and his half-drilled troops, and after dubbing Arabi a rebel they have sent him out of the country. I do not know whether England desires to kindle a war between France and Germany, so that she may annex Egypt, but I feel bound to say it looks very like it. If so, it is a bloodthirsty policy, and the people of Europe regard English conduct in Egypt with the greatest jealousy and indignation. At first, it was thought the occupation would be of only a temporary character; but now it has lasted for five years, at an enormous expense to this country and Ireland. England has slaughtered the Egyptians wantonly; for they have done nothing against the British Empire; they have offered no insult to the flag. This slaughter has taken place merely to gratify a wish to extend the already over-bloated British Empire. The extension of that Empire has been made through merciless shedding of blood and the laying waste of other lands. It was so in India, in Africa, and New Zealand. Everywhere slaughter has preceded annexation, and it looks as if the slaughter in Egypt is to be the forerunner of annexation. The Irish people view the proceedings in Egypt with the deepest abhorrence and disgust; and the originator of all this is the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen). The tree he planted has borne suitable fruit. If he were so fortunate as to secure a seat—

MR. SPEAKER: "Order, order." The hon. Member is not speaking to the Amendment before the House.

MR. W. REDMOND: I was about to mention the connection of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with the affair.

MR. SPEAKER: I must caution the hon. Member not to pursue that line of remark.

Mr. W. REDMOND: I should be very glad to be allowed to explain what I was saying as to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already cautioned the hon. Gentleman.

MR. W. REDMOND: Well, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully maintain that the origin of the Egyptian difficulty is to be traced to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I regret very much he is not in the House. Mr. Goschen went to Egypt to float a loan. It is not my intention to impute motives—no doubt, the motives of the right hon. Gentleman were of the most honourable description; but it is extremely unfortunate that the Egyptian difficulties date from the intervention of the right. hon. Gentleman. From that time to this there has been nothing but misery, war, and famine in Egypt. I happened to be in that country shortly after the bombardment of Alexandria; and I felt ashamed to see the Natives crouching at street corners, or flying into the back streets at the approach of a white man. I was utterly ashamed of the British ruffianism which I witnessed in the streets; and I am not surprised that the people looked on the flag of England with the same loathing with which it was regarded by the Irish people. Everywhere there was ruin, misery, and havoc, and over all floated the Union Jack of England, the symbol of liberty. I believe the time will come when, by a combination of the Powers, England would be compelled to leave Egypt.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): I must apologize for taking part in this debate, because the subject of it does not directly concern the part of the Empire to which I belong, and because I have already addressed the House. But as the wisdom of the House has decided—I believe for ever—that Ireland is to remain an integral portion of the United Kingdom; all that concerns the best interests and the welfare of the Empire to which I belong is, I think, deserving of the careful attention and consideration of Irish Members. The hon. Member who has just sat down spoke as an Irish Member, and he appears to have one remedy, and one alone, for the ills of all the nations. The hon. Member suffers from Home Rule on the brain. The hon. Member seems to think that on one occasion he ran the risk of a very great calamity, of which, however, there really was no danger; and it is that he was afraid, when at Alexandria on one occasion, that he might have been mistaken for an Englishman.

MR. W. REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.): I wish to correct the hon. and gallant Member if he will allow me. That misfortune has not yet befallen me.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I think the House will support me when I say that the Party to which the hon. Gentleman belongs is a Party whose deepest aspiration is the downfall of the Empire. [No!] The hon. Member regards our position in Egypt as a manifestation of the abominable character of British rule; and he is of opinion that if our rule were withdrawn from other parts of the world, those countries would be peaceful and contented. If that does not show hostility to the Empire, I do not know what an enemy is. And now let me say a word or two about the Amendment. The Amendment before the House is very carefully drawn. It covers a very large amount of ground, and I imagine that hon. Members opposite, when they go back to their constituents, will point out that the battle fought in the House to-night was a battle engaged in by them in order, if possible, to show to the country that the Conservative Party, in reality, desire to embark in a dangerous, an adventurous, and a meddling foreign policy. The Amendment represents to Her Majesty that—

> "The expenses of the prolonged occupation of Egypt by a British Force have to be borne by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, the great majority of whom have no direct interest in the government or affairs of Egypt, and that the retention of our troops in Egypt is a cause of suspicion and irritation to Continental Governments, and calculated to weaken the influence of the country in the Councils of Europe,"

and prays Her Majesty "to take immediate steps for recalling the whole of her Forces from Egypt." Now, Sir, I believe that I am speaking the sentiment of the whole of the Conservative Party when I say that they are opposed to anything like an adventurous foreign policy; and that they believe the worst course the Government could pursue would be to meddle with those unfortunate foreign complications that have arisen—and are likely to arise—from time to time in Europe. One of the greatest benefits which Prince Bismarck has conferred on diplomacy is that he has stripped it of that reserve, and of those circuitous methods which have hitherto been adopted by diplomatists in all countries. Now, recognizing as I do the present critical condition of Europe, when there is, as it were, a smell of gunpowder in the air—and I am fully conscious of it—I will not say a word that can help to create irritation abroad; but I believe that the way to keep out of and to avoid complications which might lead us into trouble and disastrous wars, is for us to speak our mind so clearly as to what the policy of England will be, that there can be no mistake in any country as to what we intend to do in certain contingencies. I believe the foreign policy of England is naturally, and ought to be the most simple foreign policy of any great nation in the world. We have a line that we mean to stand by—a line starting from England, and passing on by Gibraltar, Malta, Egypt and Aden to India; and our Government and our Diplomatists should be judged by the clearness and closeness with which they stick to that line, with which the vital interests of our widely-scattered Empire are bound up. If the Government go beyond that line, I believe the verdict of the country will be against them. This debate has, to a considerable degree, run off into side issues. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment asks why we went to Egypt, and why we should stay there? These are no doubt two questions that interest the country very greatly, and I think it would be as well that we should be perfectly candid and straightforward in regard to them. I speak as an outsider, but I venture to say that the opinion of the outside public in this country has long been made up on these three points—as to why we went to Egypt, why we remain there, and how long we intend to stay there. The Mover of the Amendment apparently imagines that we went to Egypt to bolster up the bondholders. Why, Sir, the British public might just as soon go to war for the Irish landlords as for the Egyptian bondholders. It would be just as philanthropic to devote the blood and treasure of the Empire to one as to the other. The British people know that we went to Egypt because Egypt is a link in the chain which binds this country to India. It has been remarked that the Suez Canal could very easily be stopped up and closed, and a speech of the noble and gallant Lord the Member for Marylebone (Lord Charles Beresford), in which he said that he could himself close the Canal in a very short time, has been cited. But that is not the point. If in time of war the noble and gallant Lord held one end of the Suez Canal and an equally clever officer held the other, it would be very difficult for any other Power to get control of the Canal, or to close it. I fully realize the fact that the Suez Canal is a link in the chain which binds us to India. I do not think the French have any right to complain of our action, because before we embarked on the Egyptian Expedition our Government invited France to join them; but M. Gambetta and M. de Freycinet answered that the French people were not inclined to take part in the operations. Therefore the French cannot throw in our teeth that we prevented them from participating in the work of restoring order in Egypt. We invited them, and they refused to cooperate with us. We went alone, and we have spent millions of money and shed a large amount of blood—I am afraid much innocent blood, too. I am not defending our policy in Egypt; but I say that we have made great sacrifices, and that those sacrifices have been willingly assented to by the English people, for objects which were thought to be vital to the best interests of the Empire. And why are we staying there? We are doing so because, up to the present moment, the Government of Egypt has not been stable enough to remain unassisted and alone. I believe that the moment the Egyptians can do without our assistance, or the assistance of other nations, we should abandon Egypt; but that can be left in the hands of whatever British Government may be in Office at the time. What we wish other nations to clearly understand is that, although we do not desire to annex Egypt, yet we will not suffer any other nation, as long as we have a ship or a sailor, to step into our Egyptian shoes. There is one remark which was made by my right hon. Friend who spoke on behalf of the Government to which I feel bound to demur. It has been said that we went to Egypt to maintain the integrity of the Turkish Empire. Sir, I believe that the English people will not re-echo that sentiment. I have been a good deal in Egypt, and I have mixed with its people, and I believe it is impossible to mix with the Fellaheen and the Egyptian people without being struck by their many good qualities. Their patience, their temper, and their industry always attract Europeans. But they have been ruled with tyranny. What has been the curse of Egypt? It is that they have been ruled by the Turks; and I do not think that the British people would ever have spent a shilling, or shed a drop of the meanest blood of an Englishman, if they had thought for a moment that it was to bolster up the authority of Turkish rule in that country. The English Government did not feel keenly about the integrity of the Turkish Empire in putting their hand upon Cyprus. Our whole action in this matter, I believe, had been influenced distinctly by the desire for self-preservation on the part of the British Empire. It is quite evident that we did not feel very much about the integrity either of Turkey or Egypt when we did what I have said with regard to Cyprus. Our only desire was to secure the preservation of our Indian Empire. We took Cyprus because we believed it to be on that line which we mean to maintain. We went to Egypt because we thought that it was a link in the chain which we mean to maintain, and which we must maintain. We intend to remain there until we have made that link secure; and if the day comes, as I believe it may, when we shall be able to establish in Egypt a stable Government and retire from the country, then, looking at the enormous improvement that has taken place, looking at the absence of gross and abominable Turkish oppression which has existed, and at the progressive development of the resources of the country, I believe that we shall in the end be able to say that our blood and our treasure have not been spent in vain.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham) said, he was not disposed to find fault with the hon. Member for the Haggerston Division of Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) for bringing foward this Amendment. There had been a considerable amount of irritation and impatience at the prolonged occupation of Egypt, and if such impatience existed out-of-doors it was only right and natural that it should find vent in the House. Whatever might be the value to themselves of such debates as they had that night, he did not think that it was by any means so certain that debates upon subjects of foreign policy strengthened the position of the British Government abroad. That was, however, the price which we had to pay for discussing questions of this kind in a popular Assembly. If Egypt was ever to be brought into such a condition that it could safely and honourably be evacuated by the British Government, it could only be by a steady and continuous line of policy. Any interruption of that steady and continuous line of policy was certain to postpone the day on which the evacuation of Egypt could take place; and if the effect of the debate which had taken place that evening, and the Division which he supposed would ensue, should be to lead either Foreign Governments or the Egyptian people to suppose that the British Government had any idea of abandoning the task it had undertaken, or that having put its hand to the plough it was disposed to look back, he was sure that the effect of the debate and the Division would be to defeat the very object which the hon. Gentleman the Mover of the Amendment had in view. Upon one point they were all agreed. The late Government, the present Government, and those hon. Members below the Gangway opposite who had moved and supported this Amendment, were all agreed as to the wisdom of evacuating Egypt as soon as they possibly could do so. The reasons for the determination of the Government to effect that at the earliest possible moment was not any pressure which was now put upon us by Foreign Governments. The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) stated, at an earlier period of the debate, that the Government were not aware that any pressure was being exerted at present by any of those Governments who were parties to the Convention of 1885. No doubt, there was agitation in certain foreign countries on the subject of the British occupation of Egypt; but the sayings and writings of agitators abroad were not yet sufficiently powerful to influence the conduct of a British Government. While our occupation of Egypt was assented to by those Powers who were parties to the Convention of 1885, we could very well afford to disregard the attacks made upon us by foreign newspapers and agitators. The real difference of opinion between the hon. Members who moved and supported the Amendment and the present Government—he was, probably, right in adding the late Government—was that while they desired to limit the occupation of Egypt by a period of time—whether it be one month or six months—the view of the Government was that it must be limited, not by any particular period of time, but by the fulfilment of the objects to which the occupation of Egypt had been directed. To put a period of time to the occupation was the way to prevent the fulfilment of that object. On one occasion, several years ago, the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), on the part of the then Government, was incautious enough to state that it was hoped Egypt would be evacuated in six months; and it was owing probably to that statement, in no small degree, that Egypt was not evacuated yet. He (Sir John Gorst) felt sure that any attempt on the part of either the House of Commons or the Government, or any responsible Member of the Government, to declare that Egypt should be evacuated within any defined period of time would result in the defeat of the object for which that declaration had been made.

What was the object for which we were now in Egypt? He really must protest, on behalf of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), against the extremely hard measure which he had received from his supporter the hon. Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark). That hon. Member said that the late Government, presided over by the late Prime Minister (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), "went to Egypt for the purpose of putting down Parliamentary government." Now, he believed that he (Sir John Gorst) had made use of language very much like that; but that was at a time when he held an irresponsible position on the other side of the House, and when it was part of his duty to endeavour to draw the right hon. Gentleman. He would, however, have never thought of making use of such language towards the Leader of the Party to which he professed to belong—and now that he filled a responsible position he must protest against the Government of the day being supposed to have gone to Egypt, or to remain there for so unworthy an object as the suppression of Parliamentary government. The object for which they were in Egypt was admirably stated in the Speech from the Throne—"We are in Egypt, and we shall remain in Egypt until we can leave that country with an assurance of external and internal tranquillity." The moment the Government could leave that country with an assurance of this kind, he supposed it was the policy, both of the present and of the late Government, to withdraw. It was idle to say that no progress had been made there, although it might suit the purposes of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway, whose object was to heap obloquy upon the British Government, to assert so. He would remind the House of some of the advantages which had been conferred on the Egyptian people. First of all there was the entire abolition of the kourbash. Anyone who knew Oriental countries, and the way in which Oriental Governments were accustomed to collect their taxes, would recognize the immense and beneficial revolution which the abolition of the kourbash had been. Instead of the Fellaheen having their taxes extorted from them by torture, they now only paid what was legal, without being subjected to violence. If that reform stood alone as the one achievement of the British Government, he thought it was one of which they might be justly proud. Another reform had been accomplished under our auspices. The *corvée*—or forced labour—had been almost wholly abolished; it would have been entirely abolished if it had not been for a little accident which happened in the course of the negotiations. Last year the *corvée* was partially abolished, and this year there would have been £250,000 applied for the almost total abolition of the *corvée* in the present year. It was not true to say that this proposal had been opposed by the French Government, but differences of opinion as to the details of the scheme had arisen. Then there was the administration of justice. The hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness (Mr. Caine) most justly condemned the administration of justice by the Foreign Consuls; but what the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) had alluded to was the administration of criminal justice by the Native Arab tribunals. Before we went to Egypt the administration of criminal justice by the Arab tribunals was a mockery. He did not say that the administration of justice was perfect now; but he was justified in saying that the administration of Native justice by the Native tribunals was enormously improved. Besides that, we had succeeded in re-opening trade with the Soudan. The Suakin coast was now thrown open again to commerce, and it was very likely that in that way the whole country would be pacified, and peace and good order prevail. Immense improvement had been made in the military organization of the country; military service was not now unpopular with the Natives — who had proved themselves good soldiers at Wady Halfa — recruiting had improved, and the men composing the different corps were not only more happy and more contented, but made, he was told by military authorities, good soldiers. All these were substantial achievements, and to leave the country at the present moment would be to destroy all that had been done. They were carrying out the task which had been undertaken by Her Majesty's Government in Egypt and making substantial advance towards the assurance of "external and internal tranquillity." But it was said, "If everything is going on so well, why do you not leave the country?" The answer had been given by those who had spoken in favour of the Amendment. The hon. Member for Barrow had himself admitted that if we were to leave Egypt now all the good already accomplished would be thrown away, and that, one would have thought, was a sufficient answer to the Amendment. He should have thought, indeed, the hon. Member would have withdrawn it. It was not the case that the Egyptian people were opposed to the Government. The hon. Member for Barrow would himself admit that at the present time the Egyptian people acquiesced in the Government—which was the most that could be expected from an Oriental nation—and showed no strong desire for a change. But there were certain conditions which must be fulfilled before the Government could withdraw its forces if it was desired to avert an immediate revolution. What were the conditions under which a withdrawal might safely take place? First of all, there was the question of Finance; for any country which depended for its Revenue upon the price of agricultural produce could not be said to be entirely out of financial danger. The Egyptian Government had taken steps to get rid of the Daira and Domain lands; not only had they endeavoured to effect the sale of those lands, but they had attempted to get those Egyptians who were entitled to pensions—and the number was enormous—to take land in commutation of their pensions. A large extent of land would thus be disposed of in the course of the present year. The additions to the Egyptian Civil Service were now made in the most sparing manner; very few foreigners were appointed; in fact, like all other Governments, the Egyptian Government had embarked upon a career of economy, but it would take some years of economy before the reductions would tell upon the expenditure. Another reason why they could not withdraw from Egypt was the existence of the Capitulations. He would go so far as to say that he did not think it was possible for the wisest Government in the world to govern a country in which such things as these Capitulations existed. The hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness had given a good example of their mischievous effects. Every civilized Government levied much of its taxation upon alcoholic liquors. What could be a more monstrous thing than to have in your capital town persons representing 17 nationalities establishing liquor shops over which the Government of the country had no control, and could not even levy a tax? He remembered a remarkable illustration of this which occurred at the time the English Fleet was at Besika Bay. A number of Greeks came down and established liquor shops on the shore, and when the seamen went off on leave they were seduced into those liquor shops and made drunk. It appearing, after conference with the authorities, that the Turkish Government had no power to put a stop to this state of things, the Admiral took the law into his own hands, smashed up the shops, and spilled the liquor, with the result that the British Government had to pay compensation to the owners. The Government had been asked, What were they doing to get rid of the Capitulations which were the cause of all this mischief? He would answer the question by saying that if we evacuated Egypt we should never get rid of these Capitulations, and it would come sooner or later to a question of the surrender of the Capitulations as the price of the evacuation of Egypt. It was impossible to evacuate until a stable Government were established. If we were once out of Egypt, we might depend upon it we should have no lever by which to get the Capitulations abolished. There was another obstacle to our leaving Egypt, and that was the Joint Administrations. A great part of the administration of the country was not in the hands of the Egyptian Government at all, but under the joint administration of Englishmen and Frenchmen, who set themselves to thwart each other. The railways and the Daira and Domain lands were so managed, and while this system of joint administration was upheld, it was impossible for any Government, however able, to manage successfully the affairs of the country. He (Sir John Gorst) hoped that he had shown that substantial progress was being made towards the objects which had been stated in the Speech from the Throne with regard to Egypt, that it was impossible, at the present moment, to evacuate Egypt without sacrificing all the progress that had been made, and that there were certain conditions which must be fulfilled before any Native Government could be expected to undertake the administration of Egypt. In the first place, the finances must be put on a sound and permanent basis; in the second place, they must get rid, somehow, of the Capitulations; and, in the third place, they must get rid of the Joint Administrations. When the European Powers had been persuaded to give up these ridiculous Capitulations, and to put a stop to these absurd Joint Administrations, the time would, he (Sir John Gorst) thought, have come when Great Britain would seriously consider whether her mission was not accomplished; and, he thought, that no Government which might then be in Office would be so indifferent to the burdens thrown upon the taxpayers by the occupation of Egypt, as to wish to prolong the occupation for one moment longer than the honour and interests of our country demanded.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL (Kirkcaldy, E.): I cannot help thinking that our unfortunate occupation of Egypt has been the beginning of great evils all over the world. It has set the ball rolling; it has brought us into antagonism with France in the Eastern hemisphere, in Madagascar, and elsewhere. We have been told by the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that we are following a continuous policy, with a view of getting out of the country speedily. I think the right hon. Gentleman is altogether mistaken in expressing that opinion. I see no evidence of such a design, but just the contrary; and the speeches which we have heard from the Government simply amount to an elaborate argument why we should stay in Egypt. We are told, in fact, that when the Millennium comes, we may think of evacuating Egypt. When Lord Dufferin went to Egypt he did apply himself to the task of making the country self-governing, but now there is nothing being done in that direction. The work of Lord Dufferin has been set at naught, and Egypt is governed by a Sovereign who is a mere puppet in our hands. No step whatever is being taken to secure self-government, and by imposing foreign methods upon Egypt more and more, we are making it more impossible that we can leave it ourselves. From what I know of the Oriental character, after that method Egypt will never be able to perform the work of self-government. I have always believed that money has been the moving spirit of our going to Egypt, and money is now the moving spirit which is inducing us to stay there. We have always taken an optimist view of Egypt, but I know that Oriental people do not altogether agree in our modes of government. You may have put down brigandage, but in the first instance you created it. We have heard a great deal about the abolition of the kourbash, but I believe that there is less security for property and less peace in the country than were in existence before we went there. It was not until after your occupation and your attempt to govern Egypt in your own way that brigandage sprang up. You say that you have secured better Courts of Justice in the country, but have they been successful? Judge West was sent there, and made a very unfavourable Report, which has never been produced. The Under Secretary admits that heavy burdens are still imposed upon the Fellaheen, and we are told that this is because there are financial necessities. That means paying the bondholders. But why are we so anxious to maintain the credit of Egypt? We are not so anxious to maintain the credit of Turkey. Turkey repudiated its debts long ago. We are simply bribing foreign countries to assent to our occupation of Egypt by paying foreign bondholders. It is only on this account, and because the foreign bondholders are a strong power in France and on the Continent, that the power of France and other foreign Powers has not been brought to bear upon us in a more vigorous and active manner. I think that an attempt should be made to establish a Native Government like that of one of the Native States of India, and that we should make an arrangement with France that, if we go out, she will pledge herself not to take our place. So far as we are concerned, I am afraid that our connection with Egypt is the worst thing that could have happened. It would be far better to leave Egypt to herself.

Mr. DE LISLE (Leicestershire, Mid): Perhaps I may be allowed to say a few words in reference to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer). I am afraid that our present occupation of Egypt has given rise to much suspicion among some Continental nations, and so long as we remain there under the present conditions there will always be a certain amount of irritation in certain quarters on the Continent. It would, therefore, be better that we should boldly, wisely, and courageously declare that we are in Egypt because it was a political necessity to go there, and that we intend to stay there. If I believed that by remaining in Egypt for a few years we could succeed in establishing a strong and independent Native Government, it might be our policy merely to stay there, and I would earnestly desire to assist in the work. But having lived in the East for some short time, I believe that that is an impossible task. Any man who has had any experience of the dark races—and I have had some short experience of them both from Asia and Africa—must know that they are incapable of self-government. Consequently, to go on protesting, as Her Majesty's Government does, that we are about to leave Egypt, is misleading to our friends, and only tantalizing to our enemies. I am afraid that, unhappily, Europe is on the verge of a great war, and anything we could do to divide the war interests on the Continent, by a friendly alliance with Austria, Germany, and Italy, would have a tendency to insure the preservation of peace. This would place a great peace barrier down the centre of Europe. If we tell Italy, Austria, and Germany that we intend to remain in Egypt, they will be our friends, because it is to their interest that we should do so; but our protestations that we are going to leave Egypt in no way tend to diminish the irritation of France and Russia, while they will undoubtedly increase our difficulties. If I believed England would ever, under any possible circumstances, grant Home Rule to Ireland, I would say "Do so at once," for we should remember the old proverb—"*Bis dat, qui cito dat.*" And it is because I believe Home Rule never will and never can be granted that I now oppose it. But anyone who takes into consideration the character of the Egyptian people and the circumstances of that country must be aware that they are a people who are not fit for self-government. Therefore, I think it would be wise on the part of Her Majesty's Government to declare that we intend to remain in Egypt, and to take upon ourselves the responsibility of governing the country and securing the welfare of the people, because necessity compels us, and because it is not conceivable how future events can alter present necessities so long as our Empire lasts.

Mr. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I do not think that any part of the House has any right to complain of the hon. Member for the Haggerston Division of Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) for having brought forward his Amendment and raised this discussion. Everyone must admit that he stated his case with great fairness, and considering the strength of his opinions, with great temperance. The only part of the speeches which have been delivered in support of the Amendment to which I demur, is the history which has been given of our occupation of Egypt, and its application to the facts of the case. Much of that history has been very far from correct. I must also observe that the fact that Mr. Goschen has now taken his place in the present Ministry, as an adversary of the Party to which I belong, cannot prevent me from expressing my regret that the hon. Member for Cockermouth (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), and one or two other Members should have thought fit, in the absence of the right hon. Gentleman, to renew charges against him which he, in a previous Parliament, refuted to the complete satisfaction of the House. My hon. and learned Friend the Under Secretary for India has said that such a discussion as this ought not to be raised in the House, because it is embarrassing to the Government. But, having regard to the increasing interest and disquietude that exist, in regard to the occupation of Egypt, it is only right that the opinion of the House of Commons should be expressed. In times past we have suffered too much from the House of Commons not expressing the mind of the people on matters such as this. Many of our mistakes in Eastern policy might have been avoided if the opinion of the people had been more unmistakably expressed in the House of

Commons. Therefore, I find myself in considerable agreement with the hon. Member who has proposed this Amendment in regard to the interests of England in this matter. We gain no profit from our presence in Egypt. We have made the most solemn promises not to continue our occupation. It puts us to considerable expense, even when a financial equilibrium exists; and there is no denying the fact that, although we occupy a perfectly good position, both legally and morally, so far as the other Powers of Europe are concerned, it makes our position in the Councils of Europe less easy and manageable than it otherwise would be. Egypt has been to us what Homer called it 30 centuries ago, bitter Egypt. It has been a very bitter possession, and, as far as our interests are concerned, I admit that the sooner we are out of it the better. But, turning to the words of the Amendment, I find we are asked to assert, upon rather doubtful and disputable grounds, a proposition which is both general and immediate—that we ought to withdraw forthwith. The hon. Member has, no doubt, explained this by saying that he does not desire that a telegram should be sent off, ordering the evacuation of Egypt in 48 hours; but that we ought to fix a date, and an approximate date, such as three or six months, or the end of the present year, when we should withdraw our troops.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I think I said the end of the present year.

MR. BRYCE: But I do not see, and the hon. Member has not explained, how it is possible to pull up thus suddenly our tent-poles and depart. Now, what is our position in Egypt? We are not in Egypt for our own benefit. We are not there because we have anything to gain. We have, in fact, nothing to gain. We are not there for the sake of the Suez Canal. In the speeches of the two Under Secretaries in the present debate, I am glad to notice that there was not a word about the Suez Canal. I was sorry to hear the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs revert to the old phrases about the integrity of the Turkish Empire. The so-called traditional policy of England to maintain the integrity of the Turkish Empire should, after the taking of Cyprus, and the arrangements of the Treaty of Berlin, have been relegated to the limbo of departed foreign policies. I quite agree with the hon. Member for Bishop Auckland (Mr. Paulton) when he said that the importance of the Suez Canal is being less and less regarded by the people of this country. I believe that its importance to this country has been immensely exaggerated. It is quite as important to other commercial countries as it is to us, and as a trade highway is, indeed, more important to the Mediterranean countries than to us. If public opinion had been a few years ago in the state it is now, we should never have gone to Egypt for the sake of the Suez Canal. It is now regarded as an international highway, which, so far as commerce goes, may be left to take care of itself, and whose value to us, even for military purposes, has been enormously exaggerated. If, then, we are not in Egypt for our own interests, what are we there for? We are there to maintain order, and to discharge certain engagements. I do not desire to discuss how those engagements came to be contracted. They are mainly engagements for which the Party on this side of the House are not responsible, having been entered into before 1880; but they were entered into under the influence of ideas which at one time prevailed on both sides of the House; and I will not, therefore, inquire who ought to bear the blame of the errors that were committed when the Dual Control was established. What the Amendment suggests is that we should throw over those engagements, and get out of Egypt as quickly as we can. We have a very delicate task, which is not to be solved by merely dilating upon the difficulties of our present position, but by considering what would happen if we changed it by immediately retiring. That is the point to which the supporters of the Motion ought to have addressed themselves. The House has heard difficulties stated which make immediate retirement impossible. It ought to be remembered that we cannot rely on the quiet now prevailing on the Southern Frontier of Egypt. The storms which troubled the Soudan have passed, but the waters are still heaving; and a longer time ought to be allowed for them to subside before the danger from that quarter can be deemed to have vanished. Then there is the position of the Khedive. I do not believe the Government of the Khedive is so unstable as it has been represented to be. It is becoming more stable under the better administration we have succeeded in fostering. But there can be no doubt that it would be made more stable if this administration can be maintained for some time longer. The people are beginning to see how much just and honest government may do for them, and they have it now before their eyes; but time must be given them to realize the benefits of just government, and to appreciate what is being done for them, before they will be induced to walk in the path we have chalked out for them. I can confirm the two Under Secretaries in the account they have given of the reforms which have been effected, and I am glad that, to a great extent, my hon. Friend the Member for Barrow-in-Furness (Mr. Caine) has concurred in that view. It is also an important fact that the irrigation works have not only been greatly developed and improved, but are now being honestly managed, so as to benefit the people. Formerly, the water would only have been let out for the benefit of the Pashas, and others who desired to get it would have had to pay heavy bribes. But now the water is fairly distributed, so as not only to benefit the people generally, but also to inspire them with confidence in the Government. As regards the question of military exemptions, referred to by the hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness, the tax paid for such exemptions no doubt seems heavy, considering the poverty of the people, but it is voluntarily paid by the people, who pay it rather than enter military service, and it considerably mitigates the severity of the system of conscription. In former times the amount of such a tax would have gone into the pockets of the military director, or other official responsible for the collection of taxes, while the people who paid it would have been left for military service all the same. No doubt it will be said that my statements are of an official or ex-official character. But the information from which I speak comes mostly from private sources, and a statement may happen to be true even when it comes from an official or ex-official quarter. I am sorry to be obliged to admit that if we were to go away at the present moment, the result of our reforms and of all the progress made would be largely lost. This was a consideration which weighed with the late Government during the six months they held Office. Of course, that was a very short time to enable them to enter into the consideration of large questions of foreign policy, but they were induced to believe that, inasmuch as reforms were advancing satisfactorily and steadily, it was unwise to interrupt them. The late Government, during their short tenure of Office, conceived it to be their duty so to influence the administration of Egypt as to enable it ultimately to stand alone. Their Egyptian policy was governed by this view and hope. The British force guarding the Southern Frontier was withdrawn to Assouan. The total force in Egypt was largely reduced, and still further reductions were in contemplation when we quitted Office. We came, further, to a resolution for the re-opening of trade with Soudan, both in the Nile Valley and from Suakim, and we were able to effect considerable retrenchments in the expenditure of Egypt. I believe that still further retrenchments can be effected, and that the financial burden borne by this country may be thus removed. I am glad that the Government are at length resolved to give effect to the resolution taken by their Predecessors last July for the removal of the restrictions on trade, for nothing will more tend to the pacification of the Soudan. It has been suggested by the hon. and gallant Member for Finsbury (Colonel Duncan) that 4,000 troops would suffice for the British garrison—2,000 at Alexandria, and 2,000 at Assouan. I am inclined to agree with him. Probably we might, with safety, even reduce the troops below that figure. The general tranquillity of the country is now such that less than 4,000 British soldiers may suffice to maintain order, and it would doubtless improve the position of the Khedive in the eyes of his subjects if they saw him surrounded exclusively by his own troops, instead of by foreign soldiers. But the process of effecting these reforms is necessarily slow, for both the Khedive's Government and we, as its advisers, are hampered by the Capitulations and rights of interposition guaranteed to other Powers. Hon. Members who have read the last Blue Books will remember that it took three years to effect so small a change as the extension of the House Tax to foreigners. Sir Evelyn Baring has pointed out a difficulty in connection with the administration of Egypt which has been commented on by the Under Secretary for India—namely, that owing to the necessity of obtaining the consent of other Powers, great delay is experienced in effecting reforms, and that is especially the case with regard to the salaries of officials, and to the incurring of expenditure which may be expected to prove reproductive. It en-often happens that, by a slightly very larged expenditure, you may very largely increase your receipts, and thereby benefit the public revenue. But it is impossible, under the present system, to incur any such small additional expenditure without the consent of the Powers who are parties to the Financial Convention; and so we are compelled to forego many advantages, and to submit to vexatious delays. In that state of things, we cannot expect that the desired reforms can move rapidly forward. One thing would greatly facilitate those reforms—if we could remove from the minds of the French people the jealousy and distrust with which they view our occupation of Egypt. The French Government and people, no doubt, desire to see us out of Egypt. That feeling is a natural one ; and however strong we may believe our moral position to be, however conscious of the honesty of our intentions, experience shows us that we must reckon with these feelings of suspicion ; and the best thing the French Government can do, if they desire us soon to leave Egypt, is to abandon the somewhat contentious and unaccommodating spirit which they have exhibited, and to treat us more frankly and cordially. I hope, and venture to believe, that the present Government share the views I have been endeavouring to express. There certainly is a great contrast between the language which we hear from the Conservative Party now and that which we heard in the debate of February, 1885. Hon. Members who sat in the Parliament of 1885, and who now sit in this, will remember the language used by the right hon. Gentleman now the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), and the right hon. Gentleman who is now the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen), as to the duty of England to make permanent provision for the Government of Egypt, and to occupy the country as far as Berber. Their language imputed, if it did not openly proclaim, a permanent protectorate of the country. Hon. Members, I think, will recognize in the past and present language held by the Tory Party the difference between critics in Opposition and Ministers speaking with the responsibility attaching to Office. I now gather from the speeches of the Under Secretaries that the Government regard our evacuation of Egypt as a thing to be distinctly and earnestly desired and worked for, and which they hope before long to attain. They agree in the view which we hold that the duty of Britain is to endeavour to place the Egyptian Government as soon as possible upon its own basis; and whenever they see a prospect of its being able to stand alone, the time will have arriven when our troops may be withdrawn. The Under Secretary for India now represents our position in Egypt as being, in fact, purely philanthropic. He says nothing about the old ground of British interests, and describes us as standing on the new and higher ground of philanthropy. But there must be a limit even to philanthropy ; and even though philanthropic objects might be served by a protracted occupation of Egypt, it does not follow that we are to remain there, at risk and cost to ourselves for their attainment. Our aim should be so to guide her internal administration, so to improve her relations with the other Powers that now possess rights of interference, as to secure that every year shall mark a distinct advance towards the moment of our permanent retirement. There is reason to believe that a comparatively short time, at the present rate of progress, if steadily maintained, will enable the Native Army and the Native Administration to be brought to a condition permitting them to be left to themselves. One word remains as to how hon. Members on this side of the House who desire the evacuation of Egypt, but do not think it possible at this moment, can deal with the Amendment of my hon. Friend. I cannot vote for it, because, although I sympathize with the ends it seeks to attain, I believe it might defeat its own object ; and I regret that my hon. Friend thinks it necessary to go to a Division, because many hon. Members, besides myself, will be unable to vote with him, although we really sympathize with him. I think my hon. Friend would have done better if he had couched his Resolution in such terms as would have permitted the House to express the opinion that the time has come when the evacuation of Egypt should be regarded as in the near future. Entertaining that view, I do not see how I can accept the Motion of my hon. Friend. But I feel as strongly as he does that this is the goal upon which our eyes should be fixed. Every possible step should be taken towards its attainment; each month and year ought to bring it more within our reach, and it will be a fortunate day for this country and for Egypt when we are able, having discharged the duties which still detain us, to embark from the shores of that country the last of our troops.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I do not complain of the speech which has just been delivered by the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Bryce), who was Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the late Government. It is only natural that he should endeavour to fasten upon hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House the responsibility for the position of affairs in Egypt. But I think, if I may be allowed to say to him, that that responsibility rests entirely upon the Government of which the hon. Gentleman was a Member, and on hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House. I prefer, myself, however, to date the events which we are now discussing from the year 1882. [An hon. MEMBER: Oh!] The hon. Gentleman opposite makes an exclamation. It appears to me that there was no occupation of Egypt before 1882. The whole of the policy we are now discussing is a policy which took its origin in 1882. But it is not desirable to go back into past history. We have to do with the present condition of affairs—we have to deal with present engagements, not of this or that Government, but with the engagements of England. I hope that this House will be content to regard the engagements this country has solemnly entered into with a deep sense of the responsibility of the people who have entered into them, and as binding alike on the one Government and on the other. Therefore, Sir, it is in no spirit of recrimination and with no desire to obtain Party advantage that I have made these few observations. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down referred, I think with commendable praise, to the fact that the House of Commons is not only at liberty, but that it is its duty to take notice of circumstances and conditions which relate to the Foreign Affairs of the country. I agree with him. I know it has placed some difficulty in the way of Foreign Affairs; but with a democratic Constitution we must be prepared to encounter these difficulties, and to feel strong in the assurance that the nation and the House of Commons will maintain and discharge the obligations of the country. The hon. Gentleman was perfectly right in stating that we are in Egypt for no profit or advantage of our own, and whether it is this Government or the last Government, or any previous Government, I am prepared to maintain that the principle always adhered to in the discharge of international obligations has been that we have sought no particular preference for ourselves. Therefore, the promises and the engagements into which we have entered with good faith will be kept in perfectly good faith. We remain in Egypt until our duties are discharged, until our international obligations have been fulfilled, until we have been able to establish that Government in Egypt which the hon. Gentleman has stated to be necessary—a Native Government, a strong Government, a Government capable of holding its own and of discharging its duties as a great civilized Power. The hon. Gentleman has also referred to the fact that the late Government found that the work which was then in operation in the direction which I have indicated was progressing, and that it was progressing slowly; but that the aim which they had in view was being attained—namely, that Egypt should be able to stand alone and govern itself in the face of the world. He likewise said that the objects they had in view and the objects we have in view would be lost if the aim which the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) has in view was attained—that our withdrawal from Egypt at the present moment would produce a condition of anarchy which would imperil every advance that has yet been made in the social improvements of the people and the finances of the country. The hon.

Member for Barrow-in-Furness (Mr. Caine) gave testimony to the same effect. He said that the inevitable effect of our immediate withdrawal would be revolution—that as soon as the English troops were withdrawn the Government of the Khedive would fall. I think I heard an hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House state that our withdrawal from Egypt would be no great misfortune—that Egypt would be in a position to govern herself. But that would not be the case. Egypt is subject to international obligations and engagements. The hon. Member appears not to be aware that the Powers of Europe would not permit revolution in Egypt; that they would themselves intervene, and that that would bring us into conflict with them in the endeavour to restore order and to set up a more stable government. To talk of revolution is not only to imperil the condition of Egypt, but to light a brand in Europe which would be fatal to the interests of this country, of Egypt, and of all other countries on the Continent. The right hon. Gentleman also spoke of the relations which exist with regard to France in this matter. He said that the departure of the English Army from Egypt would be hastened if France and the other Powers would heartily co-operate with England in the endeavour to bring about the reforms which are necessary to the stable government of Egypt. Sir, we recognize—to a certain extent, we sympathize—with the susceptibilities of France and of Frenchmen in this question. We are aware that they have a feeling with regard to Egypt, which not only justifies, but requires the greatest possible consideration to be paid to Frenchmen in their relations with us and with Egypt. But we desire to point out that what we seek to gain is not an advantage for England, but an advantage for Egypt, in the better government of the country and in the constitution of a Government which will enable us to depart, having completed and discharged the duties which we think we are bound to accomplish. We have reason to believe that France recognizes not only the advantage to Egypt, but to herself and all Europe, of conceding the conditions which are necessary to the security and good government of Egypt. The hon. Gentleman spoke with some doubt as to the Capitulations and the tribunals, which interfere with the good government of Egypt, being given up. I have better hope than the hon. Gentleman. I believe we can place the subject so reasonably before the Powers of Europe that they will be disposed to join in the honest endeavour which we are making for the good of Egypt and of their own subjects. The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) and the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) have, by their speeches, made it unnecessary for me to refer at any very great length to the debate which has passed; but I must allude to some observations which fell from the hon. Baronet the Member for Cockermouth (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) and the hon. Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark). I confess I did feel great regret that in this House insinuations should be made and charges should be repeated against my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) which had been disposed of in the face of the right hon. Gentleman himself, and by himself, in 1882 and 1884. It is not for Gentlemen in this House to make charges behind the back of the person accused. It is the custom, which is well observed, to give Notice to a Gentleman against whom a charge is to be brought, and, at least, to give him an opportunity of answering it face to face. The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) will probably soon be in a position to give an answer to any person who has any charge to bring against him in this House. I think it would have shown better feeling if the hon. Baronet (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) and the hon. Gentleman (Dr. Clark) had thought it right to wait until such a time as the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer could have defended himself. But I will read a letter which I have received from the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen). He says—

> "I send you a copy of the main conditions I made when I went in an honorary capacity to Egypt. You will see how very clear I made my position, and how I reserved my entire political liberty. I went not to exact payment, but to arrange a compromise; and the relative sacrifices to be made by different classes of creditors. With regard to the connection of my firm with Egyptian loans, I stated in the House that they had had no part in the issue of loans subsequent to 1866. They were only concerned quite with the first loan, and had nothing to do with subsequent Egyptian finance. I, as you know, have been out of business for 22 years."

Well, I think that the character of our public men is of value to this House, and that a charge should not be lightly made against one who has held high Office in this House, or even against an ordinary Member of this House, and especially, as I said before, when the Gentleman charged has not a chance himself of answering the charge. And now, Sir, I will read the conditions which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen) made. In a letter of July 4, 1876, to the Council of Egyptian Bondholders, Mr. Goschen lays down the following conditions of accepting the mission to effect a compromise between the Khedive and the bondholders—

> "1. That it must be understood that if I undertake to represent the interests of the bondholders I should do so simply with a view of securing, if possible, their more equitable treatment, and advising with regard to the propriety and expediency of accepting or rejecting proposals that may be made by others, but that I should not, under any circumstances whatever, be involved myself in any financial transactions or combinations."
>
> "If any financial combination favourable to English bondholders should be proposed by English capitalists in whom the bondholders would have confidence, I should wish to be able at once to consider my functions at an end."
>
> "2. That my position should be entirely honorary. I should also expect that in any negotiations of which I was cognizant no paid agents of any kind should be employed. To speak quite plainly, what I mean is this—that no money should be made by anybody out of the protection of the interests of the English bondholders."
>
> "3. That I can undertake no duties that would interfere in any way with my perfect freedom of political action. I could not urge any steps on the English Government which, though useful to the bondholders, I might deem politically inexpedient. I am bound to say that this may fairly be considered by bondholders as a reason for preferring their interests to be placed in any other hands."

Now, Sir, these were the conditions under which Mr. Goschen went to Egypt in 1876, and I appeal to any Gentleman who has any knowledge of business, any knowledge of political life, to say whether they were not conditions highly to his credit in every sense of the word. I have here a Report published in 1881 which gives the decree resulting from the interposition of Mr. Goschen in Egyptian affairs. Referring to the Controller of Receipts, the decree says—

> "It will be his duty to see that the agents of collection do not collect more than the authorized taxes. Collections cannot be enforced on the taxpayer of the direct taxes until after they have been countersigned by him."

The object was to prevent any oppression or irregularity. Well, Sir, what was the remark made by the Consul General in Egypt at the time, Mr. Vivian? He said—

> "The powers of the English and French Controllers General of Expenditure and Audit will certainly be extensive, but I do not think they trench upon the Khedive's administrative independence, nor are they greater than recent disgraceful disclosures show to be absolutely necessary to insure the faithful and honest observance of any arrangement, while the frauds and exactions which are crushing the Fellahs make me attach great importance to the powers given to the English Controller General of appointing and dismissing the tax collectors in the provinces."

Then, Sir, it is suggested that by an intrigue of Mr. Goschen, a Minister, an administrative Minister, Sadyk Pasha, was arrested and conveyed away. Mr. Vivian says—

> "How grossly the ex-Minister abused the trust confided to him, how greatly Egypt has suffered from his dishonesty and mal-administration, and how far others were implicated with him, will probably now never be known; but as he was the great stumbling block to any chance of financial reform or honest administration, his fall, however it was brought about, can only be regarded as a great public benefit."

Now, Sir, I hope I have disposed of the illusions which have existed, if they have existed in anybody's mind, as to the circumstances connected with Mr. Goschen's mission to Egypt. I believe, for I was in the House at the time, that these illusions were dispelled by Mr. Goschen's explanations in 1882; but if they were not, the House has now all the facts of the case before them, and I hope hon. Members will join with me in deprecating any further references to the matter. I have now only to thank my hon. and gallant Friend, the Member for Holborn (Colonel Duncan), for his interesting speech. He made suggestions which certainly were of very great value. It is, however, within his knowledge that a large reduction of troops has lately been effected by the exertions of Her Majesty's present Government. The hon. and gallant Gentleman pointed to possible still further reductions, and he was followed by an hon. Gentleman, the Member for Aberdeen, the late Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bryce), who advocated still greater reductions. I can say for myself that further reduction of our force in Egypt will be possible, and will be desirable, but such reduction must be associated with the condition that we are still determined to fulfil the obligation which we went there to carry out—namely, that the Government of Egypt shall be protected by England until it is capable of discharging its own duties and of standing alone as a strong native independent Government. Until that day comes, as I hope it will very soon, in the interests of this country and in the interests of good government, and in the discharge of the international obligations into which we have entered, we are bound to remain in Egypt.

MR. JAMES STUART (Shoreditch, Hoxton): Mr. Speaker, it might, perhaps, be convenient to the House if the Amendment which has been proposed by my hon. Friend the Member for Haggerston (Mr. Cremer) were allowed to be withdrawn, with the view of presenting to the House the Amendment in a somewhat modified form; for instance, with the word "immediate" omitted, and the words "in the near future" added at the end. I think it would tend towards the conclusion of the debate if the House were to turn its attention to the suggestion which I take the liberty of making.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cremer) propose to withdraw his Amendment?

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): Upon the understanding that I am permitted to introduce it in the altered form. [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"]

MR. O'HEA (Donegal, W.): Then, Mr. Speaker, the proposal of my hon. Friend (Mr. Cremer) stands before the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith), who spoke with that *suaviter in modo* which is so conspicuously at his command, attempted to measure, not illusions, but opinions that are based upon hard and strong facts. Of all the calamitous enterprizes that were ever entered into by responsible Ministers of Her Majesty, I regard, and I believe the country regards, the Egyptian enterprize as the most calamitous, and the most disastrous—as the heaping of horrors upon horrors' head. In viewing this Egyptian matter we have to travel back, not into the regions of ancient history, but to a time that is within the recollection of each of us. We are all well aware of the conditions of things that obtained in Egypt when French and English financiers had, between them, the almost exclusive and absolute control of the railway system in Egypt. We know what the action of those financiers led to. We know how the Khedive at first coquetted with France and England, and finally insulted both nations by dismissing the responsible Ministers of France and England. My hon. Friend the Member for Kilkenny (Mr. Chance) referred to-night to the enormous taxation that the taxpayers of Great Britain have to bear in consequence of this Egyptian business. My hon. Friend the Member for the Haggerston Division of Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer) takes, in his Amendment, exactly the same view as the hon. Member for Kilkenny; and, Sir, as my hon. Friend (Mr. Chance) put it to the House, if England had acted in the wise and prudent manner in which France acted when an insult was given to the Embassies of both nations, this House would not have been troubled with the Amendment now under consideration. The condition of things in Egypt went from bad to worse, until, in an evil hour, Her Majesty's troops were sent into that country—until Her Majesty's ironclads were sent out to batter down the Forts of Alexandria. [*Laughter.*] I refer to that, Sir, as an evil hour, and before I resume my seat I will show hon. Members opposite, whose risible faculties are so susceptible of being aroused, that it was not only an evil hour for England, but a hundred times more evil an hour for the unfortunate people of Egypt, at which this country took possession of Egypt. This House is informed that it was in the interest of British commerce that all this business was undertaken. No word has been repeated more in the course of this debate than Suez. The Suez Canal, I am prepared to admit, is an important factor in the commerce and navigation of the world; but hon. Members opposite and this House would arrogate to itself too much if they claimed for England anything like a monopoly of the navigation and commerce of the world. It is a notorious fact, in connection with this Egyptian matter, that the Government of England invested nearly £4,000,000 in the purchase of the Shares which the Khedive held in the Suez Canal. Hon. Gentlemen will, I am sure, admit that the Suez Canal does form a very considerable and important factor in our relations with Egypt. A series of letters were written upon the purchase of the Shares in the Canal, from which I will, with the permission of the House, make one or two quotations. Sir Samuel Baker addressed a most important and interesting letter to *The Times*, and in it, referring to the purchase of the Khedive's Shares, he declared—

> "That the Canal is positively indispensable to our commerce, and that we are determined at all hazards to keep that highway opened and undisturbed."

Now, no person, no matter in whatever quarter of the House he sits, will quarrel with that determination; but I submit that Her Majesty's Government went the most roundabout way to conserve their rights so far as the Suez Canal was concerned. Consequent upon our troops and ironclads going to Egypt, there were many complications in that unfortunate and unhappy country. One of the leading men in the service of the Khedive, Arabi Bey, revolted against the Khedive, and thence occupied in Egypt a position far stronger than that occupied by the Khedive, because his position was one based upon the affection of the people. But that did not suit Her Majesty's Government. France declined to interfere; but Her Majesty's Government stepped in and did interfere, involving this country in the expenditure of an amount of money that it is startling to contemplate. I have looked up the Egyptian Vote for 1885-6, and I find it amounted to £2,300,000. That for 1886-7 amounts to £2,793,560. This is not an expenditure to be regarded lightly; the Egyptian matter, generally, is not one to be lightly discussed. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen express the hope that we shall soon get rid of this Egyptian difficulty. It seems, Sir, that exception is taken to the word "immediate" in the Amendment of my hon. Friend (Mr. Cremer); but if hon. Gentlemen opposite are sincere when they say it would afford them the greatest gratification to get rid of our Egyptian troubles, why should they object to this word "immediate?" There is no time like the present, and I am fully persuaded that the country will sympathize with my hon. Friend (Mr. Cremer) in the Amendment he has moved. I submit to the judgment of the House that it is obvious Her Majesty's Government ought, in the interest of good Government, and in the interest of the people of Egypt, to accept this Amendment. The condition of the people of Egypt has been anything but what it ought to have been, but if they were left to themselves they would be able to manage their own affairs in a manner which would be eminently satisfactory to themselves. If the Forces which are now in occupation in Egypt were brought back to this country, I am sure they would be received on their arrival here with open arms. What is their function in Egypt? They are simply an Army of occupation in the country protecting the Khedive, who, I submit, standing in my place in the House of Commons, would, if the English Army evacuated Egypt, follow them and, perhaps, open a residence in some fashionable centre of London. The people of Egypt would soon forget the calamities and the sorrows which were brought upon them by the action of our troops. I never take up any illustrated paper which contains pictorial representations of the engagements in which the British Forces took part in Egypt without experiencing a sickening sensation. When I see the poor naked savages represented as being driven under foot by the Cavalry of Great Britain; when I see men of dusky skin represented as pierced with British bayonets; I ask myself why it was these unfortunate men were so treated, and the only reason I could find was that it was simply because they were defending their homes. It is not because they are of an Oriental race; it is not because their skins are of a different colour from ours that they are not our equals in the sight of Almighty God. Their homes are as sacred in their eyes as the palatial mansions in the West End are to their owners. Their feelings towards their wives and children may be as strong, and, perhaps, stronger and more tender than the feelings of those who live in palatial residences in this country. Sir, it is because, in my opinion, the occupation of Egypt by our troops is fraught with mischief and misery to the people of Egypt, and is attended with enormous expenditure to this country, from which the taxpayers of Great Britain do not derive a scintilla of advantage, that it affords me the greatest pleasure in supporting the Amendment of my hon. Friend (Mr. Cremer), in which the House is asked to humbly pray Her Majesty to take immediate steps for recalling the whole of her Forces from Egypt.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford, W.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of Order. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether I should be in Order in moving an Amendment by way of an Amendment to that now before the House ?

MR. SPEAKER: It is quite in Order to move an Amendment to the Amendment.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : Then, Sir, I beg to move that the Amendment now before the House be amended by leaving out the word "immediate," and adding at the end of the Amendment the words "in the near future." The last section of the Amendment would then read—"humbly to pray Her Majesty to take steps for recalling the whole of her Forces from Egypt in the near future." I move this alteration with the sanction of the mover of the Amendment (Mr. Cremer), and on the suggestion of my hon. Friend the late Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bryce). The Party on this side of the House has been largely responsible for the policy which this country has pursued towards Egypt. Our expenses in that country has led us to wish that we were freed from the responsibilites which have been incurred by this country; and I hope from the speeches which we have listened to from the other side of the House, and from responsible Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench, that this Amendment will be acceptable to the House as a whole. We wish to give the world to understand that our desire is that our occupation of Egypt shall be for as short a period as possible. It has been declared to-night that our whole object is to leave behind in Egypt a Native Government, strong and independent. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the best way of ensuring the independence of a Native Government in Egypt is for us to withdraw our troops rapidly, and to take every day a less active part in the government of that country. I am one of a small body of Members of this House who has opposed from the outset any interference by force in Egyptian affairs. All through I have consistently opposed the advancing steps which have been made by the Government of my own Party in that direction. As I understand it, there is now comparatively little difference of opinion between the two sides of the House upon this subject. I admit there is a difference between going into a country and the manner of leaving it; it is one thing to take a decisive step at the outset and refuse interference, but it becomes a question of policy, to some extent as to how the withdrawal is to take place. Already a large proportion of Her Majesty's Forces has been withdrawn from Egypt, and we have an assurance from the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith) that it is both practicable and desirable that there should be an early reduction of the remnant of the Force left in that country. If that be so it must clearly be the intention of Her Majesty's Government that there should be an early and an absolute withdrawal of Her Majesty's Forces with the view of leaving the government of Egypt to the people of that country, and I think we shall make a substantial advance, if the House is able to agree upon the Amendment now submitted to it. By the adoption of this Amendment we should not compromise or unduly tie the hands of the Government; but, on the other hand, we should, by this unanimous expression on the part of the House of Commons, be doing, at this critical moment in Europe, a great service towards the removal of the feelings of irritability which prevail at any rate in France, if not elsewhere. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without detaining the House one moment longer, I beg to move the Amendment to the Amendment I have suggested.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, in line 9, to leave out the word "immediate."—(*Mr. Illingworth.*)

Question put, "That the word 'immediate' stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 247; Noes 127: Majority 120.—(Div. List, No. 3.)

Question put,

"That the words 'and humbly to represent to Her Majesty that, inasmuch as the expenses of the prolonged occupation of Egypt by a British force have to be borne by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, the great majority of whom have no direct interest in the Government or affairs of Egypt, and that the retention of our Troops in Egypt is a cause of suspicion and irritation to Continental Governments, and calculated to weaken the influence of this Country in the Councils of Europe, humbly to pray Her Majesty to take immediate steps for recalling the whole of Her Forces from Egypt' be there inserted."—(*Mr. Cremer.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 97; Noes 263: Majority 166. (Div. List No. 4.)

Main Question again proposed.

Motion made and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Parnell,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT (1881) AMENDMENT (No. 3) BILL.—[BILL 65.]

(*Mr. T. W. Russell, Lord Ernest Hamilton, Mr. Lea, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Sinclair.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. PARNELL (Cork): Mr. Speaker, I wish, in reference to this Order, to ask the hon. Member in charge of the Bill whether it is his intention to persevere with the measure, or whether he has really brought it forward for purposes of his own. The Bill has been upon the Paper for nearly a fortnight, and we are told that it consists of only one clause. It seems to me that if the hon. Member who has brought forward this matter with a great sound of trumpets and show of energy had taken the ordinary trouble which most Members take with their Bills, he might have been able to get such a Bill printed in the time which has elapsed since the opening of Parliament. Such a chance may not occur to the hon. Gentleman again, and I think it is much to be regretted that he has not taken the ordinary business-like course of seeing that his Bill was printed.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, South): In answer to the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, I desire to say that the Bill was introduced not a fortnight ago, but on this night week. It is my intention to press it forward whenever I can get an opportunity. It has been sent to the printer, and if it had been printed to-night I should have asked the House and the Government to assent to the Second Reading. The measure consists, as the hon. Gentleman has said, of a single clause, giving every leaseholder in Ireland the option of applying to the Land Court to fix a fair rent. I will put it down for Tuesday, and hope it may be printed and circulated on Monday. If the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) will be kind enough to exercise his influence to prevent a block being put on, I most unhesitatingly say that I shall press the Bill forward at all hazards on Tuesday night.

Second Reading *deferred* till *Tuesday* next.

COLONIAL SERVICE [PENSIONS] BILL.

Resolution [Feb. 3] *reported;* and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Herbert Maxwell, Sir Henry Holland, and Mr. Jackson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 158.]

MOTIONS.

——o——

ECCLESIASTICAL ASSESSMENTS (SCOTLAND) (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Finlay, Bill to amend the Law as to Ecclesiastical Assessments in Scotland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Finlay and Mr. M'Lagan.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 160.]

FOYNES HARBOUR (TRANSFER) BILL.

On Motion of Sir Herbert Maxwell, Bill to provide for the transfer of Foynes Harbour, in the Estuary of the River Shannon, to the Limerick Harbour Commissioners; and for other purposes, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Herbert Maxwell and Mr. Jackson.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 159.]

ELECTIONS (INTERVENTION OF PEERS, &C.)

Ordered, That a Select Committee be *appointed*, "to consider the Sessional Order with reference to the Intervention of Peers or Prelates in Parliamentary Elections, and to report whether any, and, if so, what alterations are advisable therein:"

The Committee was accordingly *nominated* of,—Mr. RAIKES, Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER, Sir JOHN GORST, Mr. WHITBREAD, Sir RICHARD PAGET, Mr. WODEHOUSE, Lord CLAUD HAMILTON, Mr. BRADLAUGH, and Mr. CHANCE:—With power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.—(*Mr. Akers-Douglas.*)

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 7th February, 1887.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, *appointed* and *nominated*.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Lunacy Acts Amendment * (7); Lunacy * (8); Appellate Jurisdiction * (15).

Committee — Report —Pluralities Act Amendment * (14).

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that Her Majesty had (by Commission) appointed the Earl of Selborne Speaker of the House in the absence of the Lord Chancellor, the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, the Earl of Cork and Orrery, the Earl of Lathom, the Earl de Montalt, and the Viscount Oxenbridge; the Lord Halsbury, Speaker of the House in the absence of the Lord Chancellor; the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, the Earl of Cork and Orrery, the Earl of Lathom, the Earl de Montalt, the Viscount Oxenbridge, and the Earl of Selborne; and the Lord Herschell, Speaker of the House in the absence of the Lord Chancellor; the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, the Earl of Cork and Orrery, the Earl of Lathom, the Earl de Montalt, the Viscount Oxenbridge, the Earl of Selborne, and the Lord Halsbury: The said Commissions were read.

LUNACY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(*The Lord Chancellor*.)

(NO. 7.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY), in rising to move that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it had been introduced for the purpose of carrying out a Resolution which their Lordships had come to on two occasions for amending the Lunacy Acts throughout the country. The clauses in the Bill were apart from all controversial matter, with the exception of one point, which he would mention thereafter. There had been a general consent, on both sides of the House, that some alteration was required in the Lunacy Laws; and in preparing a great part of the Bill which he had presented to their Lordships, he had inherited the fruits of the labours of two noble and learned Lords—one his Predecessor in Office (Lord Herschell), and the other a noble and learned Lord, whom he did not see present (Lord Selborne), and he had followed as closely as he was able in the lines they had laid down. In one particular, however, the controversial matter differed from the Bills which had preceded this one. The greater part of the Bill was entirely based on matters beyond controversy, and it was agreed that it was of serious importance that legislation on this subject should not be further delayed. That the matter was an important and urgent one could be seen from the fact that the total number of lunatics shown in the last Return of the Lunacy Commissioners was now 80,126, being an increase of 452 on the previous year; making the smallest increase for the last 27 years in proportion to the population. There were 4,440 licensed houses, and the patients therein had increased by 8.5 per thousand, but the admissions had been lower than since 1880. It was suggested that the small increase in the number of lunatics was due to the reluctance of medical men to sign the certificates of lunacy; but the Commissioners of Lunacy did not think that this had any appreciable effect on the general statistics. For himself, he did not know, however, that the increase was out of proportion to the increase of population. With regard to the gradual decrease of licensed houses, he thought it right to adopt the views generally entertained with respect to their gradual decrease, and he hoped that subject of controversy would cease. With regard to the matter of controversy, the Commissioners refused to accept the conclusions of their Lordships' House, and emphasized the view the late Lord Shaftesbury entertained as to the introduction of some judicial authority to examine persons who were to be confined in a lunatic asylum. That subject, he believed, had passed beyond the region of controversy; and, having regard to the state of public opinion, he thought no alteration of the law would be satisfactory that did not make further provision for the liberty of the subject. There had been a very strong opinion abroad—whether exaggerated or not he would not say—that it was possible, without any proper investigation at all, for designing persons to take away the liberty of their fellow-subjects by the instrumentality of the Lunacy Law as it at present stood. It would, therefore, he believed, be impossible to amend the law adequately without taking notice of and, at the same time, giving effect to, the state of public feeling. He proposed, therefore, to insert in the Bill a provision for the protection of personal liberty; and this question of importance was as to what degree the judicial interference should take place. It was a subject of controversy whether the magistrate should be directed to see the alleged lunatic. The Lunacy Commissioners, on the other hand, disapproved of any alteration in the direction of introducing a judicial authority to examine whether or not a person should be confined in a lunatic asylum. He, therefore, proposed to make it a condition of the power to restrain that there should be served on the alleged lunatic a notice giving him information that if he pleased, and at his option, he would be brought before a magistrate. If the person was, in truth, improperly detained, he would be intelligent enough to understand the notice given him and act upon it. On the other hand, if he was a person who ought to be restrained, he probably would not insist on the production of himself before a magistrate. The Bill, however, was in their Lordships' hands, and the wish of the Government was that they should be assisted in making an amendment of the law which would have the desired effect. The noble and learned Lord concluded by moving the second reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

LORD HERSCHELL said he gladly supported the Motion for the second reading of the Bill, for, in his opinion, it was worthy of passing such a stage. He did not propose, at this stage, to say anything on the only point of controversy. He entirely sympathized with his noble and learned Friend's desire to safeguard the liberty of the subject, so far as it could be done with safety to the lunatic, and with a due regard to his interests and the interests of others. The requirement of the Bill, that the magistrate should have an interview with the alleged lunatic, if he desired it, however, was not absolute. If it were, it might be regarded with some apprehension. But the notice to be served upon him, that he might have an interview with a magistrate, might be dispensed with in any case where the magistrate satisfied himself that the service of such notice would be prejudicial to the lunatic, or dangerous to the public. For his own part, previous to committing himself, he (Lord Herschell) would like further to consider the matter before coming to an absolute conclusion upon it, and there would be an opportunity of doing so before the Bill went into Committee.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, he must take that opportunity to express the great satisfaction he felt that his noble and learned Friend (Lord Halsbury) had, so early in the Session, brought forward that most important measure. On a former occasion, he had himself expressed a hope that the Legislature might see fit to vest all lunatic asylums in public bodies, and to do away with all private asylums; and although he was aware of the difficulty of enacting such a change, in consequence of the large vested interests affected, still he trusted that that object might be attained at some not distant date. In furtherance of that view he would ask their Lordships' attention to an extract on the subject from a letter which he had received from the late Lord Shaftesbury, dated April 16, 1885. In it, the noble Lord said that he had not changed by one hair's-breadth his opinion of the danger which beset all private asylums, and of the necessity of placing the whole care of lunacy on a public basis; but that that could not be done by permissive legislation, and the enactment must be compulsory; that when he wrote to the Lord Chancellor in December, he did not venture to suggest more to begin with than enabling provisions in the Bill that he introduced; but that then he would go much further, and make counties and boroughs responsible for the initiation and the maintenance of such institutions, which he was sure would be self-supporting; and that the terrors and suspicions in the mind of the country in regard to the nature and tendency of private asylums could not be eradicated or abated until such a change was effected. He would only add that, as his noble and learned Friend had not found it possible or desirable to adopt those views in the present measure, it was to be hoped that, at any rate, he would do everything in his power to strengthen the Bill so as to prevent abuses arising, as there were no less than 80,000 lunatics confined; and it was absolutely impossible for the Lunacy Commissioners, who were only six in number, and had to go in couples to visit them, as they should do, four or five times a year. He considered that it should be compulsory upon the proprietors of private houses to transmit to the Commissioners a report of his condition on the admission of every lunatic into their houses. He further thought two medical certificates, and not one only, should be necessary for an Urgency Order.

Motion *agreed to*; Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the whole House on *Tuesday*, the 15*th instant*.

LUNACY BILL.

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

(NO. 8.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY), in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it was simply a Bill to codify the numerous Acts of Parliament—somewhere about a dozen in number—dealing with the subject of lunacy; and, in the event of the Bill which their Lordships had just read a second time going to the other House, it might be possible to refer both the codification of the existing law and the new Bill to a Committee together, so that the new Bill might be incorporated with the other measure, and the whole law in regard to lunacy be reduced to one Statute.

Motion *agreed to*.

Bill read 2^a accordingly.

INDIA (MADRAS)—THE COVENANTED CIVIL SERVICE—LAND SPECULATIONS—CASE OF MR. SULLIVAN.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, in asking the Secretary of State for India, What steps have been taken with regard to Mr. Sullivan's infraction of the regulation against land speculations by members of the covenanted Civil Service, now that Mr. Crole's accusations of Mr. Sullivan have apparently been substantiated, inasmuch as Mr. Crole had been replaced in the Service after having been suspended by the Madras Government for making them? said, that the case was one of the Madras scandals, but not the first. The first of this nature had been the speculations in gold mines in Mysore, in which several officials in Madras had taken part in 1880. That had given rise to a Question in the other House; and the late Secretary of State for India (the Earl of Kimberley) had written, on the 28th of December, 1882, to the Governor of Madras (Mr. Grant Duff) for explanations. This despatch and the reply of the Madras Government, with enclosures, had been laid before the other House of Parliament on the Motion of Mr. O'Donnell. This Parliamentary Paper was, however, incomplete, since it did not contain the despatch of the Secretary of State in reply to that of the Madras Government. A list of lands held by Civil officers of Madras contained the name of Mr. H. E. Sullivan as owner of 75 acres for building purposes. This, however, was not the estate which had given rise to the accusations of Mr. Crole. Mr. Sullivan had tried to pass this other estate as belonging to his son, though he had a mortgage on it to its full value. An attempt was made to sell this estate, which led to Mr. Crole being consulted by the intending purchaser, and to his receding from his intentions, and to Mr. Crole making charges against Mr. Sullivan of infraction of the regulations against land speculations by civil or military officials, supported by nine documents containing affidavits in support of his allegations. There was no inquiry into Mr. Sullivan's conduct; but Mr. Crole was suspended. He then appealed to the late Secretary of State, who directed that he should be replaced in an office of equal emolument, and also allowed the time during which he had been suspended to count for his pension. Mr. Crole, however, lost his salary during the time of his suspension, as the post he occupied had been filled by another official; and some of the Indian newspapers stated that, when reinstated, he was placed in a post inferior to that which he had before occupied. It would appear, from this decision of the late Secretary of State for India, that Mr. Sullivan was in fault, and that Mr. Crole was justified in the charges he had made. It had also been stated that Mr. Crole wrote an intemperate letter; but it was only natural that he should be betrayed into some heat when he found himself suspended by Mr. Sullivan, amongst other members of the Madras Government. It had not yet transpired what notice the India Office had taken of Mr. Sullivan's conduct in the matter; and, as far as the public were aware, Mr. Crole was the only sufferer. As it appeared that the Government regulations against land speculations by civil officers would not be upheld as they should be, he would put the Question which stood on the Notice Paper.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Viscount Cross): My Lords, the question whether Mr. Sullivan had infringed the rules relating to the holding of land by Government servants—and, if so, to what extent—was taken into consideration last year by the Secretary of State in Council. Before any final decision had been come to on the case, Mr. Sullivan placed his seat in the Council of the Governor of Madras at the disposal of the Secretary of State; who, after a careful examination of all the circumstances, arrived at the conclusion that it was his duty to advise Her Majesty that his resignation should be accepted. Mr. Sullivan ceased to be a member of the Council on the 7th of December last.

ARMY—SMALL ARMS—DEFECTIVE SWORD BAYONETS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of ERNE: I have to ask Her Majesty's Government a Question which appears on the Paper, with reference to defective bayonets. This is not the first time the matter has received public attention. Indeed, I believe that in the battles of the Soudan more than one valuable life was sacrificed by the defective quality of the bayonets supplied to Her Majesty's Land and Sea Forces; and, since then, a large number of bayonets have been tested, and of those about one-third were found to be in a defective state. Your Lordships may have seen, from the public prints, that about 10 days ago a number of bayonets and cutlasses were served out on board Her Majesty's ship *Indus*, at Devonport; and every one of those, without exception, on being tested, was either bent double or twisted round like a corkscrew. I desire, therefore, to ask Her Majesty's Government, If they can give any information as to the reported defects in the sword-bayonets lately supplied to one of Her Majesty's ships; whether any of these bayonets are in London; and if so, if they can be seen by Members of this House; also to ask, if Her Majesty's Government can inform the House of the date of their manufacture and the firm supplying them; and also when, and by whom, they were passed into the service?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Lord Harris): My Lords, in answer to the noble Earl, I have to say that the sword-bayonets in question are some which were altered from cutlasses at the time of the adoption of the Martini-Henry rifle. They were reduced in size in order to suit that weapon, and were approved of by the Director of Naval Ordnance in 1871, after reference to the captain of Her Majesty's ship *Excellent*, then stationed at Portsmouth. That officer reported that the new weapon was suitable for the new Martini-Henry rifle, and for the then sword exercise was a more efficient weapon than the old cutlass. The cutlasses in question had been many years in use, having been made in 1859, and had passed muster, or had proved satisfactory, until the year 1871. They were then withdrawn, and altered to suit the Martini-Henry rifle issued in 1874. They had been in use from 1874 down to 1886, and there was no complaint made about them which the authorities could trace until last year, when the Training Squadron did complain that one or more cutlasses had bent. They are being gradually withdrawn, however, and are being re-tested, and put to a severer test. Some of the sword-bayonets are at the War Office now; and if the noble Earl, or any other noble Lord, wishes to see them, I will have them placed in my room for their inspection. I must say that they have bent in a very remarkable way; but their having bent does not prove that they were not equal to the test originally demanded of them at the time they were issued. The test which was then required of them was that they should be bent to the extent of four inches over a block; and there is no doubt they will still stand that test. The conjecture is that they have been put to a severer test than that; and I am informed that there is no steel which is made which will not give way when put to a severer test than that which it was originally intended to stand. These naval sword-bayonets were originally supplied by contract in 1858, when 15,000 were obtained from Charles Reeves, of Birmingham; some 3,000 since from Chevasse, of Birmingham; and 900 from R. and W. Aston, of Birmingham; and in 1859, 3,300 were bought from Kirschbaum, of Solingen. On the introduction of the Martini-Henry rifle, they were altered at the Enfield Small Arms Factory, to meet the views of the naval authorities; all so altered being tested so as to comply with the sealed pattern. The tests were on the responsibility of the Superintendent of the Small Arms Factory, who, in all deliveries, is responsible that the supply is equal to the specification and sample; and they stood the tests satisfactorily. All cutlasses and cutlass sword-bayonets are in course of being re-tested, and are now being subjected to a more severe test than was considered necessary at the time of the approval of the present pattern in 1871. As that pattern has been complained of, it comes within the subject of reference now being considered by the Royal Commission on Ordnance Stores, and the question will, therefore, be submitted to them. These cutlasses have been in use since 1874; and when, in March 1884, General Graham was instructed to report as to some complaints that had at that time appeared in the public Press respecting defective cutlasses and bayonets which had been in use in Egypt—he reported that no reports had been received in reference to cutlasses.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL.

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

(NO. 15.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY), in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that provisions had been introduced in the Act of 1876, apparently under the idea that the only persons who could sit during the Prorogations were the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary. The consideration appeared to have been overlooked that there might be persons competent under the Act to sit and hear the appeals who were not within the description of Lords of Appeal in Ordinary. Indeed, the framer of the Act had so framed the provisions that they were confined to the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary. The result of this had been that during the recent Prorogation, it became impossible for the House to avail itself of the services of those noble and learned Lords like Lord Herschell and Lord Bramwell, who, had they taken the Oath during the ordinary Session, would have been able to give their assistance. It was desirable, therefore, that the power should be extended to all persons capable of sitting and forming part of the Court of Appeal. The next point in the Bill had reference to the provision of the statute, that a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary, by his appointment, was entitled to rank during his life as a Baron; but, upon his ceasing to hold the Office, the provision was made that he should no longer be entitled to a Writ of Summons. No doubt, there was great jealousy among their Lordships as to Life Peerages at that time; but the recent resignation of Lord Blackburn offered an example in point. The noble and learned Lord was a Judge to whom he (Lord Halsbury) thought it was no exaggeration to say that the jurisprudence of the country was deeply indebted for his great learning, his logic, and acuteness. Although a Lord of Appeal might not be desirous of continuing to hold his Office, so as to be bound to attend every day; yet it was extremely inconvenient that, on occasions on which a noble and learned Lord was quite willing to give the advantage of his great learning to their Lordships, the language of the statute should prevent him from any longer affording that assistance, notwithstanding that he still retained the rank and title of Baron. The other provision of the Bill had reference to the constitution of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. By the Act constituting the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, two small sums, considering the judicial services rendered, were permitted to be given to anyone holding a high judicial office in India, if he came and gave his assistance to the Judicial Committee. The sum appointed to each person was £400 a-year. He proposed, by a section of the Bill, to give power, where there was only one person, to make the sum £800 a-year; and in that way to induce those with judicial learning and experience gained in the great centres of administration in India to give the advantage of them to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. He hoped the Bill did not raise any subject of controversy, and would now move its second reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

LORD ELLENBOROUGH said, he would like to know whether, if he was not mistaken, the Bill was not an attempt to introduce a new class of Life Peers by a sort of side issue?

LORD HALSBURY said, he had no further explanation to make. He was not aware that the Bill professed, or did, in fact, make any alteration in the state of the law, or of the Constitution, with a new class of Barons. The Act of 1876 left the Lord of Appeal on resignation with the rank of Baron, without the right to vote. The present Bill did not profess to make any new class of Life Peers; but it provided that on resignation of the high judicial office, the Baron so created by his appointment and maintaining that rank was not, in future, entitled to a Writ, or to vote in their Lordships' House. The Bill was intended to meet that state of things.

LORD FITZGERALD said, he rose, not for the purpose of criticizing the Bill, but rather of supplementing what the noble and learned Lord (the Lord Chancellor) had said in reference to Lord Blackburn—whose character was increasing in public estimation from day to day—as being himself one of the very few Members of their Lordships' House present who remembered Lord Blackburn's first appointment. Lord Campbell, who was Lord Chancellor in Lord Palmerston's Second Administration, had the responsibility of the appointment; and he told us very graphically in his Diary, writing in 1859, on what principle he had made his selection:—

> "I have already got into great disgrace by disposing of my judicial patronage on the principle *detur digniori*. Having occasion for a new Judge to succeed Erle, made Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, I appointed Blackburn, the fittest man in Westminster Hall, although wearing a stuff gown."

The appointment was not popular, for the simple reason that the public did not know Blackburn; and it was censured also, on the ground that Lord Campbell had deliberately passed over other and more experienced men. The career of Sir Colin Blackburn as a Judge had, however, amply justified the appointment, and shown how well Lord Campbell understood the qualities necessary to constitute a great Judge. He was a great jurist, a strong and learned constitutional lawyer, with a mind so happily constituted that partiality was with him impossible; inflexible in his integrity, inexorable in his pursuit of justice, he dealt out even-handed justice to all suitors who came before him. He had throughout his long career performed with great success the duties of his high office; and his name would be known to posterity as one who, in his own life work, had well illustrated and enforced the principles of our own laws and the foundations of our Constitutional rights and liberties.

LORD HERSCHELL said, he entirely agreed with everything that his noble and learned Friend upon the Woolsack had stated with regard to the very great services that Lord Blackburn had rendered. He (Lord Herschell) could himself speak with some knowledge on the subject; for the period of Lord Blackburn's judicial career covered the whole period of his (Lord Herschell's) own professional life; and, having seen the noble and learned Lord constantly discharging his judicial functions, in fulfilment of the duties of the various offices he from time to time filled, there need be no hesitation in saying that those services were most valuable to the country. Lord Blackburn possessed vast stores of knowledge, singular capacity for using them, and a rare grasp of legal principles; and all must regret that circumstances had rendered it necessary that he should perform no longer those great and important public services. He had no intention to oppose the Bill of his noble and learned Friend, which contained various provisions, entirely independent of one another, with which he was in entire sympathy. He thought it right, however, to call attention to one of those provisions, so that, at all events, it might be perfectly clear what was being done; for there could be no doubt that, for the first time, their Lordships would, if they accepted it, sanction the creation of Life Peers, who, without filling an official position, might sit in that House. At the time when the Appellate Jurisdiction Bill was introduced in 1876, it contained a provision that a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary should retain his seat in that House only so long as he held his office—that, in fact, he should be an official Peer; and, though his rank was continued during the term of his natural life, he was not a Life Peer. When the Bill was passing through the House of Commons, a hon. and learned Member moved to omit those words which one section of the present Bill proposed to omit. That Amendment was opposed by the Government of the day—that of Mr. Disraeli—on the ground, among others, that to accept the Amendment would be to trench on the Privileges of the House of Lords; for there could be no doubt the House of Lords viewed with strong repugnance the creation of Life Peerages, and to compel that House to accept Life Peers against its own wish and desire; and the section in question was drawn for the very purpose of preventing the creation of Life Peers, to which their Lordships had expressed such strong objections. On that occasion it had been objected that it would be dangerous to allow a Prime Minister, under the guise of making Law Lords, and inducing them to retire one after the other, to create a number of official Life Peers. For his own part, he confessed he had not much apprehension of such a danger, since a Prime Minister could accomplish such an object in a much more direct manner. Undoubtedly, however, a change was now being made, in that, for the first time, their Lordships were sanctioning the creation of Life Peers—that was to say, Peers of Parliament, occupying seats in that House, and fulfilling all the functions of Peers, without filling any office while they were exercising those functions. For his own part, he did not share in the apprehension which had been expressed with regard to such a course; but was glad to see that that which was looked upon with so much hostility in 1876 could now be introduced by the Lord Chancellor of a Conservative Government with every prospect of success. When objection was taken in the House of Commons to the creation of these Peers, he distinctly remembered that the position of the Law Lords was somewhat ridiculed, on the ground that they were Peers having seats in the House, and then, on retirement, were still Peers, but ceased to have seats in that House. He well remembered the reply given by Mr. Disraeli, when asked what would be the position of these Lords on retirement? "I suppose," was his reply, "they will relapse into the position of Irish Peers." For his part, he hoped that they would no longer relapse into that position. He did not oppose the second reading of the Bill; but he thought it right to call attention to the fact that it was not a mere formal change, but a distinct reversal of what had been hitherto laid down.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, he most decidedly held that the Act which they were now called upon to amend had not created Life Peerages. It had already been decided that the Crown had not had, and did not then possess, any power to create Life Peers. The words of the Act under consideration were to the effect that the Law Lord should "rank as a Baron," not "be" a Baron. This was not a distinction without a difference. Sir James Parke's creation as a Life Peer was impeached by Lord Lyndhurst, on the ground that the Crown could make no such creation. A Committee of Privileges held that Lord Lyndhurst was right; and, in order to get out of the difficulty, the Minister of the day created Sir James Parke an hereditary Peer, under the title of Baron Wensleydale. The difficulty arose from the confusion of the name "Peer" with the name "Lord of Parliament." The two positions were totally different. A man might be a Peer, and yet not a Lord of Parliament, as was the case with certain Peers of Ireland and Scotland, who had at present no seats in that House, while, on the other hand, the Bishops, who had seats and were Lords of Parliament, were not Peers.

Lord DENMAN said, he should not have troubled their Lordships if his Father, in 1821, had not stated that he would vote for no payment to an ignoble assistant to the Lord Chancellor. This was not used in an offensive sense; but to show that all Peers, except Spiritual Peers, should be on the same footing. Lord Eldon, whose retiring pension was to be only £4,000 a-year, said that no retired Chancellor should receive his pension unless he sat on appeals in the House of Lords; and had formerly, in 1856, divided the House against the Leaders on both sides—4 against 44 on the Life Peerage Bill, three of the four being Irish Peers. The House of Commons had rejected the Bill, and two hereditary Peers were created, according to his father's (Lord Denman's) advice, who, for 20 years, did all the business in an admirable manner, as a respected Member of their Lordships' House, had at one time wished for Life Peers, as he then thought the agricultural interest too strong. He (Lord Denman) said he was on dangerous ground, as the House of Commons' majority wished to extend the principle of Life Peerages much further; but by their vote they saved the country at least £180,000. They had now the Lord Chancellor and two retired Lord Chancellors sitting in that House, and he thought there was already ample provision for discharging the judicial Business of the House, since those three Peers formed a quorum of themselves; and, beyond them, any Member who chose had the right to sit, both in Session and in Recess, as a Lord of Appeal. In his opinion, the Bill was unnecessary. Why not make Lord Blackburn an hereditary Peer as Lord Wensleydale—whom Lord Lyndhurst and Lord Denman wished to see made a Peer when he was Sir James Parke — had been made? His services certainly entitled Lord Blackburn to that honour. Having been present on the first day of the Appeal, "Bradlaugh *v.* Clark," he sat till the end, and voted with Lord Blackburn. No one could say that the Act of 1801, imposing a penalty on ministers of the Churches of Scotland and of England, was not now in force; and yet a Scotch Member who had preached in the Established Church had so voted several times; but proof of his preaching would subject him to the fines. But in the case of Mr. Bradlaugh it would be far better to make him ineligible from having lectured against religion than to let him pay penalty or costs, because the Attorney and Solicitor General had told him that he might lawfully affirm, whereas every case from 1849—when his noble Father was opposed by Lord Brougham on religious grounds—scruples founded on religion were the only ones which gave the privilege of affirmation instead of an oath, and it was merely because Sir George Grey had drawn the Act and not Sir Roundell Palmer that the difficulty occurred. He (Lord Denman) considered the Act wholly unnecessary, and if he had any weight in the House he would at once, without previous Notice, move its rejection, as was done by the Earl of Wicklow, supported by Lord Brougham, in 1849, and as was done the other night on the Woman's Suffrage Bill.

Lord HALSBURY, in reply, said, it was not the object of the Bill, nor the effect of its provisions, to create any one a Peer. All it did was to leave a Lord of Appeal in exactly the same position after his resignation that he was in before it with regard to the Peerage.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the whole House on *Thursday* next.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS AND OFFICE OF THE GENTLEMAN USHER OF THE BLACK ROD.

Select Committee appointed: The Lords following, with the Lord Chancellor, the Lord President, the Lord Privy Seal, and the Chairman of Committees, were named of the Committee:

D. Richmond.
D. Saint Albans.
D. Bedford.
M. Salisbury.
M. Bath.
E. Mount Edgcumbe. (Ld. Steward.)
E. Lathom. (Ld. Chamberlain.)
E. Devon.
E. Carnarvon.
E. Belmore.
E. Harrowby.
E. Bradford.
E. Beauchamp.
E. Camperdown.
E. Granville.
E. Kimberley.
E. Sydney.
E. de Montalt.
V. Hardinge.
V. Eversley.
V. Oxenbridge.
L. Colchester.
L. Ker.
L. Kintore.
L. Aveland.
L. Colville of Culross.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 7th February, 1887.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE — Endowed Schools Act, 1869, and Amending Acts, *appointed* and *nominated;* Town Holdings, *nominated;* Perpetual Pensions, *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILL — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Cottagers' (Allotments) * [161].

QUESTIONS.

—o—

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—DEFECTIVE MILITARY WEAPONS.

MR. HANBURY (Preston) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether it is true, as reported from Devonport, that the sword-bayonets supplied to a newly commissioned ship are utterly unfit for use, as when placed across the knee they are easily bent in two or three places; whether, besides, the *Indus*, the *Mariner*, *Racer*, and *Icarus* have been supplied with weapons of the same description; whether the *Mariner* is now actually employed in Burmah, and the *Racer* and *Icarus* on the West Coast of Africa; if he would state who supplied these bayonets; whose duty was it to test these bayonets; what, if any, system is adopted for the inspection of swords and other articles, and a comparison of the deliveries with the original specifications and samples upon which the contracts are based; and, whether in such cases any penalty in addition to dismissal can be imposed under existing regulations upon careless or incompetent officials?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): The cutlasses and cutlass sword-bayonets supplied to Her Majesty's ships are in accordance with the sealed pattern approved by the Director of Naval Ordnance in 1871, after reference to the captain of Her Majesty's ship *Excellent* at Portsmouth. The latter officer reported that the new weapon was suitable for the Martini-Henri rifle, for the then sword exercises, and that it was a more efficient weapon than the old cutlass. The weapons lately complained of have been rendered unfit for use by subjection to a treatment they never could have undergone in actual warfare. The present naval sword-bayonets were originally supplied by contract; and, on the introduction of the Martini-Henry rifle, were altered at the Enfield Small Arms Factory to meet the views of the Naval Authorities—all so altered being tested so as to comply with the sealed pattern. The tests were on the responsibility of the Superintendent of the Small Arms Factory, who in all deliveries is responsible that the supply is equal to the specification and sample. All cutlasses and cutlass sword-bayonets are in course of being re-tested, and are now being subjected to a more severe test than was considered necessary at the time of the approval of the present pattern in 1871. As the pattern has been complained of, the subject comes within the reference of the Royal Commission now sitting on the Patterns of Ordnance Stores, and the complaint will be submitted to them. The cutlasses have been in use since 1874; and when in March, 1884, Sir Gerald Graham was instructed to report on the complaints that had been published in the public Press of defective cutlasses and bayonets in use in Egypt; he replied that no reports had been received relative to cutlasses.

MR. HANBURY: Who is the person actually responsible for the supply of these bayonets to these vessels?

MR. NORTHCOTE: The responsibility, I presume, would be that of the head of the Royal Small Arms Factory at Enfield; but he would be supplying bayonets which had been proved to be in accordance with the sealed pattern; and I do not see that the present Superintendent could be held responsible, he not having been in that position in 1871.

MR. HANBURY gave notice that, in consequence of the answer of the Surveyor General of Ordnance, he would take an early opportunity of calling attention to the defective system of administration in the Ordnance Department, under which it was a common occurrence for bad and inefficient weapons to be issued to Her Majesty's Naval and Military Forces.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SCOTLAND)—ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITY TEACHING.

MR. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether his attention has been called to the Report of Mr. Ogilvie, Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools for the Northern Division of Scotland, for 1885;

and to his statement therein (Report of Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, 1885-6, page 237), that—

> "The link between the Elementary School and the University is year by year getting weaker, because the stiffer subjects are less remunerative to the school exchequer;"

and to the statement of Mr. Andrew, also one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools (page 238 of same Report), that—

> "Knowing as I do what the general character of the Aberdeenshire Schools was some 15 years ago, and quite as conscious as anyone can be of how much teaching in them has, in many respects, benefited by the influence of the Code, nothing has struck me more, in renewing my acquaintance with them during the past year, than the all but complete extinction of the University subjects;"

and, whether the Scotch Education Department have taken any, and, if so, what, steps for maintaining, in that Division of Scotland, the standard of education in terms of "The Education (Scotland) Act, 1872?"

THE SECRETARY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): I have considered the passage in the reports of Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Andrew referred to, in connection with other evidence bearing on this point. Their Lordships have endeavoured, by certain provisions which have been, from time to time, introduced into the Scotch Code, to encourage the higher subjects; but the terms of the Code must necessarily apply, not to one division, but, except in certain points relating to specified Highland counties, to the three divisions alike.

ARMY—OFFICERS' QUARTERS—SALE OF PREMISES, PORTSMOUTH, OCCUPIED BY THE COMMANDING OFFICER OF ROYAL ENGINEERS.

SIR WILLIAM CROSSMAN (Portsmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it has been decided to dispose of the premises at Portsmouth now occupied by the Commanding Royal Engineers of the Southern District; if so, whether the Corporation of Portsmouth will be allowed to purchase the property at a valuation; and, if not required by the Corporation, how the property will be disposed of, whether by public auction or otherwise?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The property in question will be sold by public tender; and the Corporation of Portsmouth will have the same opportunity of tendering as will be afforded to private individuals.

DEFENCES OF THE EMPIRE—COALING STATION AT CASTRIES (WEST INDIES).

SIR WILLIAM CROSSMAN (Portsmouth) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is intended to make the harbour of Castries, in St. Lucia, one of the coaling stations for Her Majesty's Fleet; how much has been voted by the Legislature of the Island for the improvement of the harbour; and, if Castries is made a coaling station, whether the place will be put in a proper state of defence, and the head-quarters of the troops stationed in the Windward and Leeward Islands moved from Barbadoes to St. Lucia?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) (who replied) said: Yes, Sir, the harbour of Castries, in St. Lucia, is to be a naval coaling station; £70,000 has been voted by the Legislature of the Island for the improvement of the harbour, and the place will be fortified as soon as Parliament votes the necessary funds. The troops will be moved from Barbadoes to St. Lucia.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—ULSTER WINTER ASSIZES—CONVICTION OF M'GRATH.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether, in a case heard at the last Ulster Winter Assizes, at Armagh, against two men, named Hillman and M'Grath, charged with having been concerned in the affray at the tramway stables during the recent Belfast riots, the jury acquitted Hillman, and at first disagreed as to M'Grath, but, having re-examined two witnesses, named Lacky and Whelan (the former of whom was himself charged with murder), who swore that they had pointed out M'Grath in the stable yard at the time of the affray to a sergeant of the Constabulary, the jury then convicted M'Grath, and he was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment; whether the sergeant in question, John Murphy, can testify that neither of the witnesses pointed out M'Grath to him; and that M'Grath was not in the stable yard at the time of the affray; and, whether the case will be made the subject of inquiry?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University), in reply, said, the witnesses Lacky and Whelan had been examined and cross-examined in the usual way, and a verdict was found by the jury. Sergeant Murphy states that M'Grath was not pointed out to him. On the occasion of the affray he did not know M'Grath's appearance, and could not say whether he was there or not. The Crown Solicitor had not reported on other points in the Question, and he (the Attorney General for Ireland) had ordered him to do so, and was making further inquiries in the matter.

ISLANDS OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC—ISLAND OF MALAYTA—H.M.S. "OPAL."

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he is yet in a position to give any information regarding the statement as to the bombardment of villages in the Islands of Malayta and Lentara by H.M.S. *Opal*, concerning which a Question was asked on the 6th of September last; and, whether, in the course of her investigations of the outrages to which he referred, in his answer to that Question, the *Opal* engaged in any belligerent reprisals upon Natives; and, if so, whether he will lay Papers concerning them before Parliament?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): Reports have been received from the Commander-in-Chief on the Australian Station detailing certain outrages by the Natives of one of the Islands of the Solomon Group; and also giving the conclusions arrived at by the Officers who were directed to investigate these occurrences. These outrages resulted in the murder of several white men. The Chief of the tribe who were guilty of those acts having declined to give either explanations or make reparation, the *Opal* punished the village of the tribe by firing upon it. There will be no objection to the production of the Papers relating to the matter.

NORTH BORNEO — ATTACK ON NATIVES—H.M.S. "ZEPHYR."

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether his attention has been called to a statement that H.M. Gunboat *Zephyr* had, in the course of a cruise undertaken for the purpose of "settling some trouble with Natives" in North Borneo, shelled villages and landed a boat's crew which destroyed two villages and some canoes; and, whether he has received any Report on the subject, and if he will lay Papers concerning it upon the Table?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): A gunboat was sent to punish a piratical tribe who had been guilty of some rather serious acts of kidnapping in Darvel Bay—a place of bad repute for piracy. Some of their boats and huts were burnt; but, as far as we know, there were no casualties. The hon. Gentleman can have the officer's Report if he moves for it.

POST OFFICE—THE SUBMARINE TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

MR. MONTAGU (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) asked the Postmaster General, How long the monopoly of the Submarine Telegraph Company will continue; and, whether he has considered how far it is desirable that telegraph messages between England and France should be conveyed through the medium of a private Company?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): The concessions held by the Submarine Telegraph Company from the French and Belgian Governments cease in January, 1889. The subject referred to in the latter part of the hon. Member's Question is engaging my serious consideration.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—THE FISHERY DISPUTE.

MR. GOURLEY (Sunderland) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he can give the House any information regarding the measures proposed to be adopted by the United States Government arising out of the seizure of American fishing vessels in Canadian Waters; whether it is correct that the United States Legislatures have empowered the President to refuse, by proclamation, the entrance into United States Waters of Canadian ships from British North American ports, and also of fresh or salt fish, or any other product and, whether he can, without inconvenience to the Public Service, at once place upon the Table of the House all Correspondence upon the question?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): Correspondence on the subject of the North American Fisheries will shortly be presented to Parliament. This will afford all necessary information on the question up to a recent date, and will include the text of an Act passed in June last, to enable the President, under certain circumstances, to refuse commercial facilities to foreign vessels in United States ports. A Bill is now under the consideration of the United States Legislature to empower the President to restrict still further commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States; but the Bill has not yet become law. A despatch from the Government of Canada is on its way, containing suggestions for a *modus vivendi* between the two countries on this subject. It is not possible for Her Majesty's Government to make any proposals to the Government of the United States until they have received and considered that despatch.

In answer to a further Question by Mr. Gourley,

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON replied that the intentions of Her Majesty's Government would be fully set forth in the Correspondence, which would be published shortly.

ADMIRALTY.—ADMINISTRATION OF THE DOCKYARDS.

Sir WILLIAM PLOWDEN (Wolverhampton, E.) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, whether the arrangements for improving the administration of the Dockyards, and reducing the expenditure and time occupied in building and repairing ships, arrangements which were commenced last year by the appointment of a Director of Dockyards, and Civil Assistants to the Naval Superintendents, have yet been completed; if not, to what extent have offices yet to be filled in the Department of Director of Dockyards, and what is the cause of the delay?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): The arrangements are completed; but the composition of the staff of the Director of Dockyards has not yet been finally decided upon by the Admiralty. The arrangements will probably be completed shortly.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT).—THE ROYAL GUN FACTORY, WOOLWICH.—DEDUCTIONS FROM PAY.

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether a large number of workmen employed in the Field Gun Section of the Royal Gun Factory, Woolwich, in July last, complained, through the prescribed channels, against a deduction (equivalent to three and a-half hours) alleged by them to have been improperly made from their pay on the observance of the anniversary of Her Majesty's birthday; and, whether such complaint has yet been considered?

The SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. Northcote) (Exeter): The men in question did make a representation to the manager of the Factory as to a deduction from their wages; and the manager, through an error of judgment, for which he has been admonished, omitted to bring the representation to the notice of the Superintendent. It is stated that the course pursued was in accordance with recognized rules; but the men's representation will now receive all consideration, and, if a hardship is found to have been inflicted, steps will be taken to have it removed.

POST OFFICE — LETTER CARRIERS' GOOD CONDUCT BADGES.

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Postmaster General, Whether the issue of good conduct badges to letter carriers had been suspended; and, if so, for what reason?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member, I have to state that the issue of good-conduct stripes to letter carriers has not been suspended. There appears to be a general impression that these good-conduct stripes are unlimited—that a well-conducted letter carrier has only to serve five, 10, or 15 years, and to succeed to one, two, or three stripes as a matter of course. But such is not the case. They are, on the contrary, strictly limited; and a letter carrier, although in point both of conduct and service qualified to receive them, must await a vacancy.

INDIA—INCOME TAX ON TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether officials in India pay Income Tax on the travelling and contract allowances drawn by them, or merely on the amounts received as salaries?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): According to law in India, Income Tax is payable on salaries only, and not on travelling or other allowances granted to meet specific expenditure.

POST OFFICE—CONVEYANCE OF AMERICAN MAILS.

MR. GOURLEY (Sunderland) asked the Postmaster General, Whether he has entered into a new arrangement for the conveyance of the American mails with British shipowners only; granting them an annual subsidy (in addition to the payment for the mails), and in return for which the owners are to place their vessels under the absolute command of the Government in the event of war; if so, whether he will be good enough to inform the House of the nature of the new arrangement?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): I am glad to be able to inform the hon. Member that I have concluded arrangements with two British Companies, the Cunard and Oceanic, for the conveyance of mails from Queenstown to New York by their best ships throughout the year, in winter as well as in summer. The price to be paid for letters is 3*s.* per lb., as compared with 4*s.* paid under the old contract, and 3*s.* 6*d.*, the lowest sum for which the Cunard and Oceanic Companies tendered on the last occasion. The despatch of the mails for conveyance by the contract packets will take place every Wednesday and Saturday night; and, in addition to these two regular despatches, the Post Office will send mails by other fast steamers either from Queenstown or from Southampton. As the names of the ships sailing are not commonly known to the public, letters can be marked "by Inman Line" or "by German Line" when intended for those steamers. This plan will practically give four mails a week from this country to America—namely, every Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Saturday, besides the occasional chance of sending by such fast steamers as the *Alaska*, the *Arizona*, and the *City of Rome;* and I think this will satisfy all reasonable requirements. As regards the latter part of the Question, I can only say that the negotiations are not yet sufficiently advanced to enable my hon. Friend the Secretary to the Admiralty, who has the matter in hand, to describe the arrangements.

In answer to Mr. GOURLEY,

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) Middlesex, Ealing) said: I cannot give any sufficient answer to the hon. Member's question within the limits of a Parliamentary answer. The contracts entered into with these Companies, however, will be laid upon the Table, and the House will then be able to judge of their merits.

MR. WHITLEY (Liverpool, Everton) asked how long these contracts would last?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES): The new contracts have been concluded for 13 months from March 1 next, so as to make them coincide with the duration of the financial year. After the expiration of that period they, will be terminable by a year's notice upon either side.

ARMY—MILITARY BALLOONING.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in view of the fact that leading Continental Powers have adopted balloons as a regular part of their military organization, and on a considerable scale, it is proposed to adopt a similar system in our own Army, and to continue experiments in military ballooning; and, whether any and what funds have been included for this purpose in this year's Estimates.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Balloons have been used in war by several foreign nations, and by ourselves in the Soudan and in South Africa. The War Office is making experiments in military ballooning, and has recently constructed balloons which it believes to be superior for military purposes to those of any other nation. We propose to include the sum of £2,000 in next year's Estimates for this Service.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE—CHANCERY TAXING MASTER'S OFFICE.

Colonel DUNCAN (Finsbury, Holborn) asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether there are bills of costs still untaxed in the Chancery Taxing Master's Office, which have been lodged for taxation for more than a year; and, whether he will order a Return to be made, showing the date when each bill of costs now in the Chancery Taxing Master's Office was lodged there?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) (Isle of Wight): In consequence of the Question of the hon. and gallant Member, I have made inquiries into the matter, and I have obtained Reports from the Taxing Masters which enable me to say that no bills requiring taxation have been lodged for more than a year. There is no difficulty in obtaining appointments for the taxation for any bill within a month of the application. Cases in which bills have remained untaxed for periods exceeding a year, are those in which the parties do not desire the taxation to be proceeded with. If the hon. and gallant Member desires, I will ascertain whether the Return in question can be prepared.

PARLIAMENT — ORDER — DISALLOWANCE OF QUESTION AS TO LORD COWPER'S COMMISSION ON IRISH LAND.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) had the following Notice of Question upon the Paper:—"To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Sir Redvers Buller and other witnesses examined before Lord Cowper's Commission have been invited or permitted to cancel, or materially alter, certain portions of their evidence; and, whether the original evidence, as well as the substituted version, will be published with the Report of the Commission?" Before the hon. Member proceeded to ask the Question—

Mr. SPEAKER rose and said: It is my duty to call the attention of the House to Question No. 21, to which my attention was only directed this morning, and which I had not seen on the Paper previously. There have been several instances this Session of Questions having been presented to me which contained imputations and reflections upon persons outside this House; and this Question—No. 21—contains, I think, an insinuation and imputation of a very grave character indeed; not only against the Government, but against the witnesses who gave their evidence before Lord Cowper's Commission. I do not think that a Question ought to be made the vehicle for insinuation or imputation of this very grave character. Of course, I have nothing to do with the nature of the charge made by the hon. Gentleman; but that charge, in my opinion, ought to be made when there is an opportunity of replying to it in debate or by a definite Motion before the House. It is not, I think, right or fair that charges of this kind should be made in a Question, since, under the limits imposed by Parliamentary Procedure in answer to Questions, no adequate opportunity can be afforded to the parties implicated to answer them in the House.

Mr. SEXTON: I submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Question; but I wish to say that I shall make it a subject of debate.

LAW AND JUSTICE—JURORS IN CRIMINAL TRIALS.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the practice on criminal trials in England, either generally or in cases of a political nature, for the Public Prosecutor or his representative to order jurors to stand by; and, if so, in what cases and what extent?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): It is the constant practice on criminal trials in England in all cases, whether political or not, to do what is practically equivalent to ordering jurors to stand by—namely, to suggest to the officer of the Court the names of those jurors whom the prosecution or the defence desire not to have called; in order that the panel should be gone through and exhausted before those jurors are called and either challenged or ordered to stand by. The right of the prosecution publicly to order jurors to stand by is undoubted; "Mansell *v.* The Queen" (8, "E. and B." 54) and such cases not unfrequently occur.

Mr. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid) asked where the law was laid down that prosecutors had a right to challenge jurors?

Mr. MATTHEWS said, that was a question of law, which it would be wise, he thought, if he declined to answer. It had better be put to some person learned in the law, like his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General. The law on the subject was laid down in a case in 8, "Ellis and Blackburn."

Mr. MAURICE HEALY said, that the right hon. and learned Gentleman had not answered his Question as to what extent the practice of ordering jurors to stand aside was exercised in England?

Mr. MATTHEWS said, that the practice of suggesting to the officer of the Court the names of jurors who were not to be called was a general one, and the right was constantly exercised.

Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) asked, Whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman meant to suggest that the practice he had described ever publicly took place in an English Court?

Mr. MATTHEWS said, that he had already referred to the leading case in which it did take place. The case occurred at the Old Bailey, in which the right of the Crown to order jurors to stand aside was challenged and decided to exist.

Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman had evaded the question as to the frequency of the practice. He was asking whether, in reference to what the right hon. and learned Gentleman had stated was a constant practice, it ever publicly took place in English trials.

Mr. MATTHEWS said, that it was done by communication between the counsel on either side and the officer of the Court, and so far was in a sense a public proceeding.

Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN (Denbighshire, E.) wished to know the date of the case to which the right hon. and learned Gentleman had referred.

Mr. MATTHEWS said, that he was not prepared to give its date at that moment; but he assumed, from the fact that it had been reported in 8, "Ellis and Blackburn," that it had occurred somewhere in the "fifties."

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: Is it the practice that each prisoner has an equal right with the Crown to challenge jurors?

Mr. MATTHEWS: Certainly.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—RECORD OF JURORS ORDERED BY THE CROWN TO STAND BY IN CRIMINAL TRIALS.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether a record is kept by the Crown Solicitor or otherwise of the names or of the aggregate number of jurors ordered by the Crown to stand by on criminal trials in Ireland; whether, if so, the Government will be willing to grant a Return showing the number of jurors ordered to stand by by the Crown in criminal cases of an agrarian or political character for the past six years in Ireland; and, whether, if not, he will direct such a Return to be kept henceforward?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): No such record is kept as that referred to in the Question of the hon. Member; and I do not see what advantage would be derived from such a record, as any Return based on it would almost necessarily be misleading.

BURIAL ACT, 1880—CONSECRATION OF CEMETERIES — THE REFUSAL OF BISHOPS.

Mr. WOODALL (Hanley) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is his intention to institute legal proceedings against those Bishops who, in consequence of the passing of the Burial Act of 1880, have refused, or may refuse, to consecrate cemeteries in their dioceses?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): No, Sir. The Secretary of State has no authority or jurisdiction over Bishops, and no legal proceedings can be instituted against Bishops who refuse to consecrate cemeteries. The Archbishop of the Province has power to decide any dispute that may arise in consequence of such refusal.

BURIAL GROUNDS BILL—CONSECRATION OF CEMETERIES.

Mr. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, in view of the fact that the Burial Grounds Bill now before Parliament, which is similar to the Bill read a second time May 1886, will, if passed, remove the objections now taken to the consecration of cemeteries, he will suspend legal proceedings against Burial Boards in regard to consecration until Parliament has had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the question?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): The hon. Member asks me to suspend the operation of the existing law until the House has had an opportunity of expressing its opinion on a Bill proposing to alter the law. I am not clothed with any such dispensing power, and must therefore decline to accept the suggestion of the hon. Member.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)—AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether there exists at present any system of public audit in reference to the accounts of the official assignees of the Court of Bankruptcy in Ireland; and, whether, if not, the Government propose, in view of the recent disclosures in the case of Mr. Lucius H. James, to amend the law on the subject?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): There is no general audit by a public officer of those accounts; but under the Bankruptcy Act of 1866 there is a provision for an audit by the Court in each individual case; and I think this audit, if carried out, would be probably the most satisfactory.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Would the right hon. and learned Gentleman state why it is not carried out?

MR. HOLMES: No, Sir; I really do not know.

CONFERENCE OF COLONIAL REPRESENTATIVES — STATE-DIRECTED COLONIZATION.

MR. SETON-KARR (St. Helen's) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether Her Majesty's Government would use their influence to bring the subject of State-directed Colonization before the approaching Conference of Colonial Representatives for discussion?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): The special Questions that are proposed for discussion at the Conference have been stated in my Predecessor's Circular Despatch of November 25 last; and, unless this subject is one which, to use the words of the Circular,

> "In the general opinion of the Colonial Governments might be properly and usefully brought under consideration,"

Her Majesty's Government would not think it desirable to depart from the conditions laid down in that Despatch. The views of Her Majesty's Government upon this important subject were fully stated by the Marquess of Salisbury, on Friday last, to the Deputation of the State-directed Colonization Association.

VENEZUELA — SEIZURE OF THE "HENRIETTA" AND "JOSEPHINE" —CLAIMS OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the outrages committed by the Venezuelan Authorities on the crews and passengers of the British merchant vessels *Henrietta* and *Josephine*, illegally seized in May, 1883, have yet been redressed; whether any, and what, reply has been received to the further communications from the British Foreign Office, which the right hon. Gentleman stated, in August last, was about to be sent to the Venezuelan Government; and whether due diligence, and sufficient attention and solicitude, has been given by the British Officials in Trinidad to the claims of the British subjects in question?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): I regret to say that no redress has yet been obtained in the cases referred to. No reply has been received to the demands which Her Majesty's Government have felt compelled to address to the Venezuelan Government in October last; notwithstanding the repeated representations of Her Majesty's Minister at Caracas. There is great reason to apprehend that all chances of obtaining redress by diplomatic means are exhausted. Every attention has been paid by the Governor of Trinidad to the claims of the British subjects concerned.

GOLD AND SILVER PLATE—THE REVENUE ACT, 1887.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, with reference to Clause 4 of "The

Revenue Act, 1884," chap. 62, in which it is provided that—

> "Articles of foreign plate which in the opinion of the Commissioners of Customs may be properly described as hand-chased, inlaid, bronzed or filigree work of oriental pattern, shall, subject to the payment of the proper Duties of Customs, be exempted from assay in the United Kingdom;"

What instructions have been issued to officers of Her Majesty's Customs for the purpose of deciding what is or what is not an "oriental pattern," and how the Commissioners of Customs themselves decide as to what is "oriental" and what "occidental" or otherwise; and, seeing that a short clause in "The Revenue Act, 1884," effected the exemption of certain foreign plate from the ancient law of compulsory hall-marking, Her Majesty's Government will, in "The Revenue Act, 1887," provide for similar facilities for trade in the United Kingdom in gold and silver plate by abolishing the principle of compulsory hall-marking, and by making hall-marking of gold and silver plate a voluntary institution?

The SECRETARY (Baron **Henry De Worms**) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I understand that the instructions issued by the Commissioners of Customs are that every article of foreign plate which is claimed to be of oriental pattern, and therefore exempt from assay, should be submitted to them for their personal inspection. After considering the claim, and any Reports which may be called for from their experts in any doubtful case, the Commissioners themselves decide whether, in their opinion, the claim is a proper one, and issue directions accordingly. The question of the abolition of compulsory hall-marking is too important to be dealt with in the manner suggested by the hon. Member; and I can only say that the subject shall receive consideration when a fitting opportunity occurs.

PRISON SITES—HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

Mr. J. ROWLANDS (Finsbury, E.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Government intend to take prompt action to secure the carrying out of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, that the prison sites mentioned in their Report be utilized for the erection of artizans' dwellings?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. **Matthews**) (Birmingham, E.): I informed the hon. Member, in reply to a somewhat similar Question which he addressed to me last Session, that, having in view the recommendation he refers to, I had offered these sites to the Metropolitan Board of Works, who, however, did not then see their way to purchasing them for the purpose of erecting artizans' dwellings. It consequently became my duty to try and dispose of the sites, having two ends in view—namely, that the sites should be sold for a fair price approved of by the Treasury, and that they should be utilized for the benefit of the neighbourhood and of the industrial classes. I have within the last few days received offers for the purchase of the larger site—Coldbath Fields—which are now under consideration, and which I hope may result in the accomplishment of these two ends.

PRISON SITES—CLERKENWELL PRISONS.

Captain PENTON (Finsbury, Central) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has considered the question of the advisability of commencing the demolition of the disused Clerkenwell Prisons, with a view to giving work to the unemployed of the district?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. **Matthews**) (Birmingham, E.): In reply to the Question of my hon. and gallant Friend, I have to say that the question of the demolition of the buildings is closely connected with the question of sale. The offers I have received have been for the site with the buildings upon it. Until these offers have been disposed of I cannot issue any directions on the subject.

RAILWAYS (IRELAND)—THE DUBLIN "LOOP LINE" SCHEME.

Mr. EWART (Belfast, N.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether, in May 1884, representations were made to the Postmaster General by the four great Railway Companies in Ireland and the City of Dublin Steam Packet Company, who were supporting a Bill then before Parliament called the "Loop Line" Scheme, for connecting the several

Railways in Dublin, to the effect that they had agreed upon that scheme as a practical mode of carrying out what they had long in their minds; that it has always been a desideratum to get direct Railway communication between the different systems of Railways in Dublin, and that the only connection that is believed to be wanted now is one between the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway and the other Railways; that the Directors have agreed to recommend it to the shareholders, and the Directors have agreed to this Bill; and that that may be taken as an indication of the cordiality which exists among the four Companies, and as a guarantee that if this scheme is sanctioned it will be worked thoroughly well in the public good; whether, at the request of the said Company, who attended as a deputation on the Postmaster General to secure his support to the Bill, Mr. Fawcett directed Mr. Allen, Inspector of Mails in Ireland, to give evidence in favour of the Bill, and to state his, Mr. Fawcett's, opinion to the Committee of the House of Commons, that the Line, if authorized by Parliament, would give very important facilities; whether Mr. Allen gave evidence that the saving of time would be very considerable, from an hour and a-half to an hour and 40 minutes, and that the saving of expense to the Government would be great if the Loop Line were made; whether any intimation has been received from the Companies; and, if any, whether before or after the execution of the existing contracts with the Company, that they had declined to carry out the Line; and, whether any steps have been taken by the parties towards making the Line; and, if not, whether the Government will urge the parties to carry out their engagements, and will include the said engagement in the contract now pending for the carriage of the American Mails?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): A deputation from the Companies in question had an interview with the Postmaster General, the late Mr. Fawcett, on the date mentioned; but there is no record kept at the Post Office of any statements made at the time by the deputation. As stated by my hon. Friend, the Postmaster General deputed Mr. Allen to attend before the Committee of the House of Commons, and a report of his evidence may be found in the shorthand writer's notes. No intimation from the Companies in respect to the execution of the loop-line was received before the mail contracts of recent date were concluded. I understand that no steps have yet been taken towards making the line. The Government are not at this moment in a position to give any such pledge as that implied in the concluding paragraph of the hon. Member's Question; but I may say that the non-performance of their undertaking by the Companies has operated very strongly to counterbalance the advantages of the Queenstown mail line, and if this loop is not constructed without delay must tend to prejudice that line, whenever future contracts are under consideration.

ARMY—ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—KRUPP GUNS.

Colonel HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether, in the year 1862 or thereabouts, three rifled steel guns—namely, a 20-pounder, a 40-pounder, and a 100-pounder respectively, were sent over to this Country by Herr Krupp, of Germany, to be tested to extreme limits; whether they were subjected to the severest strains and tests to which it is possible to subject guns; and, whether any report of these trials was ever drawn up and published; and, if so, if he will lay it upon the Table of the House?

The SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. Northcote) (Exeter): About the year 1862 Mr. Krupp sent over three blocks of steel for conversion into guns. They were submitted to the endurance tests usual at that time, and the smallest gun of the three withstood a severer trial. The Report of the Ordnance Select Committee on these experiments was published to Artillery officers and others in the first volume of the extracts from the Reports and Proceedings of the Ordnance Select Committee. As the hon. and gallant Member was at the time an officer in the Royal Artillery he probably had the Report. As regards present publication, I fail to see the advantage of publishing Reports on experiments made 24 years ago with patterns of guns which are now passing out of the Service. If, however, it be desired, I shall be happy to place the volume in the Library of the House.

ARMY—ROYAL HORSE ARTILLERY—THE "MAIWAND" BATTERY.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in view of the fact that one of the Batteries of the Royal Horse Artillery ordered to be reduced—namely, "E" Battery, "B" Brigade, is the Battery that has earned historic reputation as the "Maiwand" Battery, from the services it performed in that memorable action, when it lost heavily in officers, men, and horses, and yet escaped capture, he will take into consideration the possibility of retaining this Battery on the establishment of the Royal Horse Artillery, or, if necessary, reducing another Battery in its place?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): A Battery of the Royal Horse Artillery having to be reduced, the Rules of the Service prescribed the E Battery as the one for reduction, and though it has a very distinguished record of service, it has no monopoly in that respect among Horse Artillery Batteries. I may add that honours won by individual Batteries accrue to the Royal Regiment of Artillery as a whole; and I am sure, therefore, that the services of the E Battery run no risk of being forgotten.

FISHERY DEPARTMENT (ENGLAND AND WALES)—BEAM TRAWLING.

MR. ROWNTREE (Scarborough) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to confer upon the Fishery Department for England powers to regulate or suspend beam trawling within territorial waters where it is desirable so to do, as recommended by the Parliamentary Commission of 1878, and by the Royal Commission of 1885, and as conferred already upon the Fishery Boards of Ireland and of Scotland?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Royal Commission on Trawling, in their Report of 1885, stated that they would not be justified in making such a sweeping recommendation as the general prohibition of trawling within territorial waters; but intimated that, in connection with experiments for testing the effect of trawling, power must be given to the authorities superintending them to prohibit trawling or any form of fishing in certain places for such time as may be necessary. The question of conferring upon the Fisheries Department for England the powers referred to by the hon. Member, is one which will receive attention when legislation in connection with the fisheries is under consideration.

MR. MARJORIBANKS (Berwickshire) asked, whether it was not the case that the Scottish Fishery Board had absolute power to prohibit trawling within the three-mile limit?

BARON HENRY DE WORMS said, he did not think the Scottish Fishery Board had absolute power. They had powers greater than the English Fishery Board; but at present it was not contemplated to extend those powers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [EIGHTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January.]—[See page 84.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

AGRARIAN AFFAIRS (IRELAND).

MR. PARNELL (Cork) in rising to move the following Amendment:—

> "But humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the relations between the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland have not been seriously disturbed in the cases of those owners who have granted to their tenants such abatements of rents as are called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce, and that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is not to be found in increased stringency of criminal procedure, or in the pursuit of such novel, doubtful, and unconstitutional measures as have recently been taken by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland, but in such a reform of the Law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people,"

said: Mr. Speaker, the Amendment which I propose to move to the Address deals with four points. It states that disturbance between the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland, which is complained of in the Address, has not taken place where suitable concessions have been given to their tenants by owners, and in this connection it will be my duty undoubtedly to attach serious blame to the Government for the rejection of the Tenants' Relief Bill of last Session, which would have effectually prevented or have very much limited the disturbances which have taken place. Then, Sir, secondly, I point out that coercion will fail, as it always has failed, sooner or later, in bringing about a better state of affairs in Ireland, whether between the owners and occupiers, or in that larger field which I may call the international relations between the two countries. If the intention of the Government is to undertake coercion, as is foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne—a coercion which is called by the euphonious name of an alteration or reform in criminal procedure—the result will be that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant will find himself at the top of a very unpleasant inclined plane, and that he will speedily, like Oliver Twist, be found in this House asking for more. Coercion such as the right hon. Gentleman evidently contemplates in the Queen's Speech is coercion against his political opponents in Ireland. He does not claim—in fact, he expressly denies, and rather plumes himself on the fact—that there has been an increase of crime in Ireland during the last few months. He claims, on the contrary, a large diminution of agrarian outrages. What he wants is to tackle his political opponents in the country—the authors of the Plan of Campaign, and the speakers of open and advised speeches. Some of them are Members of this House, and they appear to have entered into a competition with Her Majesty's Government in Ireland as to who should produce the best plan for taking a short cut to the better government of that country. Well, Sir, if the right hon. Gentleman gets into this slippery path he will find himself unable to stop. It will only be the beginning of his coercion. All experience in Ireland has shown that when you muzzle your political opponents, and put them in gaol, your work is only beginning; and that open agitation and advised speaking having been stopped, having been thrust under the surface, the Government is immediately face to face with the dreadful existence of secret societies and with the revival of agrarian and political crime in its worst forms; and the Chief Secretary will find himself obliged to come to Parliament, like the late Mr. Forster, and require this House to provide him with newer and stronger weapons to deal with a state of affairs which his own action has brought about. There is yet time; the right hon. Gentleman may even now be dissuaded from entering upon this course of action, and may be induced to rely rather upon the removal of grievances, the amelioration of the condition of the people, and the alteration of the system of government in Ireland, than upon those antiquated methods of procedure—this yoke of coercion, which always has created and always will create fresh obstacles and difficulties. My Amendment, Sir, also complains that the Government have been guilty of unusual, doubtful, and unconstitutional courses in Ireland during the last few months. At first sight, it might be supposed that I was referring to the exercise of the dispensing power, or the pressure which the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary boasted at Bristol that he had brought to bear against Irish landlords. This is not the case, although I shall have to deal with that phase of the events of last winter later on. Although I shall have to point out that the Government, by the adoption of their Plan of Campaign and of this dispensing power, have not cleared themselves from the blame which attaches to them for their rejection of the Tenants' Relief Bill, yet I do not propose to criticize the Government for that part of their course in Ireland. It was the best thing, under the circumstances, for the Government to do. Sir, it was a very poor attempt at government; but, although it was a poor attempt, although the authors of the Plan of Campaign had no difficulty whatever in outshining them and in concocting a better plan of action, and one with far greater and more successful results than that of the Government of the Queen, yet it was the only thing that was left for the unfortunate Chief Secretary to do, and he did it with the best materials at his command. Certainly, he was ably assisted by the gentlemen he pressed into his service—Sir Redvers Buller, County Court Judge Curran, Captain Plunkett, and the other officials who helped him in this dispensing power. But the blame is not in that direction; it is rather in the direction of the actions, illegal, unusual, and outside the law, which they committed in their attempts in the other direction—in the direction of upholding what they called the law in Ireland. I will refer to a few only of their mistakes. I cannot go over the whole of their misdeeds within the last few months; I should weary and detain the House too much by the recital. I shall only refer to some of the more leading mistakes as fair examples of the rest. To begin with, let me mention their invocation of the inherent jurisdiction of the Court of Queen's Bench in Ireland against an alleged political offender, my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon). They wanted to take a short cut towards the maintenance of law and order in Ireland, and in attempting to do so they did what is without precedent even in the government of that country. It is the first time that what is called the inherent jurisdiction of the Court of Queen's Bench has been invoked for the purpose of securing a rule of bail against the offender. The Government were guilty of a mean, unprecedented, and unconstitutional action in attempting to deprive the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Mayo of his liberty. There can be no doubt they thought he would not be able to get bail, and that they would thus be able to shut him up in prison instead of bringing him before the ordinarily constituted Courts of Law and trying him before a Judge and jury. Well, Sir, let me refer also to the proclamation of the Sligo meeting. That meeting was called in a legal and constitutional manner, and for a perfectly legal and constitutional purpose. It was called for two purposes: the first was to discuss the land question and the alteration in the law necessary to settle that question; the second purpose was to protest against the illegal conduct of the Sheriff of the County of Sligo in wilfully breaking the law—Lord O'Hagan's Jury Act—in no fewer than three particulars in the formation of the jury panel for the County of Sligo. These were both perfectly legitimate objects. It was quite right for the people to discuss those questions and the alterations in the law that Parliament ought to make; and it was quite right, while there was yet time, that they should call attention to that illegal action and protest against it before the liberties of innocent persons had been sacrificed. I may mention as a proof of the legality of the complaint that when the Assizes commenced the question was brought before the Judge by counsel for the prisoners. The composition of the jury panel was defended, and Chief Baron Palles, one of the highest legal authorities in Ireland, stated that in three separate particulars Lord O'Hagan's Jury Act had been deliberately broken, and that probably there was not a single man on the jury panel who would have been on it if the panel had been legally struck; and either Her Majesty's Government or Chief Baron Palles did what was equivalent to quashing the panel, and the Assize was postponed. The Government did not want this matter discussed; up to the last the counsel for the Crown supported the Sheriff in his illegal action, and the Government had also supported him previously by proclaiming the Sligo meeting, which was called for the purposes I have mentioned. On the legal question I should like to ask the Irish Law Officers under what statute or authority it is the Lord Lieutenant claims to have power to proclaim meetings called for such purposes? In Ireland we have had examples of the proclamation of meetings by magistrates, when meetings have been prevented by armed forces; but in a recent decision of the superior Courts of this country, it has been held that magistrates have not the right to stop a public meeting. In your English history a right of public meeting was asserted by the sacrifice of lives and the spilling of much blood at Peterloo. In Ireland we have always on such occasions overwhelming forces of military and police to contend with. We have never been able to assert our right of public meeting in the same fashion. But, I wish to ask, on what authority, by what law and statute, and, if by Common Law, under what judicial decisions did the Government in Ireland proclaim this Sligo meeting? They not only proclaimed the meeting—which, after the Proclamation no attempt was made to hold—but the day before that on which the meeting was to have been held, when the High Sheriff of Dublin, who is one of the magistrates for the division of the County in which the town of Sligo is situate, had gone down to the town of Sligo, and was proceeding to the Town Hall, in company of the Mayor of Sligo, who was also a county magistrate, for the purpose of consulting together with their friends as to the action that ought to be taken in view of the Government proclamation, these gentlemen, and the persons who accompanied them, were violently attacked by the police, under the shadow of the Town Hall, while they were waiting for the purpose of securing the key of that building, and a large number of persons were seriously injured, one of them, Mr. John or Nicholas Devine, having had his skull fractured, and being still in a very precarious and dangerous condition, owing to the assault. For this there has been no redress, and I do not suppose there will be any. I should like also to ask the Government why Mr. Devine's skull was fractured. Now, Sir, I also complain of the jury panel in Sligo, which I condemn as one way about as good as could be chosen to induce the Irish people to despise and dislike the administration of the law. What are the facts of this jury panel at the Connaught Winter Assizes? On a jury panel where more than one-half of the jurors—the persons summoned as jurors—were Roman Catholics, and in a province where nine-tenths of the population are Catholics, three juries were struck for the trial of agrarian cases, on which not a single Roman Catholic was allowed to be put. A fourth jury was struck on which there was only one Roman Catholic, who was a bailiff, and under the influence of the landlords, and yet, Sir, the Government expect the Irish people to believe in the justness of the administration of the law, where three-fourths of the population of the whole country and nine-tenths of the population of the county are only allowed one single representative on juries to try political and agrarian cases. No wonder that when by some chance a Catholic or two manage to get upon a jury they should disagree with the Protestant jurors. Now, Sir, there is another example of the meanness—because I cannot invent a less hard and harsh term for their conduct in Ireland—there is another example of the meanness of the Government administration. When, after an interval of two months, they had failed to put the hon. Member for East Mayo into gaol by the short cut of invoking the inherent jurisdiction of the Queen's Bench, and when they had at length taken proceedings to bring him to trial before a Judge and a jury, they initiated these proceedings in the City of Dublin; but after the magistrate had returned the cases for trial the Crown came to the conclusion that they would get a better and more subservient jury in the County of Dublin, the jury panel in that County being very largely composed of half-pay English officers, and other retired Government officials, who might be depended upon to exhibit the least possible amount of prejudice against a man of the political proclivities of my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo. Consequently they had recourse to an obsolete statute, which never, I believe, had in modern times been used for the purpose, and removed the case by change of venue from the City of Dublin to the County. All I can say is that if the Crown succeed in convicting my hon. Friend by the adoption of such a mean trick as that, neither the justice of the verdict nor the validity of the proceedings will be recognized by an Irishman worthy of the name. It is one of the shabbiest and most miserable exhibitions of trickery and dodgery which had ever disgraced the carrying out of British misrule in Ireland. I sympathize deeply with a Government which finds itself reduced to such deplorable straits as to be obliged to hit its political opponents below the belt. I have said that I do not intend to condemn the Government for their dispensing action in Ireland. But I have also said that this dispensing action cannot be held to shield them from the consequence of their rejection of the Tenants' Relief Bill of last Session—a rejection which is the source and origin of all their troubles. Was there a necessity for the reduction of rents claimed by the Relief Bill? The Government said that there was not; and they invited their followers, with a light heart, to throw the Bill out. They did throw it out. But will they say so now? Will anybody contend in the face of the Governmental action last winter, so far as we have been able to disclose it as yet; but we have by no means got to the bottom of it—will anybody contend that there was not a necessity for large and general reduction of rent? I do not think that anybody will, because things have been going from bad to worse. The fall of prices has continued, and shown no sign yet of stopping. We are face to face with a

Front Bench which has no plan of reform for Ireland, no plan of amelioration for the tenants, no plan for easing the relations between landlord and tenant except their own stumbling, shifting, and broken-kneed processes carried out through the instrumentality of Sir Redvers Buller, Judge Curran, and others, who so distinguished themselves last winter in competition with my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo. I proposed in the Relief Bill that this law-and-order Government should proceed legally and constitutionally; that it should first amend the law, where it was shown to require amendment—and they admitted by their action afterwards in Ireland that it did require amendment—that, the law having been amended, they should have gone to work deliberately, before judicial officials appointed for the purpose, and with great experience in dealing with these cases, to decide, after the tenant had paid one-half of his rent and arrears, whether there was really a need for a reduction or a remission as regards the remainder. In that way you would have done something to train the Irish people in that respect for law and order which Her Majesty's Government profess to be so desirous to see instilled in their minds; but the Government tried a short cut again, and sent Judge Curran and Sir Redvers Buller to the County of Kerry. Why were these distinguished people, above all others, sent to the County of Kerry? I suppose it was for the purpose of still further persuading the people of the virtue of the observance of law and order. The County of Kerry happened to be not the most rack-rented County in Ireland; but it was the County in which there had been the greatest disturbance, and the greatest number of agrarian outrages, and in which moonlighting had been rifest and most rampant. This was the County which the Government chose for their operations. I suppose they did so for the purpose of teaching the lesson to the rest of Ireland that, where the tenants had made things absolutely unbearable, as they had done in Kerry, where life and property were unsafe, and where moonlighters were ransacking all parts of the County—this was the place chosen by Her Majesty's law-and-order Government for the purpose of exceptionally favouring the tenants and bringing about reductions in their rents—wholesale and sweeping reductions, as I shall show by-and-by—which, by the rejection of the Relief Bill, they had refused to the rest of Ireland because it was quiet; because there were no outrages, and which they provided special machinery for in the case of Kerry, but had provided no machinery for in the case of the rest of Ireland. The Government have alleged, as an excuse for their conduct in the rejection of the Relief Bill, that it was only applicable to judicial tenancies and leaseholds, and would not have reached the smaller tenants, such as those at Glenbeigh. Well, Sir, I should have been only too glad to have extended the Bill in Committee to the rest of the tenantry. I undoubtedly did err on the side of modesty, and I am sorry for it. I erred on the side of modesty and moderation in making my Bill too small; but that is not an argument which the Government is entitled to use. It was an argument which anybody was entitled to use against them on the Motion for a Second Reading, because the Bill might have been amended in Committee. I should have been only too glad to remedy this or any other blot. It has been said that the condition of the smaller tenantry, of which Glenbeigh affords an example, was so desperate, that they owed so many years' arrears, that they would have been unable to comply with the condition of the Bill—namely, the payment of half the rent and arrears. Now, this is not so. The Bill would amply have met the smaller class of tenants. The Glenbeigh estate, although typical in most respects of the condition of the congested or smaller tenanted estates of the country, is not typical of it in respect of the number of years' arrears which were due. The number of years' arrears on the Glenbeigh estate was owing to exceptional circumstances which do not exist on the great majority of Irish estates. It was owing to the fact that the original owner and the mortgagees had been in contention, and had served notices on each other, and had served notices on the tenants not to pay any rent. Both claimants to this estate had adopted a sort of "No rent" manifesto, and the tenants in this case had obeyed, and did not pay any rent for a number of years. But, as regards the greater number of estates in a similar position, the rents are paid up every year, so far as the tenants are able to pay, and no great number of years of arrears exist. Undoubtedly, the great majority of the tenants, by borrowing and scraping money together, would have been able to deposit the 50 per cent rent and arrears. Therefore, the example of the Glenbeigh estate is not at all applicable. It is said that the landlords had made a generous offer on the Glenbeigh estate. The generous offer made originally was that they should pay the whole five years' arrears with costs. In August, immediately after the present landlord had established his claim to the estate, he issued notices that he had established it. In September he took ejectment proceedings against the tenants in the County Court of Kerry, and in October these proceedings came on for trial, thus only giving the tenants one month to find five years' arrears before he proceeded to pile up costs, in most cases amounting to two or two and a-half years' rent in addition. It was this harsh conduct on the part of the landlord which ultimately prevented a settlement being arrived at. There can be no doubt that the tenants would have accepted the final offer of payment of half a year's rent if it had been free from the condition of paying costs, which amounted to two or two and a-half years' rent; and the infliction of these costs rendered it quite impossible to accept the apparently generous offer which was made. Hence the evictions and house-burnings, and the other features of the case. In this case the Relief Bill would have stepped in; but not even Judge Curran, with all the wide dispensing powers which he assumed, could prevent the tenants from being mulcted in these costs, the decree having carried with it the infliction of costs which they had no power to pay. If my Bill had been accepted, proceedings would have been stopped before the case came into Court by the payment of 50 per cent of rent and arrears, and thus an insurmountable barrier of costs, as in the case of Glenbeigh, would never have been created. It is also alleged, in defence of the conduct of the landlord of the Glenbeigh estate, that it was the action of the National League which prevented a settlement. Now, Sir, the National League never interfered with the Glenbeigh case at all until the evictions were in full swing. It was not until five houses had been burnt that the hon. Member for one of the divisions of Kerry appeared on the scene for the first time. War had been commenced by the landlord and trustees at that time, and the atrocities which have fixed public attention in this country had been committed. The Plan of Campaign has not been adopted on the Glenbeigh estate to this very day. But I have no hesitation in saying that if it had been adopted in time there would have been no house burning and no evictions. The essence of the Plan of Campaign—and it has been very much criticized—is that all the tenants should stand together, and those who can pay should refuse to pay until those who cannot pay should get a fair settlement. That is its most important feature, and without it the tenants who cannot pay would be evicted, and their houses would be burned and levelled. At Glenbeigh 25 solvent tenants on the estate have paid, nine of them being members of the Local Committee of the National League. Where, then, is the evidence that the National League has interfered, or that the Plan of Campaign has been adopted? I am not dealing with the rectitude of the Plan of Campaign; I am simply showing that if it had been adopted these houses at Glenbeigh would never have been burnt, the homesteads would never have been levelled, and the civilized world would not have been shocked at this fresh example of the Government of law and order in gaining the affections of the Irish people. Now, Sir, what does General Buller say of the poverty of these people in his letter to Messrs. Darley and Roe on November 29? Why, that most of the tenants are "nearer famine than the payment of rent." I will now return to the Government's proceedings during the winter. They refused the Relief Bill, and, having done so, the Chief Secretary and my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo hurried over post-haste to Ireland to put into operation their respective Plans of Campaign. The experience of history has too often shown that in Ireland nothing is to be gained by respect for law and order, by reliance upon Constitutional methods, and by looking to Parliament for the redress of grievances. But I confess I was in hopes, at the end of last Session, that a Government which had been returned for the express purpose of showing that Ireland could be justly governed at Westminster would properly attend to her wants. But, instead of that, we have the old lesson that we must not look to this House for justice. But the majority of this House—those who call themselves Liberal Unionists and Conservative Unionists—showed their determination to accept nothing which I brought forward, not because it was bad in itself, but because I had brought it forward. The mere fact of the authorship of that Bill plainly indicated to their minds that it must be a dishonest Bill concealing some deeply-laid plot against the integrity of the Union. Therefore, they rejected the Bill. The Government had then no alternative but the adoption of the course which they followed. They sent Judge Curran to Kerry. Judge Curran is a gentleman against whom I do not wish to say anything; and if I do say anything which may appear to be hostile to him, my excuse must be that I do not intend to be hostile to him. Judge Curran was a Judge who was bound by the exigencies of the office which he held to avoid all communication with either of the parties to a suit which might come before him. He was bound to have no previous knowledge of the particulars of the cases brought before him. But he put aside such antiquated notions and went to the parties to suits. He saw the landlords, and tried to dissuade them from suing their tenants; and, being in some cases successful, he came on the Bench and announced, when the suits came on for hearing, that he had the power to make reductions to the tenants; in fact, exhibited himself as the general saviour of the County of Kerry, and invited all disputants to come to him. Like the man who beats the drum outside an itinerant circus, he called out, "Walk up, walk up, gentlemen, and see what splendid reductions I will give you!" and the tenants flocked to his Court, hoping to get these reductions. In a letter to the Bishop of Kerry, Judge Curran said—

> "I went to Kerry with an honest and determined desire to do justice, and, if possible, to restore the district to its normal state of peace. I was determined that juries should convict in cases in which guilt was brought home to the parties."

But a Judge cannot give effect to any such determination. A Judge has no power to make a jury convict if the jury does not choose to convict. Judge Curran also said that he was determined to remove the cause of crime by preventing the oppression of tenants who were willing, but unable, to meet the landlords' demands. But Judge Curran had no power to do this. Parliament might have done it, but he could not. He said that he was powerless, except in cases in which tenants came before him and explained the position. He was, however, powerless in all cases except by the consent of the landlords. Without their consent he had no power to reduce the rent, or to strike off a penny of the costs. He had no real power to do anything, except postpone the execution of decrees for a very short period. But he assumed greater powers. In his letter he intimated that he should not stoop to deny that he was not acting in league with the landlords, or by the direction of the Government; but as he admits in a subsequent part of his letter that he has had interviews with Sir Redvers Buller, on the subject of the remission of rents, I may leave the House to judge of the worth of this denial. As this letter shows throughout the belief of Judge Curran that a large reduction of rents in Kerry was urgently needed, I wish to ask the Government whether they still think that they did right in rejecting the Tenants' Relief Bill, and whether they still hold that they were right, when that measure was before the House, in suggesting that no reduction of rents was needed? Judge Curran actually attempted to do things which he had no legal power to do. I do not blame him, because the emergency was great. Parliament had just made a great mistake, and the Government a terrible blunder, and it was his duty, as their loyal officer, to do what he could to cover these errors. With regard to the proceedings and sayings of General Buller, the greatest secrecy has been maintained, and whenever any awkward fact came out, it was stoutly denied till the proof became so positive that the denial could be no longer maintained. Some light, however, has been thrown upon his action. There was first the publication of a telegram from the Sub-Sheriff of Cork to County Inspector Moriarty, who was with Sir Redvers

Buller in County Kerry, asking for extra police protection. The reply of Mr. Moriarty to this request was known; he refused to send the constables, saying that 10 days' notice must be given before such a demand could be entertained, and that information must be sent as to the nature of the proceedings, the names of the parties concerned being given. By this it is plain that before police protection would be granted, General Buller required to know whether the proceedings were for the eviction of tenants on account of arrears of rent, or for the recovery of ordinary debts; also the names of the parties to be evicted, so that he might ascertain whether there existed any circumstances of hardship justifying the exercise of a dispensing power. We have next a portion of General Buller's evidence before Lord Cowper's Commission, and this is very remarkable as showing the need for the Relief Bill and the lunacy of the Government in rejecting it. The account of the witness's evidence was published in the newspapers, and purported to have appeared in a letter written by one of the Commissioners to a friend in London. It represented General Buller as saying that the tenants were over-rented, that they could not pay the rents, that the law was all on the side of the landlords, that he had been obliged to intervene to save tenants from hardship, that the National League was the saviour of the people, that before its existence the tenants had no friends, and that a stop should be put to unjust evictions. From the day of the publication of this account to the present nobody, so far as I know, has denied that it is correct. When examined in the recent proceedings before the police magistrate in Dublin General Buller excused himself from replying to questions upon this subject by saying that he had not yet received a copy of the shorthand writer's notes of his evidence. I am afraid that since his connection with Dublin Castle, General Buller has learnt not to be quite candid. Association with the Irish officials has apparently done him no good. We have lately received trustworthy information, of which we challenge the contradiction, that General Buller is now being asked by the Commission to amend his evidence, and that this portion of his original evidence will not appear in the official Report. The next thing we know about General Buller is disclosed in the correspondence with Captain Plunkett with reference to a tenant in Limerick, who was president of the local branch of the National League, and who, when about to be evicted, appealed to General Buller for protection. General Buller recommended him to Captain Plunkett's care, and shortly afterwards a letter appeared in *The Times* signed "Erigena." The agent of the estate complained that Captain Plunkett had called upon them to urge them to give the tenants a receipt for the three and a-half years' rent due, and to forgive the costs incurred on payment of one year's rent. And they said they were given to understand that should they refuse to grant these terms they would not be given police protection at the evictions. In another letter he urged the landlord to accept the rent offered, said that the majority of the tenants were nearer famine than the payment of rent, and that unless the landowner agreed to a settlement, he could not support evictions. There can be no doubt that General Buller and other officers and Government officials had repeatedly led landlords in Ireland to believe that protection would not be given in cases where unjust evictions were made. It was unquestionably the opinion of the Chief Secretary, from the speech which he recently made at Bristol, that strong pressure was necessary to induce many landlords to do what was right, and he spoke of the pressure he was exercising. I think the phrase about the exercise of pressure was an unfortunate one to use, because if it is legitimate for a Minister who has deliberately rejected an alteration of the law on the ground that no pressure is necessary, that the landlords will do of their own accord what should be done, to go over to Ireland to exercise pressure on the landlords, and to prevent them doing what is in their strict legal right to do, then I say there may be other men more interested in the welfare of the Irish people than the right hon. Gentleman, men who are more disinterested, because they have not to prop up the miserable attempts at government which have been made in Ireland; there may be Irishmen who may be pardoned for thinking that they too are justified in exercising pressure on the landlords to do what is right and just. It has been alleged or suggested in Her Majesty's Speech that the relations between landlord and tenant have been disturbed by the Plan of Campaign. Now, as one who is in no sense responsible for the bringing forward of this Plan of Campaign, I am inclined to speak freely and fairly with regard to the matter, and I deny, in the strongest terms, that there is any foundation whatever for that statement. I believe, on the contrary, that had it not been for the Plan of Campaign many poor tenants who have now roofs over their heads would have been cast out on the bare hillside as the Glenbeigh tenants were. I believe that the reduction in the number of evictions from 1,100 to 666 in the last quarter has been mainly due to the action of the Plan of Campaign. No doubt, in a secondary sense, it has also been due to the exercise of a dispensing power on the part of the Government. These efforts on the part of the Government, and on the part of my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), have induced many unjust and hard landlords to make concessions who would not otherwise have done so, and therefore, Sir, so far from the Plan of Campaign having disturbed the relations between landlord and tenant, the fact that up to a very recent time there had not been a single eviction on any estate where the Plan had been adopted by all the tenantry, is very good testimony to the circumstance that instead of leading to outrages it has pacified the country. It is evident, indeed, that the Government and the authors of the Plan of Campaign are aiming, and have been aiming, at precisely the same thing, only the Government have not been quite so successful as their rivals. It is a remarkable fact that for nearly two months after the Plan of Campaign had been published the Government refrained from taking any action against it or expressing any opinion that it was illegal. The Plan was published on the 23rd of October, and it was not until the week before Christmas—two months later—that the Government moved in the matter. That was the first intimation which was given to the Irish people that the Plan of Campaign was illegal. Did the Government know before this that it was illegal? Had their Law Officers informed them before this that it was illegal? If not, why did they not do so; and if they did, why did not the Government communicate their information to the public? If the Government believed that the Plan of Campaign was illegal, knowing that the general opinion in Ireland was that the movement was perfectly legal, and that it was held that that opinion had been confirmed by their own Attorney General, I say it was their duty to speak out at once and to warn the tenants. Why did the right hon. Gentleman wait for two months before he issued his proclamation? It is useless to point to the proceedings against the hon. Member for East Mayo, because these were not proceedings against the Plan of Campaign, but against certain speeches made by the hon. Gentleman; and I believe that to this day no proceedings have been taken against any tenant under the Plan of Campaign. But why this delay? Is it that the Government felt that they could not fully rely on their own pressure on the landlords, and wanted the assistance of the hon. Member for East Mayo; and that the exertions of Judge Curran and Sir Redvers Buller in the exercise of their dispensing power to reduce rents—which, by-the-bye, they had no right to reduce—were insufficient? Was it that the righ hon. Gentleman felt that without the aid of the Plan of Campaign his pressure on the landlords would not have been strong enough, that evictions would have increased, and that he would not have been able to come back to the House of Commons and say that his policy had been successful? Are those the reasons why he winked at the Plan of Campaign? If not, what are the reasons? If they had determined to intervene with the strong arm of what is called the law in Ireland, they should not have let the Irish people commit themselves to all the consequences of the Plan. Sir, as far as I can make out, the Government and the authors of the Plan of Campaign are aiming at one and the same thing; and I can assign no other reason for the late action of the Government in Ireland in this matter, at the eleventh hour, than that they got jealous of the hon. Member for East Mayo and Mr. William O'Brien because they were more successful in their efforts than they were themselves. And, Sir, there is evidence to show that the Plan of Campaign was worked with more moderation by its authors than the course adopted by the

Government in imitation of it; and those who worked that Plan took up no case in which there was not a clear necessity for reduction in rent. Moreover, they tried to bring about a settlement in every case in which there was a fair offer of reduction. There was no imitation of the helter-skelter, harum-scarum, slap-dash proceedings of Judge Curran and General Buller on the part of the authors of the Plan of Campaign, and all cases were carefully investigated before action was taken. Let me direct the attention of the House to the estates of Lord Dillon and Lord Dunsandle. The Dillon estate is about the best instance of a congested estate on a large scale. It is tenanted by a great number of small tenants who used to come to England every year for the purpose of earning a few pounds to meet their annual rents. At the time of the passing of the Arrears Act the estate was in a condition of frightful confusion, with several years of rent owing. Fortunately, the Arrears Act was passed, and that afforded the poor tenants some means of escape from the predicament in which they were. If this estate had not been taken in hand by the authors of the Plan of Campaign, and a settlement forced on the landlord, the horrors of Glenbeigh would have been repeated on them a thousandfold. The class of tenants is almost the same as at Glenbeigh, but fortunately we have been spared that. The same thing may be said of Lord Dunsandle's estate, which is also inhabited by very impoverished tenants, although their condition is not quite so desperate. These, and some 20 other cases in which a settlement has not been arrived at, are fair examples of the necessity which existed for pressure of some kind or other on the landlord; and they are also examples of the moderation with which settlements were effected as soon as landlords showed any disposition to come to a settlement. As regards the legality or illegality of the Plan of Campaign, I have said that the Irish public are entitled to know, without loss of time, whether, in the opinion of the Government, the plan is legal or not. I can attach no weight whatever to the judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench, or the Government Proclamation, under the circumstances of the case. The Government action has been so clouded by dodgery and by subterfuge that I reserve to myself the right to wait until I see what the decision as to the legality of this Plan is in the trial which is about to take place. The legality of the Plan is a matter on which, if I had been in a position to concern myself about it, I should have desired to be satisfied first of all. I should have thought it necessary to take the opinion of counsel myself; and I am informed that counsel has given an opinion in favour of the legality and Constitutional principle of the Plan of Campaign. But, however that may be, the conduct of the Government stands condemned, first of all for waiting two months before expressing an opinion; and, secondly, by removing the case out of the Court in which it was originated to one in County Dublin, where they expected to get a subservient jury; and, thirdly, by attempting to take proceedings by a short cut before the Queen's Bench, thus enabling that Court to express an opinion on certain speeches, and upon the Plan of Campaign, which was not before the Court at all, and with regard to which there was no evidence whatever. Now, some hard words have been used towards the Gentlemen who are concerned in this rival attempt to bring pressure to bear upon the Irish landlords. Lord Salisbury, and Conservative and Liberal Unionist speakers, have likened them to robbers and embezzlers. They do not do well or wisely who talk of robbery or embezzlement in connection with the Irish Land Question. Those Gentlemen who talk so glibly forget that almost every title to Irish land is founded on wholesale robbery and embezzlement. They forget that a great portion of the land of Ireland has been confiscated no fewer than three several times over. They forget that all improvements in the land, with very few exceptions, have been made by the tenants, and that so far as the land has derived value from such improvements, that value should by law be the property of the tenants. They forget that for centuries the landlords have been coolly robbing, confiscating, and embezzling the increased value of the land. It is not well or wise, therefore, that the supporters of the Irish landlords, whether in or out of the House, should talk about robbery or embezzlement. These unwise words may give rise to unpleasant recollections. My next proposition involves a condemnation of coercion as a remedy for the troubles of Ireland. I have said that resort to coercion is announced in the Queen's Speech in the direction of increased stringency in criminal procedure. We are informed that the proposed coercion will give power to stipendiary magistrates to convict for intimidation, and that it will give power to empanel special juries, and to change venues. It is admitted that the coercion is to be used against open agitation, and public speaking and writing. The right hon. Gentleman, like all other Chief Secretaries before him, has thought that once he gets his political enemies into gaol, and keeps them there, he will be quite happy. I wonder that he has not been warned by the case of his Predecessor. The late Mr. Forster commenced by only wanting an Act—it was rather the converse of the case of the right hon. Gentleman; but the two situations became similar in the end—for dealing with village tyrants and dissolute ruffians, whom, he said, the police knew all about, and could lay their hands upon at a moment's notice. He wanted to put these men into prison, and keep them there as long as he wished. He got the Act, but he failed to find the tyrants and ruffians—at least, he failed to put them into prison; but instead of that he put into prison 1,000 of the popular leaders of Ireland, including two clergymen, seven Members of Parliament, several town councillors, many Poor Law Guardians, and a large number of substantial merchants and traders, shopkeepers, and farmers. And, when he had done all this, he found that he wanted more power, for the exasperations, fed and nurtured by those high-handed proceedings, produced their inevitable result. A secret conspiracy had grown up under the very nose of the Chief Secretary armed with all those great powers of summary arrest and imprisonment—a conspiracy directed against his own life, which he knew nothing about, and which he was unable to cope with, and similar conspiracies existed throughout Ireland against the lives of landlords and Government officials. Those conspiracies did not come into existence until Mr. Forster had commenced his career of coercion to stamp out Constitutional agitation. But the inevitable result of driving discontent under the surface, whether in Ireland or elsewhere, followed. Mr. Forster appealed to his Cabinet for increased powers. They refused. Then came the terrible tragedy in the Phœnix Park, and it was followed by the passing of the Crimes Act, the most stringent coercive enactment, both against political agitation and crime, ever passed against Ireland by England. This Act was administered under the most favourable circumstances of a partial revival of agricultural prospects by Lord Spencer with great determination, but with very partial success, and its administration was answered from America by dynamite and other attempts at assassination and conspiracy. Dynamite was repeatedly exploded in the crowded streets of your City, your public buildings were also threatened, and attempts were made to destroy them. Even in this House the Ministers of the day were not safe from violent attack and attempts to assassinate by the discharge of explosive bombs from the Strangers' Gallery, and exasperation and international animosity reached a most deplorable height, of which I think you would have to go back to 1798 to find any example. And, after all these terrible events, after all this loss of life, some upon the scaffold, many more the victims of the wild justice of revenge, after all this peril to your citizens pursuing their lawful occupations in the streets, after all this danger to your most distinguished Ministers, what was the result? A Tory Government came into Office, and abandoned coercion. There can be no "betwixt and between" in this matter, and the right hon. Gentleman may depend upon it that, although he may get his Coercion Act to strike down his chief political opponents, he will not be able to stop murder. You will be hurried on from one step to another. Your first coercion will necessitate more coercion, and you will have to make your choice between such measures of repression as the Czar of Russia employs, or you will never be able to administer it so long as you keep the Irish Members here. I trust that Her Majesty's Government, who are at present free agents as to their future conduct, will, before they embark on this course, ponder these facts. I have not sought to make any appeals to their fears. If I have referred to ancient history, it has been to point a moral as to the uselessness of the course on which they appear resolved to embark. I believe that if they will refrain from a policy of exasperation even now at the eleventh hour, and stop the infliction of injustice in Ireland, but stop it by legislative measures, and not by the exercise of a dispensing power, which I believe to have demoralized the Irish people, and especially the Irish tenants during the last winter, more than all the exertions of the Fenian agitators from New York to San Francisco; if the Government are warned in time, and do what is just and right in a just and right way, they may devise some scheme for the self-government of Ireland—which, from the declarations they have made, they evidently have not either the time or the inclination or the ability to do—which will meet all the legitimate wants and wishes of the Irish people. A self-governed Ireland, when she makes her own laws, will show by her tranquil and peaceful character how unfairly she has been treated, and how libellous are the assertions that the Irish are not a law-abiding people. I beg, Sir, to move the Amendment that stands in my name.

Mr. P. McDONALD (Sligo, N.), in seconding the Amendment, said, that he desired to call attention to the violent and unconstitutional action of the Irish Executive and police in forcibly suppressing a legal meeting at Sligo, which was called for two legitimate objects, and the proclamation of which by the Government had aroused a feeling of indignation, not only in the County of Sligo, but throughout Ireland generally. It was proclaimed at a time when the state of the country was peaceful in the extreme; when there was scarcely any crime outside a few agrarian crimes—if they could be called such—in County Galway. On hearing of the proclamation of that meeting, he (Mr. McDonald) and two Colleagues in this House went to the town in order to advise the people as to the conduct they should pursue. They arrived the evening before the meeting, and, on approaching their hotel, found a cordon of police at each end of the street, by means of which the whole street was kept clear, so that any idea of addressing people from the windows of the hotel was frustrated. Under these circumstances he took counsel with the Mayor, who very properly offered them the use of the Town Hall for the purpose of consulting with their friends. They went thither, and while waiting on the steps for the key to be fetched, a *posse* of police fell upon them, and used their batons upon everybody within reach. A blow was aimed at him which, if it had reached his head, would have led, he fancied, to a vacancy in the representation of North Sligo, and have necessitated a new election for the High Shrievalty of Dublin. The blow fell, however, upon the head of an old friend of his, the Chairman of the Tubbercurry Board of Guardians, who he (Mr. McDonald) was sure, when the Town Hall was opened, had suffered much from the brutality of the police. Such a scene would have been impossible in England, where, indeed, no such system as was adopted by the Irish Constabulary would be tolerated for a moment. Brutal though the onslaught was he believed it would advance the cause, they had at heart in showing to the world how Ireland was governed. That was not, however, the only outrage that the Government had committed. At the trials which took place before Judge Palles several jurors were told to stand aside, solely on the ground that they were Roman Catholics, and against this bishops and priests, representative men, and even Protestants, had protested. Strong as was the protest of their fellow religionists, that of the Protestants of Sligo was, if possible, stronger. They said that "they wished to express their dissatisfaction with the systematic exclusion of Catholics from cases in which the Crown was anxious to obtain convictions. They were the neighbours of those Catholic jurors; they lived in peace and harmony with them, they had business relations with them, and always found them conscientious and able men. They accordingly united with them in their repudiation of the indignity cast upon them by the Crown, which they considered could only give rise to discord and contempt." With regard to the Plan of Campaign, he (Mr. McDonald) endorsed every word that had fallen from his Leader the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) in reference to the good work that had been accomplished by it. But for that Plan the evictions would probably not have been confined to Woodford and Glenbeigh, but would have been general throughout the West and South of Ireland. He knew every mile of Lord Dillon's estate; he knew the circumstances of the people upon it; he had witnessed their poverty, and was aware of their inability not merely to pay a fair rent, but almost to pay any rent at all. The rent that had been raised by them was not got out of the soil but from the men and boys who went across to England during harvest time, and who brought back English money to pay off the liabilities of their Irish holdings. Their labour in England last autumn was not profitable, and consequently they went back with almost empty pockets. The people were willing to pay what they could, and would cheerfully have done so, but when the Plan of Campaign was introduced reason prevailed with the agents, with the result that they accepted the reduction proposed, and that 80 per cent of the rents was collected by his hon. Friends who were engaged in that benevolent occupation. Those Gentlemen had proved themselves to be the best rent collectors that had ever taken charge of Lord Dillon's estate. He thoroughly and entirely accepted and endorsed the principles of the Plan of Campaign, and had on every platform, on every public occasion where duty called upon him to speak, so expressed himself. As four of his Colleagues and one ex-Colleague were now being arraigned in the Superior Courts of Dublin, he could only say that if they were guilty so was he. It was not, however, by prosecutions such as those, not by gagging Coercion Acts, not by police batons, not by the crowbar or the petroleum can that Ireland could be pacified. She could only be brought into harmony with England by giving her the right to govern herself, to make her own laws on her own land, and thus secure not an enforced union, but the union of the hearts of the people, now severed by unjust laws, and bring the two countries into lasting harmony and peace.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the 8th paragraph, to insert the words, "But humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the relations between the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland have not been seriously disturbed in the cases of those owners who have granted to their tenants such abatements of rents as are called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce, and that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is not to be found in increased stringency of criminal procedure, or in the pursuit of such novel, doubtful, and unconstitutional measures as have recently been taken by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland, but in such a reform of the Law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people."—(*Mr. Parnell*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BAGGALLAY (Lambeth, Brixton) said, the Amendment to the Address which the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) had just Moved was very widespread in its wording, but it might practically be reduced to three heads. The first with which he (Mr. Baggallay) did not intend to deal was the vote of censure upon the landlords in Ireland implied by the early words of the Amendment. With regard to that, the Government might really admit the truth of the statements contained in it, and upon it the hon. Member for Cork had said but little. The most important part of his Amendment undoubtedly was the charge which he made against, and which was, in fact, a Vote of Censure upon, the Government for their recent conduct of affairs in Ireland. With regard to that charge, the hon. Member for Cork had given instances in which he said the Government had behaved in a novel, a doubtful, and an unconstitutional manner, and he had called attention most particularly to the proceedings taken against the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), and to the action of the Government at Sligo. As to the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Mayo, there was not the slightest doubt that he was the great promoter of the Plan of Campaign, and that he and two or three other hon. Members were, if not the originators, the publishers of the Plan. The hon. Member for Cork had said that he was not responsible for the Plan of Campaign; but certainly from his speech that evening, it was apparent that he had entirely endorsed the procedure under that conspiracy. He had gone further and had said that speeches made by hon. Members of that House in Ireland had been advisedly made. He should like to call the attention of the House to what those speeches were. The hon. Member for Cork had said that the Plan of Campaign was legal, that it was moderate, that it had been successful in its objects, and that those objects were the same as Her Majesty's Government were endeavouring to attain by other means, but with less successful results. He thought that by a few references to the speeches of hon. Members in Ireland he should show that their conduct was what the hon. Member for Cork had described that of the Government to be—perhaps novel, certainly doubtful, and far more than unconstitutional, for it had been criminal and immoral. The author of the Plan of Campaign—the hon. Member for East Mayo—speaking in that House in the debate on the Relief Bill, had said they could trust to nothing but the same means to which they resorted in 1880. As far as he remembered, the means resorted to after 1880 were dynamite and outrage. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] Perhaps hon. Members below the Gangway would say to what the hon. Member for East Mayo did refer. He had said, further, that as long as life and liberty were left to him he would tell the people of Ireland to continue in their course of persistent and determined resistance. The hon. Member for the Harbour Division of Dublin (Mr. T. Harrington) who, he believed, was the Secretary of the National League, had sent out a circular stating that the organizing committee of the League had made arrangements under which they intended to devote the subscriptions exclusively to the benefit of evicted tenants in those localities where the tenants made the best fight, and where, in the discretion of the committee, the tenants were most deserving of support. Thus, even before the Plan of Campaign was promulgated, a project was put forward under which those who obeyed the behests of the National League were to receive payment—in other words bribery—for doing so. That statement did not stand alone. The hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. P. McDonald), who had just sat down, speaking on the 23rd of November, said that he was authorized by the National League committee to state that the tenants who followed the Plan of Campaign would be paid far more than they could earn by the profit of their labour on their farms and lands. Did hon. Members mean to deny that that was a distinct promise that the tenants should benefit in their own pockets by following the Plan of Campaign? Now, the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), whose proceedings were so legal, who had been so moderate and so Constitutional in the course that he had taken, had found it necessary to put the Plan of Campaign into action, because it was seen that the prophecies of the hon. Member for Cork during the debate on the Relief Bill were in danger of being falsified. He had prophesied that the rejection of that Bill would bring about a state of revolution in Ireland. But instead of that it appeared that crime and outrage were decreasing, and that, with winter approaching, the country was, owing to the successful action of the Government, quieter, and the tenants were paying their rents. So in the month of October the Plan of Campaign was published in *United Ireland*, and by the hon. Member for East Mayo in all parts of the country. He desired to refer to some of that hon. Gentleman's speeches in support of the Plan of Campaign. He had said that the National League intended to lay down a rule that no estate should be bought on which any tenant had been evicted since 1879 unless such tenant were restored to his holding. Were hon. Members opposite below the Gangway prepared to support the law as it existed in Ireland or were they not? If they were anxious to support the law how could they support the declaration made by the hon. Member for East Mayo? If, however, as he believed, they were not prepared to support the law or the Courts in Ireland, one could easily understand the proceedings which they took and the speeches which they made. The speeches of the hon. Member for East Mayo showed that in his view the object of the Plan of Campaign was to defeat the law of the country. The proceedings to which the Parnellite faction had been a party had been going on for some years. Those proceedings formed part of one conspiracy founded 10 years ago and first brought prominently before us six years ago. They were part of a conspiracy carried on at one time with outrage and dynamite, and at another with what hon. Members opposite pretended was a legal and a proper combination for the purpose of defeating the landlords. But whatever means the Parnellite faction might use for the purpose of promoting their object, there could be no doubt that that object was to separate entirely the country of Ireland from Great Britain. The hon. Member for Cork in his Amendment suggested that there should be such a reform of the law and of the system of government in Ireland as would satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the people. There was, however, no explanation of what reform was required. What did the needs of the Irish people really demand? A wide field would be open if they were to inquire into that question; but he hoped that this Parliament might yet be able to pass such a reform of the law, and, if necessary, such alterations in the system of government as would satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people. Still, there was no doubt what the feeling of Great Britain was upon this subject. The decision of England and of a great part of Scotland was diametrically opposed to the decision given by the constituencies of Ireland. After the decisive verdict of the country with regard to the main question, he, as an independent supporter of Her Majesty's Government, hoped and expected they would be equally decisive as to the course they would take with reference to this important question. He (Mr. Baggallay) did not expect, however, that this question could be settled and happily terminated in a short space of time. The Government would, however, have the support of the country as long as they endeavoured to frame a good Local Government Bill for Ireland and a measure to amend the law so that the relations between landlord and tenant might be ameliorated. In time he hoped such an amelioration would take place in the condition of Ireland that they might once again speak of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland—united not only in name, but in heart and soul.

MR. HAYDEN (Leitrim, S.) said, he thought that until hon. Members opposite regarded the Irish Party as being something more than a faction, they would do little to settle the questions in dispute between the two countries. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) had described the Irish crisis of 1879 and 1880 as a manufactured crisis; but it would be remembered that at that time Committees, composed of Protestants, Presbyterians, and Catholics alike, used their utmost exertions to relieve the hundreds and sometimes the thousands of cases of destitution which arose. Misrepresentations like that of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh used to go down with the House of Commons and the English people, but he was glad to know that the English people were now better informed on the subject of Ireland. The prosecutions, or rather, persecutions, which had recently been instituted in Ireland would certainly never gain the good will of that country for Great Britain; and as certainly they would not terrorize or intimidate them. But conciliation had a wonderful effect upon the Irish people, and the effort of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) had done more to bring the people to the side of law and order than all the Coercion Acts which had ever been passed. As to the Plan of Campaign, there might be doubts of its legality; but no one who knew the circumstances of the Irish tenants could have the smallest doubt of its absolute necessity. To those who doubted the honesty of the tenants, it was a sufficient answer to point to the Seeds Act and the loans made under it, 95 per cent of which had been repaid; although in many cases the poor people were charged more than double the value of the seed which had been distributed to them. The promoters of the Plan of Campaign had been more successful in their application of pressure to the landlords than the Government had, for it was a noteworthy fact that not a single eviction had taken place upon any estate upon which the Plan of Campaign had been adopted. One of the petty meannesses to which the Government had descended in Ireland was the prosecution of a newspaper, the *Roscommon Herald*, for publishing reports of meetings which had appeared in a number of other papers, and these reports had appeared six months previous to the institution of the prosecution. Not satisfied with instituting the prosecution, the Government so framed the jury panel as to provide a jury of 12 Protestants to try the case. Notwithstanding the employment of these means, the jury disagreed, and it was an open secret that 10 were for acquittal and two only for upholding the Government. In many cases the Plan of Campaign was resolved upon by the tenants themselves, without the intervention of any of the Irish Members.

Mr. BLANE (Armagh. S.): I have been thrust from the jury box in my own country as unworthy of the confidence of the Crown; but I have the confidence of the people in Ireland. There are many rumours of war abroad, and, in the event of war, owing to the small proportion of land under cultivation, the food supply will be insufficient. The United Kingdoms are not independent of other nations in the matter of food supply. Indeed, I was much struck the other evening with the statement of the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton), that we import three-fourths of our bread-stuffs from abroad. That shows the absolute necessity of providing for the protection of our carrying ships by a strong Navy. That was proved by the case of the *Alabama,* in which great damage had been done to American trade by one vessel.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman is making use of an argument which is not, in any sense, relevant to the Amendment before the House.

Mr. BLANE: Then, Sir, I will address myself to the Amendment. I submit that if the Government allowed the land of Ireland to be brought more largely under cultivation, it would help the country in the case of war, by giving an increased food supply, and rendering it unnecessary to depend on other countries. In old times the duty of providing this defence was imposed on the landowners, who had transferred the burden to the occupiers. But in these days of falling prices even the English occupier is going to the wall. If that is the case in England, how much worse is the position of the unfortunate Irish farmer. In Ireland, the rights of property have been allowed to swamp the natural rights of man, and the landlords have been harsh and merciless taskmasters. To such a pass have matters come now, that the English administrators of the law have actually been compelled to violate the law so as to prevent widespread desolation. I advocate Government expenditure upon the cultivation of lands which the owners allow to remain uncultivated, for money so spent will be more profitably expended than in any increase of our naval armaments. The Government propose to amend criminal law procedure in Ireland. I will give an instance from my own county, the County of Armagh, of how the criminal law is administered in Ireland. A man was charged with firing at a policeman, and, having been convicted, got seven years' penal servitude. That man was one whose political opinions differed from those of hon. Members on the opposite Benches. In the very same district another man was convicted for having fired at a district Inspector and a party of police, and he got only eight weeks. That man enjoyed the confidence of hon. Members on the other side of the House, and the other did not. I suppose the intended amendment of the criminal law procedure will be that one man will get seven years and the other man will get two months. I brought the cases under the notice of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland and the Chief Secretary, and I was told there was a dissimilarity between them. The right hon. and learned Gentleman did not mention where the dissimilarity lay, but I know that it consisted in this—that one man was ready to vote for the Member for North Armagh, and the other was ready to vote for his National opponent. From this it appears that there is good reason to fear that repressive measures will not be administered impartially, that opponents of the Government will be treated with great severity, and their supporters with unmerited leniency.

Mr. W. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): The hon. Member for South Armagh (Mr. Blane), who has just spoken in this debate, has, in common with other hon. Members on the opposite side below the Gangway, impugned the action of the Courts of Justice in Ireland, and has cast reflections on Protestant jurors which are quite undeserved. If I may be pardoned for referring to a personal matter, I can bear my testimony to their perfect impartiality, from the fact that I was once arraigned before a jury, on which there were several Orangemen, and found guilty. I am satisfied that Protestant jurors in Sligo, and in other parts of Ireland, will be mindful of the solemn obligation which attaches to them in the discharge of their duty. I, for one, believe that hon. Members, if they desire to cultivate good relations with the Protestants of Ireland, will do well not to impugn the motives which actuate them when they act as jurymen, but will give them credit for having due regard to the solemn responsibility of finding a verdict according to the evidence. I rejoice to see the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) back in his place in this House. He has often been referred to in the course of recent proceedings, and no doubt we shall soon have from him an attempt to justify the Plan of Campaign, of which, if he was not the originator, he has been the most eloquent exponent. With the Plan of Campaign itself I do not propose to deal. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes), who will probably speak this evening, will deal fully with the legal aspects of the question. Nor have I any particular desire, in addressing the House, to deal generally with the speech of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), and the Amendment he has introduced to the House; but I desire to protest most emphatically against the threats which have been used if justice is attempted to be done, and if the law, not being found sufficiently strong, is attempted to be amended in order to protect the lives and liberties of those who are threatened in Ireland. The hon. Member for South Armagh (Mr. Blane), whose integrity of purpose, and whose entire honesty, no one can doubt, told us what he believes to be the weakness of the position of the law; but I believe he will find that the Protestants of Armagh would do perfect justice to him if ever he had the misfortune to be returned to trial for any breach of the law. While I do not wish to follow hon. Members by impugning the impartiality of Roman Catholic jurymen, I am sure that they are not rightly advised when they imagine that every Protestant juryman violates his oath when he returns verdicts of "Guilty" which meet with the disapprobation of hon. Members who sit below the Gangway. A juryman has to discharge his duty, and find a verdict according to the law as it stands, and not to find verdicts that may suit the convenience of hon. Members opposite. The hon. and gallant Member for North Galway (Colonel Nolan), the other day, rightly imagined that we are all greatly interested in the development of the resources of Ireland; and, thinking that I was about to follow him in the course of that evening's discussion, the hon. and gallant Member appealed to me to say whether I did not sympathize with him. Sir, the industrious and loyal Protestants of the Province of Ulster, a portion of the Metropolis of which I have the honour to represent, would cordially co-operate with the rest of Ireland in developing the industrial resources of the country; and if hon. Members below the Gangway opposite will set themselves to do that, and will give up the phantasmal follies to which they seem to be devoting themselves, and will endeavour to join with us in fully developing the resources of the country, they would obtain the benediction of their fellow-countrymen, and the hearty assistance of those who entirely disagree with them in their political views. The hon. and gallant Member for North Galway told us, in the course of his able speech, that while he was anxious to see the farmers of Ireland their own landlords, and to see the dual ownership of land abandoned and terminated, as if that result were brought about, so far from being looked upon as a settlement of the Irish Question, it would not put an end to the demand for Home Rule. I could not help thinking that that was a complete refutation of the sanguine hopes of the hon. and gallant Gentleman who represents North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), expressed in the speech which he delivered a few nights ago. My hon. and gallant Friend said—

> "He had always held that the final solution of this Irish Question could only come from the Irish people. No one could hold that opinion more strongly than he, and he had always intimated that the way was to give the tenants of Ireland a stake in the country."

The hon. and gallant Member for North Galway has disposed of the happy delusion of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh. I have always believed that to root the tenants of Ireland in the soil, and to take away from the landlords, who are for the most part Protestants, and attached to England, the possessions they now enjoy, and to hand over those possessions to the majority of Roman Catholics, would not be the best way to establish in that country peace and order, but that it would give an impetus and an increased stimulus to the demand for national independence and the establishment of

Home Rule. ["Hear, hear!"] I am glad that those sentiments are cheered by hon. Members below the Gangway. I always thought that they were honest enough to avow their opinions; and those hon. Members on this side of the House who thought that by making the tenants of Ireland the proprietors of the soil, and rooting them permanently upon the land, by giving them the possessions which now belong to the landlords, they would, by that means, make them loyal to England, are altogether living under a delusion, and may some day find themselves bitterly deceived. The hon. Member for East Waterford (Mr. P. J. Power) made use of words which may form a commentary on the desires of those who look to the establishment of local self-government in Ireland in an extended form as a cure for existing evils. The hon. Member said—

> "The establishment of a mere Vestry Board would never meet the national demand. They would never accept it as a final settlement. They could only accept it as a platform from which to demand a greater measure."

I am aware that some hon. Members on this side of the House entertain the belief that if such a measure of local self-government is granted to Ireland as is granted to England and Scotland, the Irish people would be satisfied. I am glad to find the hon. Member for East Waterford has disposed of that view of the question, and has courageously told the House that it would only be used as a lever to overthrow the English Government in Ireland, and obtain further concessions. The majority of the Irish people, we have been told, will never rest satisfied until they have, at least, tried to secure their independence. [An hon. MEMBER: And have succeeded.] An hon. Member says, "and have succeeded." Well, I do not think they will succeed. They have to reckon, not only with the Unionists of England and Scotland, but with that disparaged and despised body, the Orangemen of Ireland; and, although we have not recently been talking much on the subject, our resolve is as firm as ever to maintain the integrity and unity of the Empire under the British Constitution. Sir, very extreme utterances have recently been made by hon. Members opposite, and their followers who are connected with the National League in Ireland. The Rev. Mr. Cantwell, at a meeting of the Dublin National League, held on the 23rd of September, 1886, said—

> "With regard to the closing sentences of Mr. Parnell's appeal to America respecting the Irish tenants, I will say that all our action with regard to this intermediary question of landlords and tenants is only a step towards the great goal of Irish Nationalists, towards the establishment of our Native Parliament here."

The hon. Member for North Dublin (Mr. Clancy) stated at a meeting at Clondalkin, in February, 1885, that—

> "Until the Irish National flag floated over a free Parliament in College Green, there would be no peace or contentment in Ireland."

That means that in this, the jubilee year of the reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, notwithstanding the turmoil and trouble that exist in Ireland, every effort of those who desire to bring about peace and contentment in Ireland will be frustrated until the green flag floats over a free Parliament in College Green. Before that day arrives, there will be battles to be fought and contests to be engaged in. Hon. Members have one style of oratory for this House and another and quite a different style for America. Here they talk in peaceful and dove-like accents of the happy times that are in store for us if we only listen to "the voice of the charmer." But we, who have read the history of Ireland other than backwards, know that this state of things is not to be brought about by listening to the counsels of hon. Members below the opposite Gangway. I, for one, honestly confess—and I speak the voice of many of the Protestants of Ireland—that we should not like to trust our destinies to the unfettered power of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Sir, we have been told by an hon. Member in this House that he is quite satisfied with the Plan of Campaign, because it has been blessed by Archbishop Walsh. Can we doubt that the same Archbishop, who has told us that Trinity College must belong to the Roman Catholics, and who is bound, by the oath which he took at his consecration, to suppress heresy, when it is in his power to do so, will, if he has control over an Irish Parliament, and such disloyal Members as the hon. Gentleman to whom I have referred, use every exertion to establish the entire domination of his Church in Ireland, and to suppress the civil and religious liberties which the Protestants now enjoy in that country, and for which our ancestors suffered so much in other days. We have read history, it is to be hoped, with some advantage, and we are not prepared to sacrifice our rights, and abandon the privileges we possess under a free Constitution. We are not prepared to abandon the position we hold in a United Empire, ruled over by our Gracious Sovereign, for such patronage as would be extended to us by a Parnellite Parliament commanded by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. The other day a rev. gentleman from the United States, who rejoices in the name of James Carey, said—

> "He would simply tell them that he voiced, he was sure, the sentiments of the great bulk of the American people, when he said that their heart and soul was with the people of Ireland in their battle for liberty. He would tell them more—the people of the United States especially, that the people born there understood everything, but they did not understand why they did not fight here at home."

Will hon. Members below the Gangway explain to this patriotic priest the reason why his compatriots would not fight? Is it because they thought that they would gain their objects without fighting; or, because there were, among these gentlemen, a number of persons who enjoy the peaceful instincts of the Quakers? This gentleman evidently implied that, unless something in the shape of fighting was undertaken, the Americans will withhold their dollars.

An hon. MEMBER: So they ought to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. W. JOHNSTON: It is the Protestants of Ireland who possess the larger proportion of the wealth, and enjoy the greatest amount of intelligence in the country, and we should not be afraid, in any competitive examination, to hold our own against our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. For my part, I have never desired to see the Irish Protestants occupying a position of ascendancy. ["Hear, hear!"] An hon. Member says "Hear, hear!" Now, I have never desired to see an ascendancy on the part of the Protestant people of Ireland. I am prepared to concede to my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen perfect religious and civil equality, but we are determined not to allow this platform to be made the means of obtaining an ascendancy on the part of those who are predominant in the Home Rule Party. May I ask the indulgence of the House while I quote a passage which is contained in the Tenth Report of the Historical Manuscript Commission, and which is certainly ancient history. In one of the manuscripts of the Earl of Fingall there is an interesting document headed *A Light to the Blind*, which gives an account of the contest between William III. and James II. The writer states what his idea is of the best way of regulating the affairs of Ireland, and I quote his sentiments because I believe they are the sentiments of those who desire, at the present moment, to see Home Rule established in Ireland. The document says—

> "And to render Irish Catholicks effectually potent for this end; it will be requisite for the King to restore unto them their antient estates, which the Protestant usurpers have retained in possession these forty years past; to make the Parliament of Ireland absolut in enacting lawes, without being obliged to send beforehand the prepared Bills which are destined to pass into Acts by the consent of both Howses of Parliament, for the King's precedent approbation of them. . . . . to make the Judicature of the nation determin causes without an appeal to the tribunals of England. . . . . to putt allwayes the Viceroydom into the hands of an Irish Catholick; to conferr the principal posts of State and Warr on the Catholick natives; to keep a standing army of 8,000 Catholicks; to train a Catholick militia; to maintain a fleet of 24 warlick ships of the fourth rate; to give the moyety of ecclesiactical liveings to the Catholick Bishops and parish priests dureing the life of the present Protestant Bishops and ministers, and after the death of these to conferr all the said liveings on the Roman clergy."

This, I think, is an illustration of the objects and aim of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway on the opposite side—namely, the restoration of the land and the ancient estates held by the Protestants to the Roman Catholic peasantry of Ireland, together with placing the whole power and control of the military and police under the Irish Executive. The exceedingly moderate tone which has been adopted by the hon. Member for Cork to-night must not deceive hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House, because the tone which is assumed here for the purposes of debate is entirely different from that assumed by the hon. Gentleman when he addresses those American Fenians across the Atlantic who are the paymasters of the Irish Party. I thank the House, and especially those who are naturally hostile to the sentiments I have expressed, for their courtesy in listening to me on this occasion. I trust that, in so doing, they will have felt that I have honestly desired to express the sentiments I hold for the good of our common country. I desire to protest against the severance of the link that binds Ireland to England, and in this, the jubilee of the reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty, I ask the House and Her Majesty's Government to do what in them lies to restore peace and prosperity to Ireland, and to maintain unbroken and unimpaired the integrity of the British Empire.

MR. PINKERTON (Galway) said, the speech of the hon. Member for South Belfast (Mr. Johnston) reminded him somewhat of the month of March, which came in like a lion and went out like a lamb. The parallel, however, was not quite exact, for the hon. Member began his speech in a lamblike tone and towards its close had emitted a lion-like roar. The hon. Gentleman claimed to speak on behalf of the Irish Protestants, and of the uprightness and impartiality of Protestant jurors of Ireland. He (Mr. Pinkerton) denied this. He hoped the case of the Walkers had not escaped the recollection of the hon. Member. The Walkers were caught red-handed in the act of shooting down a policeman and a soldier, yet the Protestant jurors at the recent Ulster Winter Assizes refused to find them guilty of murder, although requested by the Judge to do so. The hon. Member for South Belfast protested against threats which he said were used by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell); but that hon. Gentleman had simply pointed out the result which followed the disastrous rejection of ameliorating measures before, and also showed that the adoption of a policy of coercion could have but one end. The hon. Member for South Belfast had stated that the people of Belfast would do all they could to ameliorate the condition of the people of Ireland; but he (Mr. Pinkerton) might point out to them that the people he represented were those who had shown their good-will by tarring and feathering their Catholic fellow workmen, shooting down inoffensive Catholics at the corner of streets, and turning on those who represented the Government and were endeavouring to uphold the law. The hon. Member for South Belfast had also said there would be no peace and contentment in Ireland if the green flag floated over an Irish Parliament. But he (Mr. Pinkerton) said the want of peace and contentment in the North of Ireland was largely due to the outrageous conduct of those who took part in the Orange display of the 12th July, and celebrations of a like character. The hon. Member for South Belfast said the Protestants of Ireland were not in favour of Home Rule. He (Mr. Johnston) was speaking on behalf of the ignorant and bigoted section which he represented; for speaking as an Irish Protestant himself he (Mr. Pinkerton) could assure the House that the bone and sinew of the Irish Protestants were strongly in favour of Home Rule. The hon. Member for South Belfast had also referred to the Catholic clergy, and said he could not trust to the Roman Catholic clergymen, or to a Parliament controlled by the clergymen of that denomination. He (Mr. Pinkerton) had had the opportunity recently when engaged in advocating the Plan of Campaign in the West of Ireland, of meeting with more independence and of seeing more truly independent action on the part of the Catholic population in a week than he had ever seen among the Protestants in half a year. The action of the Catholic clergy would bear favourable comparison with that of the Rev. Ranting Roaring Hugh Hanna, and others of his stamp. He was proud, as a Protestant, to pay a tribute to the conduct of the priests in the South and West of Ireland. The hon. Member for South Belfast had also spoken on behalf of the landed interests. He (Mr. Pinkerton) contended that by the creation of a peasant proprietary the national demands of the people were not stifled. On the contrary, the more firmly the people were established on the soil of Ireland, the more sympathetic they would become with the claims of the National Party. In his opinion, landlordism had done more to separate the people than all the secret societies which had existed from the Riband and Whiteboy Societies down to the present day. But the people of Ireland were now more loyal to the English connection than ever they were, a fact which was due to the action of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). Reference had been made to the circumstance, and the tenants twitted with the charge, that they did not avail themselves of the Land Act. He had an opportunity the other day of hearing several reasons for that. He might mention that on the estate of the Marquess of Londonderry, the present Lord Lieutenant, the tenants who had been into the Land Courts were bound down to pay their rent to the hour, minute, aye, the second, and if they did not do so they were met at the rent office with a writ. With regard to the meetings which had been held in the West of Ireland in connection with the Plan of Campaign, he had himself assisted in the collection of Lord Clanricarde's rents, and could honestly say—and he viewed the matter very impartially—he was much struck with the great moderation which marked the demands of the tenants. In some cases, where reductions varying from 25 to 40 per cent were asked for, they would not have exceeded the necessity of the case had they demanded a reduction of 70 per cent. The hon. and gallant Member for Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) asserted that there was an absence of the Plan of Campaign in the North of Ireland; but the fact remained that the Plan of Campaign was running there as well as in other parts. He had himself had the opportunity of attending several meetings in the County Derry, and of assisting the Drapers' and Skinners' tenants, in resisting tyrannical exactions on the part of their landlords. He had anticipated the action of the Government in proclaiming the Plan of Campaign by about seven or eight hours by writing to the people of Draperstown, saying that as the Government appeared to be feeling somewhat uneasy respecting that movement, it would be well for them to substitute a Tenants' Defence Association. It was said that "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet;" but the new societies appeared to be as unsavoury an odour in the nostrils of the Government as the Plan of Campaign itself. The tenants then formed Mutual Assurance Societies, to which they paid their contributions, in spite of the presence of the Inspector General and some 80 or 90 policemen; and as a result these Companies lowered the terms as regarded the purchase money on their estates. The demand on the part of the tenants of Lord Londonderry occurred on the very day of the proclamation of the Plan of Campaign; and he did not hesitate to say but for the action of Lord Londonderry's tenants the Plan of Campaign might have gone on for another fortnight; in fact, he could assure the House that there was not a single estate in the North of Ireland where a demand for a reduction of rent had not been made by some of the tenants. It was a remarkable thing that the tenants of Kerry who were engaged in "Moonlighting" outrages should be granted reductions, and that in the North, where the people were quiet and law-abiding, no reduction had taken place, and that wherever they had offered their estates for sale they had demanded 21 or 22 years' purchase. Then, there was the case of Lady Harberton, who appeared to have her attention occupied more with the advocacy of the divided skirt than with the affairs of her tenantry. An application was made to her the other day by some of her tenants for the purchase of their holdings at 16 years' judicial rent, and in reply they received by return of post a most contemptuous refusal. Was that fair treatment, he asked, to the tenants of the North of Ireland? Personally he had no desire to rob the landlords of one single penny which they could justly call their own, but it was now a well-known fact that the tenant's interest in the land was fully equal to, if it did not actually exceed, that of the landlord. The tenants were willing in the North of Ireland to accept from the landlords the same purchase money as they tendered themselves, and surely this was in itself a wholesome check upon the demands of the tenants and the rapacity of the landlords. Where the landlord had the audacity to ask upwards of 20 years' rent as purchase money, the tenant should be able to sell his goodwill to the landlord on the same terms. Then there was the important question of leaseholders. The hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) had secured a place for the introduction of a one-clause Bill dealing with this subject. When the Tenants' Relief Bill was introduced by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) last Session, it was said that its great merit was its simplicity—in fact, the hon. Member for Tyrone appeared to have become so enamoured with tho idea that he had actually filched his one clause Bill from the measure of the hon. Member for Cork. However, so strongly did he feel the necessity for the introduction of a Leasehold Bill, that he cared not by whom it was introduced. Leaseholders in Ireland, he was sorry to say, were, to a great extent, Unionists ; and he would remind the Government that if they refused much longer to admit them into Court, they would very materially strengthen the position of the hon. Member for Cork. Unless something real and tangible were soon given to the people of the North for all their loyalty, the Government might take it for granted that they would begin to compare the attention they received with that which was accorded to the Nationalists. In conclusion, he (Mr. Pinkerton) wished to say, if the Government wished seriously to remove the discontent from Ireland, they would allow the Irish people to legislate for their own affairs, since the English House of Commons had proved itself so incompetent for the task, and they would also strive to pass a Leaseholds Bill upon a fair and equitable basis. When the Land Question was settled, as had been said, they would be able to take up the question of self-government in its entirety. But the Nationalist Party had no intention of severing the connecting-link between Ireland and England. [" Oh," and *laughter.*] There was not a Member of that Party who did not wish rather to connect the countries together by stronger bonds than had ever existed before, by the sense of right and justice, and with the idea that the Democracy of England was fighting on their side, and that it was only a privileged class in the one country bolstering up a privileged class in the other [" Hear, hear,"] which was depriving them of their just rights.

Mr. HANBURY (Preston): The hon. Member who has just sat down misrepresents both the Leader of his Party, and some other important Members of it, when he says that separation is not their object. The Amendment is most ingeniously worded. Indeed, it seems to be the fashion in this House so to word Amendments as to get as many hon. Members as possible to vote for them, and to commit such Members as little as possible. The hon. Member in his Amendment, says that he advocates "such a reform in the law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people." Many Members on this side of the House would go as far as that; but a great deal depends upon what is meant by "satisfying the needs and securing the confidence of the Irish people." Does the hon. Member mean to satisfy their political aspirations about which we are certainly not unanimous, or does he mean their material and social needs; and by "the Irish" people does he mean the whole people of Ireland or the political agitator, or the average Irishman in that country? Does he mean the people living in Ireland, or Irishmen living in America, or Paris? But the Amendment, although ingeniously general in its terms, at least contains two valuable admissions—first, that, after all, the Land Question is the one question which is causing the present crisis in Ireland; and, secondly, the further admission that a good deal has been done, even by the landlords themselves, to remedy the defects of the Land Laws. But when the hon. Member said that the conduct of the Government has recently been novel, unconstitutional, and perhaps doubtful, he can hardly, I think, have meant to attack the Chief Secretary for acting in a manner which must meet with the approval of most persons of any humanity in trying to divest himself of the character of a hard-hearted official, and to alleviate the miseries of those tenants who were liable to eviction. I certainly think it would be curious if hon. Members on the other side of the House were to condemn the Chief Secretary for that, and at the same time to resist him when he brings in a measure which is not to punish the poor tenants of Ireland, but those who have been notoriously and openly breaking the law. I fancy that there are a number of law breakers in Ireland whom even the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) himself would be glad to see punished. One of the great troubles of Ireland is that moonlighting, connected, in the first instance, with agrarian disputes, has passed now beyond the power of the Land League to check or control, and is taking the form of vulgar and ordinary crime. But whether the cause of crime be agrarian or not, I think that the people of this country are determined to uphold the law in Ireland so long as it is the law. They see that it is the poor and the defenceless who suffer most from breaches of the criminal law. The civil Code is, to a great extent, the Code of the rich man. The poor man is not able to avail himself of it as much as he ought to on account of the cost; but, from the criminal law, he feels that he can get redress, and if the mass of the people feel confidence in the justice of the law, they will be determined that it shall be carried out. But saying this, and feeling it as strongly as I do, I feel that there are conditions which the people of England would attach to the introduction of new criminal legislation. In the first place, I think they would not wish to see any special legislation applied to Ireland. If we are going to amend the criminal law, let it be amended for England, Scotland, and Ireland alike. I believe that the people of this country are not prepared to inflict punishment on Ireland which they are not prepared to inflict on themselves. Then, again, it should not be a temporary, but a permanent law. A temporary law is more calculated to be a severe and stringent law than one which is intended to be permanent. Hon. Members, if they knew that a law was only to be imposed for one year, might make it exceptionally stringent; but they would be very careful indeed not to make it too stringent if it was intended to be a permanent law. Then, again, a temporary law which might be good for 1887, but not at all adapted to the circumstances of 1888, would not, therefore, carry the same moral sanction with it as if it were made a permanent law. Further, it is not enough—and I hope to hear the admission on this side of the House—to enforce the law. The fault we have so often committed in past times is, that we have been firm at one time and just at another, but we have seldom seen a Government combine firmness and justice together. That is why I find fault with some portions of Her Majesty's Speech. While I see that there is to be at once an Amendment of the criminal law, I do not see it put in equally emphatic terms that there is to be that redress of grievances which ought to accompany an amendment of the criminal law. The redress, I am sorry to see, is to depend upon the reports of two Commissions and a hypothesis. We are told that there is to be local government if the circumstances render it possible. But the question of local government was put in the forefront at the General Election. It was the alternative policy on every Tory platform. Lord Salisbury has spoken of 20 years of firm government. Let us have 20, or 100, years of firm government if you like; but let us also have 100 years of justice. Then, again, as to the Commissions which have been appointed, I do not myself quite see—it may be owing to my ignorance of official life—why it is necessary that we should wait for the Reports of these two Commissions. These are questions which the officials of the Government ought to be perfectly well acquainted with. There is a large staff of permanent officials in Ireland, and is it possible that these men, who have been in the office for years, and have been receiving large salaries, know nothing about these two most important questions—that of the land and that of the material needs of Ireland—and that it is necessary to go through two long and dreary Commissions? Then, again, I do not believe that we in this House are in as impartial a position to form an opinion upon the Irish Question as the public outside. When we once come into this House, the spirit of Party sits heavy upon us; but we are bound to recollect that Parties in the present day are very much in a transition state. In regard to Party questions in reference to Ireland, we may be quite sure of this—that the one thing the people feel about it is, that hitherto the great curse of Ireland is that it has been treated too much as a Party question. Ireland has been made the shuttlecock of Parties. We are likely to be influenced by the types of extreme men we have in this House. If all the landlords outside were of the same good type as those in this House, my opinion is that matters would be different from what they are; but you have the pick of the landlords here, and they do not represent the average landlord. As to the question of property, the people of this country feel that there is other property as well as land, and that the tenants' property has just as much right to be considered as that of the landlords. Then we have the Orange Members, such as my hon. Friend the Member for Belfast (Mr. W. Johnston), who spoke recently from this seat. I cannot believe that these Gentlemen adequately represent the Protestant opinion of Ireland. I, myself, represent a Lancashire constituency, which is in the peculiar position of containing within it nearly one-third of Roman Catholics. So far as English Roman Catholics are concerned, I find them ready and willing to work with their Orange and Protestant fellow-countrymen; and in Lancashire, Roman Catholics and Protestants combine together for every good work. There is a general feeling that what is good for England and Wales, where there is a Protestant majority, and a Catholic minority, should be equally good for Ireland, where they have a Catholic majority, and a Protestant minority. Then, when I come to deal with hon. Members opposite, who represent the people of Ireland, it appears to me that with regard to them there, again there is a difficulty. I do not believe that the average Irishman is by any means the extreme politician that we are accustomed to meet in this House. I do not believe that in the mind of the average Irishman there is that bitterness of feeling which exists towards the English Government on the part of hon. Members sitting below the Gangway opposite. I know that, from my own experience in the employment of Irish harvestmen and labourers, I find among all of them a kindliness and consideration for England which I wish we could more often hear expressed on the Benches opposite. I believe that in this country we are becoming somewhat sick of politicians and political remedies. Sensational Acts may have brought glory to individual Statesmen, or opened avenues to office for political Parties, but the people whom they were supposed to benefit have got very little from them indeed. We have had too much of Party questions and political considerations, and if we want to legislate we must do it both for Ireland and England, not with the view of satisfying the aspirations of politicians, but of meeting the real and material wants of the people of both countries. I believe that the people of this country have a real sympathy for Ireland. They feel and know that just as they desire to have their own trade and social wants satisfied, so the Irish men also desire to have their's satisfied. I believe there is genuine self-confidence among the people of this country, and they are not going to throw up the game in despair, or admit their own incompetence to deal with the question. The people of this country have come of age, and they are not going to throw up their inheritance either in disgust or despair. The more we assert that the Irish Members are not the adequate Representatives of the Irish people, the more it becomes our bounden duty to see that the people of Ireland do not suffer in consequence; and the more we may decry mere political remedies, the greater is the necessity that we should attend to their material wants. Is there any trade question that can possibly interest the people of this country as the Land Question interests the people of Ireland. Unfortunately, and to a large extent, by our own fault, we have destroyed every other industry in Ireland, and it has come to pass that the people have been wholly thrown upon the land. Even the hon. Member for Cork admits that the Land Question at the present day is the most important question of all. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), and all history, tell us the same tale. It is to be hoped that the Land Commission of which we hear does not mean delay in dealing with the question; and above all, I hope that if it is to be dealt with, it will not be dealt with on any new and fantastic principles. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham has, apparently, got some new theory of his own as to rent—namely, that no rent is to be paid until after the occupier of the land has got a reasonable return for his labour. The objection to this is, in the first place, that it would not meet the necessities of the poorer tenants in Ireland, who suffer most under the present condition of the Land Question; and, in the next, that any dealing with the question upon this basis would postpone till an indefinite period the settlement of the Land Question in Ireland, because it would open up the question of rent in England and Scotland, as well as in Ireland. Although I entirely agree with many of the views of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), I confess that I was surprised the other day to hear the observations of the noble Lord on this subject. The noble

Lord seemed to think it possible to return to the days of political economy and of free contract, and he asked why it was more hard to evict the tenants in Glenbeigh than in London. The answer to that is very clear indeed. When you have destroyed every industry throughout the length and breadth of England, and there is no resource left but to go back upon the land, the cases will be similar, but not till then. We in Lancashire are not inclined to blindly worship the principle of freedom of contract; for we know what the Factory Acts have done for women and children by abolishing contract. The women and children protected by the Factory Acts were not a bit more helpless than these unfortunate Irish tenants. Hard commercial principles applied to the land have been the modern curse of Ireland; and when you have the landlord an absentee, managing his property through an agent, you have commercial principles in a doubly aggravated form. The old kindly dealing due to the friendly intercourse between landlord and tenant, and which in this country has affected the relations between them, no longer exists on the estates of the mere merchant in land, who purchased as a speculation under the Encumbered Estates Act. If such kindly feeling could be re-established, I believe it would do much to smooth matters, even where the people are less warm-hearted than in Ireland. If it is unwise to alter the principles on which the Land Act is based, how do we find ourselves now in regard to the Land Act itself? That Act proposed that the Irish tenants should have fair rents, and that they should have an absolute right in their own improvements. It is difficult for an Englishman to understand exactly how far the tenants have got the benefit of these Acts. It strikes me as a curious fact that whereas there are 700,000 of these tenants in Ireland, no more than 200,000 of them have got judicial rents fixed at all. I do not know the cause of that; but, if fair rents were intended to be given to them by the Land Acts, we ought to see that justice is done, and that the Acts are carried out, both in the letter and spirit. Although I found myself utterly unable to agree with the hon. Member for Cork last Session, when he introduced his Bill to bring down rents temporarily by 50 per cent; yet I do think that it would be a wise and permanent settlement of the question if, having promised the tenants a fair rent, you could introduce a sliding scale which would adjust itself according to the price of produce in Ireland. Then, again, as to the tenants' improvements. I understand that in the last Land Act the tenant was not to be rented on his own improvements. If that is not the law, then the law ought to be altered. There is also another question about which I am not clear, and upon which I should like to receive some information in the course of this debate. In England, if we evict a tenant, two things happen. In the first place, the tenant has somewhere to go to; and he gets full compensation for his improvements, although the improvements are not done on anything like the same scale as in Ireland. What I want to know is, whether in Ireland, when a tenant is evicted for non-payment of his rent, which might be £10, does that lead to the forfeiture by the tenant of a tenant-right which may be worth £100 or £200? [*Cries of* "Yes!" *from the Home Rule Benches.*] If that be so, the Act certainly requires amendment. It seems clear that, at any rate, it is not working as was originally intended; and if we want to put an end to endless agitation, we ought to have these Land Acts settled once and for ever. I want to know who is responsible for the bad working of these Acts? Is it due to the ambiguity of the phraseology of the Acts? If so, let us apply a remedy. Is it due to the impossibility of the tenants finding their way into the Land Courts? If so, let us make it cheaper for them to go there. I have heard it said that hon. Gentlemen opposite do not wish them to go into the Land Courts, and have the question settled; because it would be the means of stopping the land agitation. Then, I say, it is the duty of the House to protect people against such agitation, and to say, whether it is the fault of the law or of the agitation, that the tenants do not get the full benefit of the Acts. I may be told, in answer to the remarks I have made—"Oh, but, in the first place, the tenants of Ireland are a great deal richer than you generally give them credit for. They have got money in the savings banks." Yes; but I know that not long ago, at the General Election, Conservative speakers were pointing to the increase of deposits in the savings banks, not as showing increased prosperily, but the lack of confidence and the small scope for safe investment that existed. It was said that when other means of investment decreased, the people put their money into the savings banks. Then it is said that enormous sums are being paid for tenant-right. Is not that owing to the fact of the bitter competition for the possession of land? Naturally, now that the rent has been reduced, the tenant right has become more valuable than it was. In raising this point, I have been sometimes met by this somewhat contradictory answer—"Oh, these people are so poor, that if you were to give them the land for nothing they would not be able to live upon it." Now, it strikes me that that is a curious argument in justification of enforcing rack-rents. The very first thing we have to do is to settle the Land Act, and see that it is carried out thoroughly, both in the letter and in the spirit. Let us settle these matters, step by step, and when you have done so, you will at any rate have settled the difficulty between landlord and tenant. You will have given the tenant absolute security for his improvements, and the landlord absolute security in his possession of the land; and if, when a fair rent has been properly fixed, the tenant does not pay it, then not even in Ireland should we allow robbery. We are told that ejectments will still happen. I know they will, and why? Because we come back to the old question that there is nothing for the people to live on in Ireland except the land. If the small tenants have nothing to live on except their small holdings, they cannot live upon them. Then what are we to do? We may do a great deal by strictly carrying out the law in the first place, because if the law is carried out, and the landlord is protected, and is so able to live on his land, the landlord will be able to find employment for the small tenant as harvestman or blacksmith, or in some other way, as is done in England. A good many of the men with these small holdings formerly managed to get a good living by coming over here in harvest time. I believe it is a fact that, owing to the bad harvest of 1879, the earnings of Irish harvestmen were £250,000 less than it had been in more prosperous years. And I know that now-a-days many Irishmen are unable to find employment of this kind, on account of the antipathy to Irish harvestmen among the English agricultural labourers, who, rather than work with them, prefer to do the work themselves. Then, again, there would be some finality, and the Irishman would be free to settle down to his daily work. If the law were vindicated and strictly carried out, you would have capital flowing back again to Ireland; but it will never do so under other circumstances. I cannot agree with some of the remedies which I have seen suggested for this Irish Question. I, for one, do not believe in emigration; I, for one, do not for one moment believe in governing a people by getting rid of them. And then, how about our Colonies? Are you going to send away these men—the young, and the strong, and the best among the people of Ireland—to the Colonies, with their hearts full of bitter hatred of England? Suppose that, in a place like Glenbeigh, you send 50 persons out of the country. What will happen? A low ideal of life will still remain. It is a remarkable fact in Irish history that the prosperity of Ireland was not increased with the decrease of population; and I say that until you have done your best to raise the ideal of life among the Irish people, you may emigrate 50 out of every 100, but those who are left will only increase and multiply, and will do nothing to improve their condition. I believe that we English people have to face this matter boldly. It is we who destroyed the industries of the people of Ireland, and the people themselves are, to a large extent, what we have made them. I believe that the people of this country will have to put their hands into their pockets, and do what they fairly can to replace their Irish neighbours on a sounder footing. I believe that you will have no peace or contentment in Ireland until you give these people something besides the land to fall back upon. And as we treat them they will be grateful to us for anything we do to help them. I know that Irishmen, under fair and equal conditions, are as law-abiding, and even more law-abiding, than the people of this country. Put an Irishman into the

Army, or into the police, and you will find no braver or more loyal man in your service. Even in regard to ordinary crime, it is a notorious fact that if you put agrarian crime on one side, the Irish are more innocent of ordinary crime than other people. We are sometimes told that the Irishman is not a provident man. I am bound to say that my experience does not bear out that assertion. The pauperism of the Irish people at this moment, in proportion to the population, is less than that which exists in England. We are told that they enter into early and improvident marriages; but I find that the percentage of early marriages, and indeed of marriages altogether, is less in Ireland than in England and Scotland. We are told that the Irishman is not industrious. Not industrious! Why, I should like to know who has made our railroads and canals in England, in America, and Australia? It is the Irishman who has carried out these works. Why is it that the Irishman is industrious in other lands, and not in his own? It is because he has not got the same hope that he has in other lands, the same chances of, and the same reward for, honest industry. If you gave him the chance to be industrious in Ireland, I believe he would care far less than he does about mere political aspirations. It is his own material wants which touch him most. Then I say give him hope and opportunity, by restoring the Irish industries you have destroyed. It may be true—I do not admit it—but we are told sometimes that the Irishman longs for political institutions more than anything else. But if he does so, why is it? It is because we have taught him to look to political agitation as his only trade, except the land—it is because political agitation is the only trade in which he has ever seen a ray of hope. Then, I say, try to restore Irish industries, and let him see hope from his industry in the future, as he has seen it in political agitation in the past. I am anxious that full justice should be done to the material wants of Ireland, for two reasons—first, because I believe that the masses of the people of England attach more importance to questions of trade and industry than they do to schemes of political agitation; and, secondly, because I believe that the first and greatest necessity is to uphold the law in Ireland. But you can only uphold the law in Ireland or elsewhere if you have a clear conscience and clean hands, and I would have you say to the people of Ireland that, while you are determined to uphold the law, you also intend to do something even better, and that you will dispense absolute justice, and give a ready and an attentive ear to the admitted injustices and the material wants of a people whom I believe to be as justice-loving as any on the face of the earth.

MR. WODEHOUSE (Bath) said he could not gather from the hon. Member who had just addressed the House whether he intended to vote for or against the Amendment, or not vote at all; but no one who had listened to his speech would be surprised to learn that there were a good many Irish voters in the hon. Gentleman's constituency. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), against which he should vote without hesitation, presented for discussion both a political and an agrarian side; and as the connection between agrarian and political projects in Ireland was universally admitted to be very intimate, the Amendment virtually raised the whole Irish question. It called for such a reform of the law and system of Government as would satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people; and even if they had not heard the speech of the hon. Member for Cork, there could be no mistake about the real meaning of those words when coming from him; they meant an Irish Legislature and an Irish Government. The hon. Member for Cork did not stand alone in this interpretation of the imperative and immediate wants of Ireland; by his side stood a greater than he, the late Prime Minister of England. These circumstances must govern the consideration of the Amendment, and for his own part he approached it as an opponent of the Irish policy of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian and the hon. Member for Cork. He must leave many points of law and administration to which the hon. Member had referred to be dealt with by the Attorney General for Ireland; but he would like to say a word or two with regard to the so-called dispensing power which was alleged to have been exercised in Ireland. It was certainly an untoward incident when an eminent Judge noted for impartiality, found, or thought he found, occasion to pass something like censure on the Executive Government in connection with the enforcement of legal proceedings. Such an incident would be regrettable anywhere, but especially in a country like Ireland, where respect for the law of the land was, to say the least, imperfect, and where the most just and laudable actions of the Government were daily liable to deliberate misconstruction by those whose avowed object was to make all government impossible. The discretion of particular officers might, perhaps, in some cases have been at fault; but a Minister in the arduous post of Chief Secretary for Ireland, who exercised his legitimate moral influence to moderate differences and assuage strife in so troubled a condition of society, did not deserve the disparagement and carping criticism of the hon. Member for Cork. He deserved rather the approval and support of the House. And when the action of the Chief Secretary was placed on a level with the Plan of Campaign, when counsels offered to landlords to be lenient in the exaction of what was legally theirs, were likened to instigation addressed to debtors to withhold from their creditors what they owed and defy the law—the parallel and juxtaposition were a monstrous confusion of plain right and wrong. How far cases of serious disturbance in the relations of landlord and tenant had been due to refusals of reasonable abatements of rent, and the rejection of the Tenants' Relief Bill of the hon. Member for Cork; or how far they had been due to the authors of the Plan of Campaign, he would leave hon. Members to discuss who had more detailed knowledge of the agrarian situation in Ireland than he had. The House required accurate information, and there were few spots on earth where it was harder to get at the real bare truth than in Ireland; exaggeration thrived there, and the Glenbeigh evictions were a typical illustration of this. No one could be insensible either to the pain or or public mischief of such scenes, or could fail to yearn for a remedy which should make them cease. But the attempt made by those who would extirpate all landlords from Ireland to inflame prejudice against a whole class by affixing a stigma of atrocious inhumanity upon one particular landlord, had been a signal failure. When all the modern arts and artifices of sensation were employed to dress up a particular case in flaring colours, it was as well to remember that the worst sufferings in this world were not those about which most noise was made. Could no saddening pictures be drawn of the indigence and privation into which persons had been plunged by the refusal of tenants to pay rent when perfectly well able to do so—persons whose suffering was all the more acute because they had not been reared in hardship from their birth? And if the degree of suffering could not be accurately measured even by the cries and the clamour of those who felt it, how much less could it be measured by the clamour of those who did not feel it, but who utilized it for their own selfish or political objects. These evictions might, however, be of use to remind the House and the Government of the necessity of dealing with those districts where the occupiers could not thrive, even if they paid no rent. The problem of the congested districts pressed for solution, and he clung to the hope that the wisdom of this Parliament might devise a scheme of migration or emigration, or of both combined, to deal with those districts in such a manner as would be just to the landlords, and considerate of the future welfare of the transplanted occupiers. With regard to the reduction of judicial rents, and the extension of the Land Act of 1881 to leaseholders, the House was awaiting the Report of Lord Cowper's Commission, which might, perhaps, present a strong case for such changes. Should it do so, these amendments of the Act must be made. But, looking at that Act as intended to be a *modus vivendi*, pending the substitution of single for dual ownership, he could not contemplate disturbance of so important a provision as the term for which judicial rents were fixed without regret or disquietude. The Land Act of 1881 was no common Statute. It was passed with wonderful dexterity and energy by a great Minister in the plenitude of his power, and it had been lauded to the skies as an imperishable monument of his constructive genius. Its author fondly described it, even in its cradle, as an infant Hercules strangling powers of evil. He spoke of it as granting, with a liberality unknown in the history of landed legislation, privilege and security to the cultivator of the soil, and he told them that the prosperity and happiness of Ireland might depend upon its working for generations and even for centuries. Faith in legislation would be rudely shaken, and a sense of insecurity would spread, if it were found that this memorable historic Statute, intended to be a sort of Charter for generations yet unborn, could not bear the ordinary, reasonable wear and tear of four or five short years. He said the reasonable wear and tear, because it was incredible that a great Statesman, when framing so exceptional and drastic a measure, should have overlooked such obvious possibilities as vicissitudes of seasons and developments of agriculture in other parts of the world, with consequent fluctuations of prices. When, however, such measures as the Land Acts of 1870 and 1881, the Arrears Act of 1882, and Lord Ashbourne's Act, had been passed by Parliament; when legislation had paid regard to improvements made by tenants; when the Irish tenant had been invested with privileges and advantages unknown elsewhere; when, in short, to use a phrase of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, the land law of Ireland had been purged of any taint of injustice, surely it was essential that remedial legislation should have fair play, and that its beneficial operation should not be marred or destroyed by combinations or conspiracies which arrogated the right to stand between the people and the law. And if this increased stringency of criminal procedure which the Government proposed was intended to protect and guard the laws and those who would profit by them, such reform of criminal procedure should certainly have his support. Why was the hon. Member for Cork put into Kilmainham by the Government of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian? Because he tried to stand between the Land Act of 1881 and the Irish tenantry; because he put the Act in jeopardy at its outset. That was what was called coercion. Coercion was a very misleading and inappropriate term; it was nothing more nor less than a nickname invented for use in Party warfare; but for brevity's sake he would use it. No one could have listened with indifference to the sinister prophecies of the hon. Member for Cork as to what would follow recourse to coercion; prophecies which that hon. Member had it so much in his power either to disappoint or fulfil. But when the hon. Member for Cork contended that coercion was harsh and hateful, and that it had always failed, he must submit that there was another side to these propositions. For his own part, when he remembered the many eloquent vindications of coercion which had fallen from the lips of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) and Lord Spencer and the right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt); and how these high authorities had assured the House that coercion had no terrors or inconveniences except for law breakers and evil doers, and that it was really a shield and defence and safeguard to peaceable and law-abiding citizens in every rank, he could not work himself up to the pitch of righteous indignation which appeared to be required now against Coercion Acts. Moreover, when he called to mind all the honest, well-deserved panegyrics which Liberals had lavished upon Lord Spencer and Sir George Trevelyan for restoring law and order, and ruling Ireland well by firm use of a strong Coercion Act, he could not readily subscribe to the doctrine that coercion had always failed. What had failed was the intermittent application of this so-called coercion in obedience to the exigencies of political Parties. Whenever the time had come to determine whether one of these temporary Acts should be renewed or not, the question had not been settled by the merits of the case, but by the exigencies of political Parties at the moment. The hon. Member for Cork had passed in review the events of recent years, and he would follow his footsteps. In 1880 the late Mr. Forster went to Ireland, relying on the ordinary law, and full of benevolent intentions towards the Irish people; but the Land League arose with its gospel of plunder, and Mr. Forster soon found that he wanted a Coercion Act. Then he was denounced in language which would have been exaggerated if applied even to Nero. Next came the Kilmainham Treaty, when the prison doors were opened, to be quickly followed by the Phœnix Park tragedy, and another Coercion Act, which Lord Spencer administered amid tremendous difficulties and under torrents of ferocious abuse and calumny. When that Act was about had been for six or seven years. There seemed to be no disposition to refuse the payment of rents, and landlords made reasonable abatements, which were willingly accepted by the tenants. Up to the first week of November no difficulties or disturbances were heard of. Yet many of the persons who so paid their rents were those of whom it had been said that they were too poor to pay them. This shows that the statements that had been made did not accurately represent the state of the country. There was ability to pay rents, and, where the whole could not be paid, reasonable reductions were made. It seems to me that if the tenants had been allowed to go on by themselves, if there had been no agitation, there would have been none of the disturbances that occurred in the last month of the year. Much has been said about the property of Lord Dillon. It has been repeatedly stated in Ireland, and it cannot be contradicted, that out of a rental of £16,000, in October £5,000 was collected in the ordinary way from all classes of tenants. But in November there was a change, and it came from agitation, and from the movement set on foot by the Colleagues of the hon. Member for Cork. That movement is known as the Plan of Campaign. The hon. and learned Member for East Edinburgh (Mr. Wallace), with something of metaphysical haziness, argued that the Plan resembled a combination of workmen to induce an employer to change the terms on which they had been employed, and to enter into a new contract. But that does not seem to me to be a parallel case. The hon. and learned Member seems to have an imperfect idea of what the Plan of Campaign is. Nor does the hon. Member for Cork seem to have learnt what it is from his Colleagues. He said, in the mildest way, that it simply came to this—that some tenants who could pay rent told the landlords that they would not pay until they made what the tenants who could not pay the full amount considered reasonable abatement. What the Plan of Campaign is may be illustrated in this way. Suppose a number of people in England, for some reason, took objection to certain persons engaged in the banking business; suppose the objectors considered that the bankers were hostile to the interests of the country, and desired to see them driven from the country; and suppose they summoned a meeting of the debtors to the banks, and said to them—"You are very poor; you are badly off; it will oppress you to pay your debts to the banks; at the time you borrowed the money you expected to make more out of it than you have done; therefore, offer the banks 40 or 50 per cent less than you owe; and if the offer is not accepted, hand over the money to someone else, so that it shall not be paid to the bank until the reduction is assented to." In addition, suppose that every form of possible intimidation is resorted to against the bankers to induce them to accept the terms, and that the debtors sell off their goods, so that if execution be issued against them it may be impossible to realize anything, and that when steps are taken to seize any tangible property the Sheriff is resisted, and it is made impossible to enforce the law. Will anyone tell me that such a course of action is moral or legal, and that it is not criminal? The persons engaged in this movement were not satisfied to endeavour to obtain concessions by withholding money; but they used various forms of intimidation against the landlords. Take, as an illustration, the case of the Marquess of Lansdowne. It was said, at one time, that he had made abatements, and that others might well follow his example. Then it was asked why, having made concessions in one part of the country, he did not do so in another. Referring to this complaint, Mr. William O'Brien, speaking at Maryborough, on the 24th of January, said—

> "We will carry the war into Canada. We will meet him at his palace-gates. We will track him night and day the wide world over, and from one end of the Dominion of Canada to another. I promise him on the part of the Irish in Canada that wherever he goes he will find Irish hearts and Irish throats that will hoot him and boycott him and hunt him with execrations out of that great and free land."

This is an example of the form of intimidation practised towards a landlord who does not make the concessions demanded from him. Similar intimidation is applied to the tenant who says—"I have got money, and I am quite willing to pay." He is Boycotted and persecuted so that he cannot be honest, even if he would. More than that, if a tenant who has entered into the Plan of Campaign comes to the conclusion that it is better for him to pay, what is to happen then? The hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) speaking at Eyre Court on November 28, said —

> "If any man went behind the back of his neighbours and paid, what would happen? The trustees would close on the money and use it for the benefit of those who stood out. The man who had paid his rent would get nothing, and the money would be kept for the purposes of agitation."

And on October 5, Mr. William O'Brien, speaking at Inchiquin, said—

> "I tell you that, under this Plan of Campaign, if an individual tenant desired to pay it is impossible to do it."

That strikes at the root of all honesty in the country. But, Sir, the Plan of Campaign goes further than that. Have we not been told that tenants ought to sweep their stock from their farms, so that there would be no means left for the landlord to realize his rent by distress? I can hardly imagine anything more disastrous to the agriculture of a country than for the whole of the stock on the farms to be converted into money, and the money to be placed somewhere out of the power of the tenant. It is not to be wondered at that some hon. Members, who advocate this Plan, should come here and tell us that some of the tenants have not even sufficient seed with which to plant a crop in the coming year. I think it would be very difficult for hon. Members from Ireland to convince other hon. Members of this House that advice such as that is not in its nature essentially illegal. It has been suggested again and again that those who are engaged in this Plan are just as much anxious to benefit the landlords as the tenants, and that it is much better for the landlords to accept a reasonable rent which can be paid than to strive after rents which cannot possibly be paid. But I submit that what lies at the root of this Plan of Campaign is an attack upon all landlordism, and that the intention is to drive landlords out of Ireland altogether. To show that I am not overstating this matter, I will quote one of the very first speeches made on this subject by the hon. Member for East Mayo, delivered at Newtownsandes, on the 25th of October. Having referred in outline to this Plan—not then very fully developed—he said that after they had succeeded in getting the reductions they asked for, they should wipe out and crush landlordism altogether—

> "When we have succeeded in doing that, we can then turn our exertions towards making Ireland what she ought to be—a free and prosperous country."

The hon. Member for North Fermanagh (Mr. W. Redmond), speaking on the 30th of November, said—

> "What will be the result if you do this? You will reduce the rents and you will beat landlordism once and for all to its knees."

On the 5th of October, Mr. William O'Brien said—

> "Together we will march shoulder to shoulder, from victory to victory, until we shall have liberated this land from the two curses of landlordism and English rule."

A more elaborate exposition was given at a very important meeting held at the town of Castlereagh on the 5th of December, and there were there the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), the hon. Member for East Galway (Mr. M. Harris), and the hon. Member for North Fermanagh (Mr. W. Redmond), and the hon. Member for East Galway said—

> "I am not going to indulge in a No-rent manifesto; that was put to the people of Ireland before, and if they had adhered to that programme there would be no landlords in Ireland to-day; but they had not the courage to do that. That great programme drove terror to the hearts of our enemies; but it broke down, and therefore we cannot put forward such an advanced programme again. But we put before you a programme that will lead to that result—that will first take one slice, then take a second slice, and we will keep slicing it till nothing remains."

That is very much like what was said by the hon. Member for West Kerry (Mr. E. Harrington), on the 19th of December last. He said—

> "We had an old traditional belief that landlords are the English garrison in Ireland. We can annihilate them with the Plan; when we have annihilated them the Government of Ireland will be in our own hands. It is the great thing we have to look to; it is not to make Lord Kenmare give us a reduction of rent. It is not for these things merely that we waste our energies."

Well, Sir, I have given some reasons which I think will induce some hon. Members of this House to believe that this Plan of Campaign is not the legal and innocent thing which it has been represented in some quarters. It is illegal and criminal. It has been asked why, if this Plan of Campaign were illegal to the knowledge of the Government, did they allow two months to elapse before taking any steps to put an end to it? That is only one instance among many of the faulty chronology of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell)—those two months existed only in his imagination. The Plan of Campaign first appeared in *United Ireland* on the 23rd of October. But a mere publication in a newspaper is not enough to make a Government institute a prosecution until they see what is coming out of it. For a fortnight after that there was nothing done except that a few speeches were made in remote parts of the country. The first speech that brought the Plan forward in a prominent way was on the 7th of November, and it was not until the 21st of November that anything like active operations took place. Then the dates of the Assizes were such that it was impossible to have any of the persons whom the Government thought it desirable to prosecute, returned for trial at an early date, and the earliest time that a trial reasonably could he had was in the beginning of February. The Government were anxious at the very earliest moment to test the legality of the statements of the hon. Members. The hon. Member for Cork has found fault with the invocation of the inherent jurisdiction of the Queen's Bench, and has said there was no precedent. I am happy to inform him that there is a precedent in this country in which an application was made to the inherent jurisdiction of the Queen's Bench.

Mr. PARNELL (Cork): The application to which the right hon. and learned Gentleman is referring was made under a statute of Charles; the application of the present Government was made under no statute, but to the inherent jurisdiction of the Court.

Mr. HOLMES: Of course I can quite understand the interruption of the hon. Member, because it is hardly to be supposed that he should be conversant with legal questions. It was the statute of Charles by which procedure in exercising the inherent jurisdiction of the Court of Queen's Bench was regulated, but that jurisdiction existed before the statute was passed. For a fortnight or three weeks we were told that this Plan of Campaign was perfectly legal. The Government of the day, however, knew no way in which its legality or illegality could be declared except by a Court of competent jurisdiction, and the Court of Queen's Bench decided that the hon. Member for East Mayo should be put under rule of bail because he had encouraged others to go into the Plan of Campaign. Yet the Government have been blamed because they appealed to the only Court which they could recognize as an authority to lay down the law. I will not trouble the House with any further observations in regard to the Plan of Campaign; but I desire to make one or two remarks in reference to the statements which have been made about General Sir Redvers Buller and Judge Curran, and what the hon. Member for Cork describes as the dispensing power. I was under the impression that the hon. Member for Cork believed and sought to convey to the House that General Buller and Judge Curran were sent to Kerry for the purpose of carrying out the policy of the Government as regards the dispensing power. Let me remind the House that in this the hon. Member for Cork is entirely at fault. General Buller was sent to Kerry within one week after the present Government came into Office, when there was no talk or thought or idea that this agitation would be raised about the inability of the tenants to pay rent. He was sent there because there had been disorder and outrages and "Moonlighting" in Kerry, and his duty was to reorganize the police, and to deal with these matters. About the same time Judge Curran was transferred from another county to Kerry. The Government of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had selected him as a County Court Judge who would fearlessly carry out the law. The present Government, finding Kerry in that state in which it was thought necessary to send General Buller to the county, also deemed it desirable to have a County Court Judge there of courage and firmness. Judge Curran accepted the transfer to that county, because he said he was willing to go to any county where his services might be useful; and, with the exception of this communication, there was never a communication of any kind between Judge Curran and Her Majesty's Government. What Judge Curran did in Kerry he did out of his own motion. From the beginning to the end of the letter which has been read by the hon. Member there is no suggestion that Judge Curran did anything that was in the smallest degree illegal. Then a great deal has been said about General Buller exercising a dispensing power. I ask the House to consider on what slender testimony all those statements have been made. Well, I have followed carefully the speech of the hon. Member for Cork, and he adduced four proofs of the interference of General Buller in this direction. The first was a telegram sent by Moriarty, an Inspector of Constabulary, to the Sub-Sheriff of Cork—I think it was —asking for the assistance of four or five constables at an eviction. That telegram was sent at 10 o'clock at night, and the eviction was to take place at four or five o'clock the next morning. In pursuance of instructions given years and years ago, the Sheriff was informed that it was necessary, for the purpose of meeting the police arrrangements, to give a 10 days' notice. So much, therefore, as regards Moriarty. A good deal has been said by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) about striking below the belt. I believe there are some suggestions of the hon. Member's that do strike below the belt, especially those in reference to General Buller, and the evidence which that officer gave before the Land Commission, which sat under the presidency of Lord Cooper. They are suggestions which may well be characterized as a blow below the belt. On this subject a letter appeared in a newspaper which purported to be written by some member of the Commission to a friend in London, and which purported to give the effect of the evidence of General Buller. The hon. Member has asserted that no contradiction has ever been made in regard to that letter. Now, in the first place, a member of the Commission—Lord Milltown—at once gave a direct contradiction to the statement that he had written it; and the secretary of the Commission—writing in the name of all the members of it—distinctly denied that any member of the Commission had written that letter. It is suggested now that General Buller did give the evidence, and that he has now changed it; and that he has been engaged recently in altering and amending his evidence. Could there be a greater reflection on an hon. and gallant officer than that those who composed a Royal Commission should have invited him to amend his evidence, and that he should have done so? The evidence itself will shortly be published; but I am informed by a member of the Commission that General Buller was not invited to alter his evidence. A printed proof of his evidence was sent to him, as it has been sent to every other witness; and it was returned without any material alteration. Anyone who knows anything about the proceedings of a Royal Commission will be aware that, as soon as a proof of the evidence is ready, it is sent to the person who has given it, with an intimation that he may correct any errors of the Press, or any part of it which does not touch the materiality of the evidence. The hon. Member has stated that General Buller, when asked if he had given evidence, said that he would not reply to the question, because he had not yet corrected it. Now, I was present on that occasion, and the answer which General Buller gave was that he had given evidence to the Commissioners, that it would be published in due course, and that he did not know that he would be justified in publishing it prematurely. This question was asked him, "Have you received a proof in the ordinary way?" and General Buller's reply was that it had not reached him. The charge, therefore, so far as General Buller is concerned, I think the House will feel disposed to regard at its proper value. The hon. Gentleman also referred to the case of an individual tenant and Captain Plunkett. It was stated by the hon. Member, in his speech, that an effort was made by Captain Plunkett to induce the agent of the property to accept a reduced rent—in fact, one year's rent out of three. That is not so. The offer by the tenant was that he should pay one year's rent at once, and that the rest should stand over for a short time, until it could be adjusted. Captain Plunkett states that he used no compulsion whatever towards the landlord. Then is it not absurd to base upon two or three instances of this kind the sweeping allegations against Her Majesty's Government, that through their officers they were exercising dispensing power? My right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary, a few nights ago, challenged any hon. Member to prove a single instance in which any person desiring to exercise his legal rights was refused protection. He asserted, on the other hand, that in every case where legal assistance was asked for it was voluntarily and cheerfully given. I now challenge any hon. Member to show that where any application has been made for protection in executing legal process, it has not been afforded. I will now pass briefly over the remaining allegations. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) referred to what he called coercion and coercive legislation; and looking at the paragraph in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech in which She speaks of the amendment of the procedure of the criminal law, he said, again and again, that the criminal law was to be enforced against political offenders. Now, it would be both premature and unbecoming for me to say what the provisions may be of the measure which Her Majesty's Government may submit to this House. But this I may promise, that whatever amendment of the law can be suggested our object will be to take action, not against political action, but against criminal offenders. If we find that the law at our disposal is not sufficient to enable us to reach criminal offenders, we shall fearlessly ask Parliament to amend and extend it. The hon. Member for Cork threatened Her Majesty's Government with dynamiters, who were to come from America.

Mr. PARNELL (Cork): Mr. Speaker, I rise to Order. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman is entitled to accuse me of having used threats?

Mr. SPEAKER: What I understood the right hon. and learned Gentleman to mean was that the hon. Member had intimated his opinion that in a certain contingency dynamiters would come from America.

Mr. PARNELL: I never made use of such a threat, and I never predicted that such a thing would happen. What I said was that those things had happened. I submit, Sir, with great respect, that nothing which I said was capable of the interpretation put upon it by the right hon. and learned Gentleman.

Mr. HOLMES: I will at once relieve the hon. Member. I never used the words in the sense of which the hon. Member complains. I will at once put it in another form, and what I say is, that the reference which the hon. Member made to the dynamiters and the conspiracies to assassinate Members of the Government of that day will not prevent Her Majesty's present Government from asking for those powers which they might think necessary to amend the criminal law. It is necessary now to say a few words, and I will endeavour to make them as few as possible, in reference to the procedure to which the Government have had recourse. The hon. Member for Cork has brought several accusations against the Government. The first, I think I have already disposed of—namely, the application of the exercise of the jurisdiction of the Court of Queen's Bench. His second complaint has reference to the proclamation of the meeting at Sligo. Now, why was that meeting proclaimed? It was proclaimed because it was an obvious attempt to interfere with the administration of justice at the coming Assizes. There were several cases to be tried at Sligo in connection with the Woodford evictions, where the tenants had fortified themselves in four places, one of which was called "Saunders's Fort," and every means of violence which could be suggested was practised to resist the forces of the law. The proceedings were altogether illegal and violent, and it required a large force not only of police, but military, to execute the Queen's writ, and obtain possession. That was a crime, and whatever hon. Members may assert, any Government that would have tolerated it, or that would not have acted as we did, would be unworthy of their position. The cases were to be tried at the coming Assizes in Sligo, and a few days before they were to be tried the following telegram was posted up in Sligo:—

> "John Dillon, O'Kelly, and myself ask the Nationalists of Sligo to assemble in their might in Sligo town next Sunday to appeal to Sligo jurors to express their condemnation of efforts of Government to assassinate liberty of Press and victimize the gallant defenders of Saunders's Fort. We will attend.—Wm. O'Brien."

That was a meeting for the purpose of telling the jury that they were to express their condemnation of the Government in prosecuting the defenders of "Saunders's Fort." According to the law administered in this country and in Ireland alike, a meeting assembled for such a purpose would be an illegal assembly, and it is not merely the right but the duty of the guardians of the peace in either country to disperse a meeting of that kind. I have been asked if there is a precedent for such a proceeding. Yes, Sir, there is a precedent, and I am glad that I can find precedents for all these things during the Government of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian. The hon. Gentleman has heard of the case of the Queen against Parnell and others, which occurred, I think, somewhere about January, 1881. A short time before the case came on a similar meeting was called, the object of which was to intimidate jurors in Dublin; but a proclamation in the very terms of the Sligo proclamation was issued by the right hon. Gentleman who was then Chief Secretary, and the meeting was suppressed. Then comes the allegation of what is called "jury packing." A Motion in reference to that subject has been placed on the Votes of the House. No doubt it will be fully discussed; and I can assure the hon. Member who has put down the Motion that no Member of Her Majesty's Government will shrink from the discussion. The hon. Member for Cork complains that in forming the first panel the Sheriff had wilfully infringed the law. Now, that question was raised and tried in the only legal way in which it could be tried—namely, by two triers who happened to be a Protestant and Catholic, and the answer given by those who tried it was that it was not a case of jury packing. The Lord Chief Baron stated that he entirely approved of the finding. The Lord Chief Baron, under the circumstances, caused a new panel to be prepared; but he did so in order to prevent any question or doubt with regard to its legality. The new panel was prepared under his own eyes and direction, and he has stated that he saw it prepared in precise accordance with the Act of Parliament. It was from that panel so prepared that the jury was selected. Whoever conducted the prosecution would have been guilty of a serious dereliction of duty if they had not exercised, under the circumstances, the full power they possessed. Another objection made by hon. Members opposite is that the Crown exercised the right of challenge, and asked certain Catholics to stand by. Let me remind the House that the Crown Solicitor was a Catholic; but at that time a large number of people in Sligo—Protestants and Catholics alike—were subjected to the most serious intimidation, and were warned as to the consequences that would happen to them if they were to serve upon that jury. The Crown was, therefore, bound to secure men of independent thought; it would otherwise have been impossible to secure a fair trial. Let me ask of what injustice the Crown were guilty after the jury was empanelled? The Lord Chief Baron repeated, again and again, that he entirely agreed with every verdict returned. The first case was one in which the jury found it necessary to record a special verdict. They found it impossible to acquit the prisoners, but, having regard to the circumstances of the case, they returned a special verdict, which the Judge ruled to be a verdict for the Crown. This shows that they were not determined to find verdicts for the Crown *per fas et nefas*. They acted with great judgment and great impartiality, and with a leaning towards mercy. Not only was an attack made upon the juries, but upon the Judge himself. The Judge who, a fortnight before, was declared by the Nationalist Members of Ireland to be the most impartial Judge who ever sat on the Bench, was denounced in the most violent terms. This is an example of what has happened in Ireland again and again, and if the Crown is not to exercise the right which the law has given with a view to the impartial trial of cases, it would be impossible to have cases tried in Ireland. Perhaps I have replied to the allegations which have been made by the hon. Member for Cork at too great a length, but I felt bound to follow him in the remarks he has made. I notice the hon. Member has said very little about the last part of his Amendment, with reference to the reform of the law and system of government. I say that if this Amendment were carried it would be an affirmation of the Home Rule Bill of last Session, because we know that the least that hon. Members opposite will accept in the direction of Home Rule is the Bill of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). We on this side of the House take up the position of opponents to that Bill. We are here for the purpose of resisting the demand for Home Rule, and for this reason alone we must at once resist this Amendment. Something has been said about remedial legislation. The Government do not desire to avoid the question of remedial legislation, and such legislation will be submitted to the House at the proper time. We trust that it will be accepted, and that it will do good; but whatever the nature of it may be, we are determined that it shall be consistent with the maintenance of the union between the two countries, and with the enforcement of law and order in Ireland.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to a speech which, it seems to me, would have been better reserved by the right hon. and learned Attorney General for the time when he will have to open my prosecution on this day week. A few sentences towards the close of that speech dealt with the wider and greater issues which ought to have occupied the attention of the House, but the greater part of the speech was devoted to a diatribe which I think came very ill from Her Majesty's principal Law Adviser in Ireland, for prejudicing my trial before a jury which the right hon. and learned Gentleman intends to pack. The right hon. and learned Gentleman spoke about the panel in Sligo, and he endeavoured to induce hon. Members in this House to believe that the hands of the Law Officers of the Crown in Ireland are guiltless of what I can only characterize as the heinous offence of jury packing. But the right hon. and learned Gentleman passed over in silence the fact which is undeniable and undenied—that in placing these men on their trial at Sligo, they being Catholic peasants from the County of Galway—and their crime was regarded as a very light one, as any hon. Member who has read the history of Ireland will know—the Crown has exercised the most oppressive, and as some think, illegal power—a power which, no doubt, they have always arrogated to themselves—of making the jurors stand aside without cause until in every instance they succeeded in securing a jury that was nearly all entirely Protestant. In every instance these poor men were tried before a purely Protestant jury, and in most cases every single co-religionist of the accused was ordered to stand aside. How can the population of Ireland be expected to have any respect for a law which was enforced by such means, and by a jury so shamefully packed? [*Cries of* "Oh!"] I cannot understand how hon. Members, even although they be Conservatives, can stand up in defence of such a system as that, or how they can believe for a single hour that the people of Ireland can ever be induced to respect or submit, except by force, to such a law. If you want to know why the people of Ireland have no confidence in the law, and do not believe in justice as administered there by the English Government, I would ask you to contrast the case of the Woodford prisoners—whose crime was light, because in the defence of "Saunders's Fort" not a single drop of human blood was shed—with the treatment of the two Waters, murderers who were taken red-handed in the act of shooting a policeman. They were placed upon their trial, charged, not with defending their homes, but with shooting down a policeman in the streets of Belfast, one of whom shot him in the back. There were witnesses who swore that with their own eyes they saw the prisoners commit the murder; but what did the Crown do in the case? They never exercised their power by ordering a single man to stand aside. In spite of indignant protests from a Protestant Judge, they allowed these murderers to be tried in the county of Tyrone by their brother Orangemen, who allowed them to go scot-free, and they are walking about the streets, at full liberty, to this very day. But the Galway peasants are now lying under a sentence of 12 months' imprisonment, because they defended their fathers' homes. Let me pass away from the subject of packed juries, although it is a delicate one with me, as I expect, in the course of a few weeks, to taste, myself, what a packed jury is. I desire to direct attention to the reasons and causes which have made English law, and the makers of it, hateful to the Irish people. In my case the Crown did not think that a City of Dublin jury could be packed sufficiently; they, therefore, shifted the venue and moved the case into the County of Dublin, because they knew that the suburbs of Dublin are full of broken down land agents and others, who imagine that they have been ruined by our agitation. For 100 years the practice in Green Street, Dublin, has been to return on the long panel about 80 names—it never exceeded 100—but now the Government have returned to the long panel 250 names. This, Sir, is what we know as equal law and justice in Ireland. I have no doubt the Crown will take good care that no Land Leaguer shall sit upon my jury. Allow me, now, to turn to the history given by the Attorney General for Ireland, as to how the present agitation and disturbances in Ireland arose. A more misleading statement, I do not say deliberately misleading, was never made in this House, and I ought to know something about it. The Attorney General said that these disturbances had nothing to do with the rejection of the Bill of my hon. Friend the Member for Cork, and as an evidence of that extraordinary assertion he pointed out that during the month of October rents were paid in Ireland with considerable freedom and regularity. That is perfectly true, but those hon. Members who have followed the course of events in Ireland will know what the reason was. When the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork was brought forward in this House it will be in the recollection of hon. Members that there was delivered from the Front Bench by the Chief Secretary, a speech in which the right hon. Gentleman maintained that there was no case for the reduction of the rents in Ireland. He did not confute our arguments, but he asserted that we had made out no case for reduction of rents in Ireland. At that time the Irish landlords and agents reflected the tone of the speeches of Lord Salisbury and the Chief Secretary for Ireland, that there should be no reduction of rent that winter. Now, I assert that if that attitude had been attempted to be maintained in Ireland, a condition of things would have been arrived to which I look forward with considerable alarm, and what has occurred in Ireland would have been mere child's play compared with what would have happened. We had only returned to Ireland a few weeks when we became aware of a total change in the policy of Her Majesty's Government, and a condition of things was brought about of so peculiar a nature that I do not think a counterpart of it can be found in the whole civilized world. The position which we occupied in Ireland was a most peculiar one. We did not enjoy the confidence of our governors; we dare not be seen talking to them, or be seen going to their official residences, and we were obliged to grope about in the dark and obtain our information from outside sources. It was not, therefore, until after some three weeks had elapsed that we discovered through certain secret channels that the Government had abandoned the attitude taken up by the Chief Secretary for Ireland in this House, and had entered upon a course which we had frequently recommended to successive Irish Governments, although it had always been indignantly repudiated here—namely, that of putting pressure upon the Irish landlords to do their duty. I have repeatedly urged Irish Governments to do that, and so far from blaming the Government for the pressure which they did place upon the Irish landlords I give them all credit for it. I say, further, that they have reaped the reward of what they did, because the difficulties they have to contend with now are as nothing compared with what they would otherwise have been. In that fact you have a reason why the present circumstances did not arise sooner than they did in Ireland, and that when they did arise they were confined to isolated localities. After a certain time it became manifest that while the Government were putting very great pressure upon the Irish landlords to substantially reduce their rents, and even to reduce judicial rents which Lord Salisbury said could not be reduced—and while large reductions were made by many landlords headed by the Duke of Devonshire—it became evident that there was a considerable body of landlords who would not listen to reason, but who insisted upon having their pound of flesh. Are we told here that because certain Irish landlords refuse to listen to reason that that is an argument for destroying the relations between the two countries? No doubt, it was an argument for us to advise and put forward the Plan of Campaign. We discovered that a very considerable number of Irish landlords would neither be coerced nor persuaded by the Chief Secretary, and that they were determined to have their pound of flesh. We then decided to recommend the policy since known as the Plan of Campaign. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Helmes) says that the prophecies dulged in by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), as to the probable consequences of the rejection of his Bill, have not been fulfilled in Ireland; and that, consequently, fewer evictions have occurred than usually take place at such seasons. It is true that fewer evictions have occurred, but why is it that fewer evictions have occurred? Why, it is owing to two things—first, the tremendous pressure put upon the landlords by the Government; and secondly, to the action of the Plan of Campaign. I think I can prove, to the satisfaction of every intelligent man in this House, that what I say is true—namely, that on those estates where the landlords were pressing their tenants, pressure was put upon those landlords by the Government, with the result, practically, of putting a stop to evictions altogether. I wish to direct the attention of the House for a few minutes—I will not dwell long upon it, because I know that a good deal has been said on the subject already—to this question of the speech delivered by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, at Bristol, in November—a time when he seemed to be under the impression that he had solved the Irish problem——

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): No, no!

MR. DILLON: That has been the impression of a great many of his Predecessors, but it has always ended in disappointment. He said in the speech to which I allude, that—

"The County Courts had exercised their power under the law with firmness and with justice, and the Government had brought what pressure they could,"

and that is very strong language—

"acting always within the law, to bear upon those few landlords who would not follow the example of their more generous fellows."

Well, I will say a few words in reference to the action of the County Court Judges, and then I will make a few observations as to what, from my own knowledge, I can say has been the pressure brought to bear on the landlords by the Government. The Chief Secretary, afterwards, when under examination in the Dublin Police Court, said, that

"He always had in his mind, when he spoke of the firmness and justice of the County Court Judges, the action of County Court Judge Curran, in the county of Kerry."

I will ask the House to listen to me attentively whilst I go into the question of the "firmness and justice" of County Court Judge Curran, because I maintain that if ever there was anything done by the Irish Government calculated to bring law in Ireland into disrepute and ridicule, it was the action of County Court Judge Curran in the county of Kerry. I think that when I have read the few extracts I have here in reference to Judge Curran's proceedings—his parody of all law in the County Courts of Kerry—most hon. Members on both sides of the House will be ready to agree with me. First of all, I will take the case of an agent named Fitzgerald against Michael Meehan, tenant, heard at the Tralee Quarter Sessions last November. It was a yearly tenancy; the tenant owed £94 10*s*. up to the 25th March. The County Court Judge said to the landlord's representative—who was a Mr. Hill—"Have you the remotest chance of recovering this big sum due?" "A portion of it," said Mr. Hill. "What portion?" asked the Judge; "£4 10*s*. out of £94?" "Half, at least," replied Mr. Hill. "If the arrears are cleared within a reasonable time, the landlord will give a 25 per cent reduction of the rent." His Honour—"If the arrears are paid within a reasonable time! Where is the use of talking nonsense? The arrears could not be paid within a 'reasonable time,' unless you can get blood out of a turnip." The Judge then let off the tenant with the payment of a gale of rent, which amounted to one-fifth of the whole sum due. I take up another case—that of a tenant on Lord Headley's estate, who had lent money to the landlord and had got the estate into his own hands, and was proceeding as mortgagee in possession. The tenant was a lady named Mary Moynihan, who came up decreed for a year's rent. Now, the year's rent was £40, and Mrs. Moynihan admitted that she had lent Lord Headley £500, the whole of which she had not succeeded in getting back from him until the other day. She admitted that Lord Headley had returned her the sum she had lent, and yet her application to the Court was to get the abatement which for three years had been allowed to the other tenants, but which Samuel Hussey refused to her. Those abatements, it was pointed out, if now allowed, would cut down her rent from £40 to £19. Mr. Hussey opposed the application to the best of his ability; but his Honour said that he would bring the rent down from £40 to £19. Mr. Hussey thereupon exclaimed—"It is all over now, but it is the lowest farm in Kerry." Remember that she had accommodated her landlord to the extent of £500, so that there is little question as to her ability to pay. And yet one of the greatest crimes urged against us is that some of the tenants whom we have asked to join the Plan of Campaign could pay if they liked. Those are only two examples of the manner in which Judge Curran attempted to administer justice in Kerry. Here is his method of dealing with "Moonlighters." Two or three men were brought before him charged at the Tralee Sessions with "Moonlighting." Judge Curran addressed these men in this language—

> "I am satisfied from the evidence and from your appearance that you are the ringleaders for everything bad. Now, as you are the ringleaders for everything bad, I am going to make you the ringleaders for everything good. What I do now is to affirm the conviction and sentence. I will sentence you to three months' imprisonment with hard labour, but will let you out on your recognizances; and if, within three months, no "Moonlighting" takes place within 15 miles of Tralee, you will never be called upon to put in an appearance."

I ask hon. Gentlemen, is not this almost incredible? Would they believe it if they had not here his own words? His words were—"I am satisfied from the evidence that you are the ringleaders for everything bad." These men were accused of midnight marauding — they were leaders of a band of Moonlighters —and yet Judge Curran set them at liberty on their own recognizances! Is it any wonder that Mr. Townsend-Trench should write to *The Times*, and ask whether these Moonlighters would not agree with him in wondering "whether cowardice, incompetence, and shame can suggest tactics more insulting to the British Constitution?" Such was the course adopted by the County Court Judge Curran, and what was the sequel to this extraordinary story? These unfortunate men—if they were unfortunate—were called up at the last Tralee Quarter Sessions, and, as ill-luck would have it, the night before the three months expired, 12 miles away, in a district with which they had no connection whatever, a case of moonlighting took place, and this Judge, therefore, sent the men to prison to serve out their sentence, and they are now in gaol serving it out. The district in which the men resided had been quiet; but 12 miles away from their dwelling-place an outrage took place, and the beautiful inconsistency of the Judge's mind is made manifest by the reflection that if the people who perpetrated the outrage were in any way connected with the men about to be sentenced, they would have waited until the next evening before going upon their mauraudiug expedition. I have said so much about Judge Curran because the subject is a serious and important one, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland—who is responsible for the government of Ireland—having boasted, as part of the means on which he relies for the restoration of law and order in Ireland, and for instilling a respect for law in the minds of the people, that he has sent this extraordinary Judge into the moonlighting district of Kerry. And now I would give a short extract from a letter in which this Judge indignantly describes his good deeds to the tenantry on the Glenbeigh estate. He says, describing his own action, and speaking in his own defence, that after he had given the decrees in the Killarney Court House in reference to the Glenbeigh tenants, he put the decrees into his pocket unsigned, went down to Tralee, and wrote to Colonel Turner and Father Quilter, asking them to meet him; and told Colonel Turner and General Buller that he would not sign the decrees because he meant to alter them if, on consultation with Father Quilter, he found the necessities of the case warranted it. And he says triumphantly—in the tone of a man entitled to be proud of his own feeling for the tenants—

> "I wrote to General Buller that I was convinced the landlord would agree to any alteration I thought fit to make."

I put it to the House, was such a system of administering justice ever heard of outside some Eastern land? We might almost imagine Judge Curran sitting under a palm tree in the dress of an Eastern cadi. So much for Judge Curran. I now wish to speak for a few moments about the pressure put upon the landlords by the Government, as to which so much has been said. I do not see what object can be served by burking matters of this kind, or shutting our eyes to facts that are absolutely patent to us in Ireland. We have been obliged to grope in the dark for evidence of the pressure exercised by the Government of Ireland upon the landlords, but as to its existence we have not the slightest doubt. What occurred in the case of that man on whose behalf Captain Plunkett, the well-known Resident Magistrate, interfered? The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes), in trying to defend the Government in relation to the matter, stated that Captain Plunkett simply wrote a letter to Messrs. Guinness and Mahon, the agents; but has anyone read the letter which Messrs. Guinness and Mahon wrote, and which no attempt has been made to contradict? I will ask the House to listen to the statement made by Messrs. Guinness and Mahon as to the interview which took place between them and Captain Plunkett—the statement made by them in a letter published in *The Times*. It reads:—

> Dec. 6, 1886.
>
> "My Dear——
>
> "I send a short statement and a copy of a letter from Mr. Plunkett, R.M., of which I do not complain. But he called afterwards, and pressed the matter much further, and did it cautiously.
>
> "He conveyed that unless the landlady accepted a year's rent instead of three and a-half years', and gave a clear receipt, and paid costs, £50, protection would not be afforded to her caretakers"—

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Will the hon. Gentleman do Captain Plunkett the justice to read his reply to that imputation?

MR. DILLON: I will read his reply to the accusation, if I have it; and, if the right hon. Gentleman desires it, I will read some of his evidence in the Police Court.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Captain Plunkett wrote to *The Times* immediately he saw the letter to which the hon. Member refers, distinctly contradicting the accusation.

MR. DILLON: Although I am no friend of land agents, I am perfectly willing to take the statement of Messrs. Guinness and Mahon against that of Captain Plunkett. I would give Captain Plunkett full credit for his denial; if I had his letter I should be most happy to read it, but I fear it is not amongst my papers. I wish to finish reading the letter of Messrs. Guinness and Mahon. They say—

> "Under these circumstances she is disposed to strike and surrender her rights, and take anything she can get. Her income is very small, not more than is absolutely necessary for her support, and she is coerced."

That is the account of the landlord's own agent. I find I have here the letter of Captain Plunkett, in reply to the statement I have read. He says:—

> "My attention has been called to a letter in your issue of th 13th inst. signed 'Erigena.' As it is evident that I am the divisional magistrate referred to as having called on the firm of land agents, and stated that, unless the landlady accepted a year's rent instead of three and a-half, protection would not be afforded her caretaker, I beg to give this statement the most unqualified contradiction."

Yes, but unfortunately, I think the position is made very much worse for the Government and Captain Plunkett, because I would direct attention to the fact that he denies especially calling on the land agents, and stating that "unless the landlady acepted a year's rent instead of three and a-half years." He explained afterwards, in the Court —he tried to get out of this statement by saying that he only asked the landlady to accept a year's rent instead of three and a-half years, "pending a settlement," wishing thereby to avoid an eviction. Therefore, his contradiction was practically quite consistent with the statement made by Messrs. Guinness and Mahon, that unless the landlady accepted a year's rent instead of three and a-half years' rent, and gave a clear receipt, and paid the costs, protection would not be afforded to her caretaker. I have not in my own mind a shadow of a doubt that Captain Plunkett did make that representation to the land agents. Now, to show hon. Members the value of Captain Plunkett's word—and if the question of credibility between himself and Messrs. Guinness and Mahon has to be considered it is necessary to do this—I would read a word or two from some sworn evidence given by Captain Plunkett in the Police Court. He was examined, amongst others, by Mr. Adams, and he said—

"It was not in consequence of representations made to me by General Buller that I went to Guinness, Mahon & Co.'s office. General Buller forwarded me a letter which he had received, about which I went to Guinness and Mahon's office"

That is to say, he swore, first of all, that he did not go to Messrs. Guinness and Mahon's office, in consequence of representations from General Buller; and when the letter was produced out of counsel's pocket, and handed to him, which letter he received before he went to the office of these gentlemen, a visible tremor passed through him, and he said he went to Messrs. Guinness and Mahon's office and did his best to effect a settlement. He said—

"It would not be accurate to say I did my best to bring about a settlement, because I might have done better."

Then the letter was produced, and in reply to questions then addressed to him, he said—

"The statement in my letter, that I did my best to bring about a settlement, was substantially true."

He did not admit that he had ever said this until he was confronted with the statement in his own handwriting. He was then asked whether he had interfered in a deserving case, and he said—"I do not know what is meant by a deserving case."

"It is true," he said, "that I was ignorant of most of the circumstances of the case. I heard that three years' rent was due. I did not know whether the tenant was able to pay or not. I suggested the acceptance of one year's rent, pending a settlement. I did not suggest a composition. I never saw the tenant or his farm, and do not know where his farm is, or how near I was to it. I could not say if I was told by anyone that the tenant was unable to pay. I do not know if he was unable to pay. I do not know what was in this case to distinguish it from that of any other tenant. I do not know how much land he had, or if he had any farm at all."

Now, I ask hon. Members, is it not the merest folly and nonsense to tell us that when an executive officer of the Government swears in the Dublin Police Court that with him lay the power to give or refuse protection to the caretakers of the farm, to give more men or withdraw those who were there whenever he thought fit, and then goes to the land agents in Dublin, and asks that a settlement should be arrived at in order to avoid eviction, is that not putting pressure upon the landlord? If that is not pressure, I do not know what pressure is, or what it possibly could be. I know the landlords themselves consider it as much pressure as I and my friends have ever put upon them. This much I will say—that I have been accused by influential gentlemen of engaging in one of the most immoral conspiracies that have ever been carried on in any civilized country; but if I did engage in that conspiracy I never undertook to defend a case in Ireland yet in which I did not satisfy myself, as far as I could, by inquiry, that justice was on our side; and I never yet went to put pressure on a landlord when I could stand up—or would be obliged to stand up in Court—and, under examination, admit that I knew nothing about the circumstances of the case, that I did not know whether or not a man could pay, and that I did not know whether he had a farm at all. Well, that is one case which bears upon that question of pressure about which we have heard so much. With the permission of the House, I will, just for a moment, bring under its notice another case—and a very interesting case—in which pressure was put upon a landlord. The case is all the more interesting because I think it has not yet been made public—I refer to the case of Mr. John Madden, of County Monaghan. On that gentleman's estate the tenantry are in a condition of the greatest possible poverty, owing to circumstances over which they have no control; because I am convinced that a more honest and deserving people do not exist in Ireland. These people are reduced to extreme poverty owing to failure of their small stock, and the fall in prices of butter, and the decline of an industry in which the women used to engage. The agent has been in negotiation with the tenants for a considerable number of months, endeavouring to come to some settlement, but the terms he offered the tenants they could not accept. On the 9th October, in writing to the priest, the Rev. P. McKeon, the representative of the tenantry, he used language which I will read—I have all his correspondence. He wrote—

"Rosslea Manor Estate.

"Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 8th inst., for which I am obliged. Hitherto all overtures for a settlement have come from the landlord, as the tenants have not made any proposal."

Then he goes on to say—

> "I would suggest that you should see or communicate with the tenants named in the list which I sent you, and that they should make some proposal, stating what sum they would be prepared to pay down in cash on or before 1st prox., on getting a receipt in full up to 1st November, 1885. If they do this, as I have already stated, any proposal made will receive most careful consideration ; and I feel sure the entire matter will be settled to the satisfaction of all parties."

Accordingly, the priest assembled the tenants, and put the agent's terms before them, and a certain number agreed to offer one year's rent, with costs. A hundred and fifty tenants were under decree of eviction. On a subsequent day the agent came down, and the offer agreed upon was made to him, but he refused it, saying that he had no authority to accept such terms. Then he writes a letter, in which he says—

> "I expected to see you on last Friday. Several of the tenants against whom decrees have been obtained attended and asked for a clear receipt up to the 1st November, 1885, on payment of one year's rent, stating that they were under the impression that I had made this offer in my correspondence with you."

He had used language open to that interpretation. He continued—

> "I stated that such was not the case, and that I had no authority to accept any less sum than that stated in the list I forwarded you some time ago, but that I would communicate with Mr. Madden."

We now come down to November, 1886. The next stage in the proceedings was this: The tenants appealed to me, sending a deputation to Dublin, and I declare most solemnly that until that deputation arrived there and asked me to take their case up I had never even heard the name of the estate, and did not know there was any trouble existing on it. They came up to me in my own house in Dublin, and asked whether I would encourage them to adopt the Plan of Campaign. I talked the matter over with them for an hour, feeling extremely reluctant to move in the matter, as it was in Protestant Ulster, and I was afraid the tenants would not join together. However, it seems that the district in question is a mountainous one, and is chiefly inhabited by Catholics, who were determined to go into the Plan with me if I would help them, but without me if I would not. Ultimately I agreed to help them, and they adopted the Plan. The Government now appears on the scene, and on the 2nd of January I received a most remarkable letter from a priest of the district. He wrote—

> "I had a long conversation to-day with the County Inspector, Mr. Lynch. He wanted to know from me the true state of affairs before the evictions are carried out. Athol Dudgeon wrote a very long statement of the case to the Government, part of which he read to me. He (Mr. Lynch) said to me that even yet, if any understanding could be arrived at between Mr. Madden and the tenants, that it would be better for them than undergo the hardships of eviction at this time of year; that the worst feature the Government saw in the case was the tenants going to Mr. Madden and saying to him, 'Accept this for a clear receipt or we will not pay.'"

But that was the very thing which the tenants were invited to do by the agent. They went on to say—

> "Would it not be better for them to offer whatever rent they were able, say three-quarters of a year's rent, and let the evictions pend over, say, for 12 months?"

It has been told you that the Sheriff applied for 1,000 police, and that the evictions were very soon to have taken place; but I suppose that the Government did not like the look of the job, and from what I have seen of the district I think they will like it less than they did. This was the first suggestion; but the proceedings broke down. But the workhouse in the district was noticed to receive 650 human beings, and in January last the police were concentrated to turn out these 135 families—when the snow lay six inches deep in the fields. I went down to Rosslea; the Chief Secretary for Ireland proclaimed the meetings, but I held four meetings, and the evictions have not yet taken place. I warn the right hon. Gentleman that if he proceeds to have these cruel evictions carried out against a people who are anxious to pay what they can, as I am certain they are, against a people reduced to poverty in spite of hard and incessant industry, the whole of England, as well as Ireland, will cry "Shame!" Are we to see the evictions at Rosslea carried out? Are we to see 1,000 armed men gathered together, at an enormous expense to the country, to turn out these families, until it is proved that they have refused to pay? I have heard it said, forsooth, that I am responsible for the Rosslea evictions and for the Glenbeigh evictions. These men say what suits their arguments. When it suits their purpose they accuse Irish Members of inciting men not to pay who were able to do so. The Attorney General for Ireland has told the House that the Glenbeigh evictions would not have been saved by the Bill of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), because the people would have been unable to take advantage of it, and yet their houses have been burnt down over their heads. But I say I never heard of the estate at all until the houses were burnt down; I never knew that Mr. Rowland Winn had an estate in Ireland until I saw it in the newspapers. Before I dispose of this case of Rosslea I wish to say a few words more, because it is one which will be often heard of in this House. I shall read particulars of a few cases which have been placed in my hands by a local priest. Here is a list of town lands. The rent of one group in 1856 amounted to £46 12*s*., and the present rent is £85 15*s*. In the next case the rents amounted in 1854 to £53 15*s*., and the present rents amount to £113 14*s*. These rents have, in some cases, been doubled, and more than doubled; and I observe in the list one case in which the rent has been raised from £4 to £16. Here, then, at all events, we have a case of real inability to pay. I say that I have had no hand or part in stirring up trouble on this estate. It was only when I was sent to at Dublin and told that the tenants were determined, as a last resource, to fall back on the Plan of Campaign, that I had anything to do with the matter. I wish, by way of warning and appeal, to say to the Chief Secretary for Ireland that he should pause before going on with another case, for, as sure as he does so, it will be quoted again and again in this country and in Ireland as a shameful act of injustice and oppression. Then, Sir, I come to the case of Bodyke, in the County of Clare, where Colonel O'Callaghan has been at war with his tenants for upwards of five years. His estate was notoriously one of the most rack-rented in the South of Ireland, and, if hon. Members have patience, I will read some examples of the reductions which have been made in the rents on this estate by the Land Court. These are some of them—

Old Rent.	Judicial Rent.
£83 0 0	£46 10 0
80 0 0	57 0 0
40 0 0	24 0 0
28 0 0	22 0 0
31 0 0	23 0 0
43 0 0	30 0 0
7 0 0	3 15 0
12 0 0	6 0 0

and so on. These judicial rents have been left at a much higher rate than the Government valuation; the tenants asked for a reduction of 25 per cent, and Colonel O'Callaghan refused to make any reduction. Well, Sir, these tenants are impoverished by long continued rack renting, the most cruel that has been carried on in the South of Ireland. And what is the state of the case to-day? Will the House believe that on Tuesday last about 1,000 men were concentrated in order to carry out these evictions, and came with all the implements of war, prepared for a prolonged campaign of a fortnight, which it was considered would be necessary for the purpose; and the workhouse were asked to be ready to receive 32 families? This armed force of 1,000 men, and even the whole armed force of England, is to be placed at the disposal of the Sheriff, and loss of life, perhaps, is to take place, because of the madness—the insane action of this man. I said that last Tuesday was fixed for carrying out these ruthless and barbarous evictions; but I understand that they are postponed, in consequence of the feeling of the people, until a larger force is got together to carry them out. If you do carry them out, I say that it will make the whole of England and Scotland ring with the shame of the thing. I will not longer weary the House with this story of evictions. I know that more will be heard of it hereafter; and no doubt the time will come in this country when the conscience of the people will be awakened to the crime that has been perpetrated in allowing these immense masses of men to be placed at the disposal of persons so dead to every sense of Christian charity and every principle of right. If I wanted to say more on this subject I might read a long statement in *The Times*, written evidently by an enemy of the Nationalist cause, who laments that the proceedings of Colonel O'Callaghan have been viewed with concern, "especially by persons of his own class," a statement which I think ought to be enough to carry conviction to every mind. One or two words with reference to the latest contribution which we have had from a very distinguished person on the Irish Question. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) made a speech the other day at Newcastle, which was repeated in this House this evening by a Liberal follower of the noble Marquess. The noble Marquess, speaking on this subject, with a never failing spring of hope, announced to an enthusiastic audience that he had at last found the solution of the Irish Question. He invited all classes of the people to assemble at the Round Table, and finally to close up the Irish Question by some system of migration or emigration. The noble Marquess, growing enthusiastic over the question, said—

> "We have here indeed, in my judgment, a problem to solve upon which all Parties—the Irish Party, the British Party, Liberal Unionists and Liberal Home Rulers and Conservatives—might meet together to see whether some remedy cannot be applied to this, the great and pressing and the immediate problem, which hinders the recovery of Ireland from its past misfortunes."

With reference to the congested districts which the noble Marquess is sanguine enough to believe that he could uncongest, and so bring the Irish Question to an end, I ask the House to view the facts I have here in connection with the growth of this question of the congested districts and the mal-distribution of the population of Ireland, which, so far as I know, have never been under the attention of this House. It is perfectly untrue, and notoriously untrue to the mind of any traveller in Ireland, to say that the country is over-populated. Ireland is crowded in the poor districts and it is depopulated in the rich districts. I ask the House to listen to some facts which I will bring to their notice, and which are familiar to us from childhood. They tell a story which is simple, which accounts for the congestion in some districts, and which if you Englishmen had learnt by suffering, would have sown the same hatred in your hearts as it has in the hearts of Irishmen. I will take four of the richest counties of Ireland, and I ask you to compare the populations at three periods.

	Pop. 1841.	Pop. 1851.	Pop. 1881.
Kildare .	114,488	95,723	75,798
Limerick .	281,638	208,684	142,069
Meath .	183,828	140,748	87,451
Tipperary.	435,553	331,567	199,602

Thus we see that in 40 years the population of Tipperary has decreased by 236,000, or by more than half the entire population! Can you wonder now why Tipperary became famous for the shooting of landlords when you recollect that every single man was driven out by main force from the home of his fathers? Take some poorer counties, the populations of which at the same periods were as follow:—Mayo, population in 1841, 388,887; in 1851, 274,499; in 1881, 245,212. The population of Kerry in 1841 was 293,880; in 1851, 238,254; in 1861, 201,800; in 1871, 196,516, there being a small increase over those last figures for the year 1881. Kerry is the only county in Ireland in which there has been any actual increase of population. These figures are eloquent to the mind of the man who reflects on them beyond anything which we can say, and they show that the congested state of some districts in Ireland is the result of the operation of evil laws and an evil system, and until you destroy that, to talk of emigration restoring prosperity to Ireland is mere moonshine. I say, further, that it will end in disaster and defeat; that it will end in the waste of English money and in widespread demoralization in Ireland. I will quote a few statistics for one county, the county of Galway, which is peculiar in this respect, that in the eastern portion of it there is some of the finest land and in the western portion some of the poorest in Ireland. Taking first the poor baronies:—Aran has an area of 11,288 acres; valuation in 1881, per acre, 3*s.*; the population from 1841 to 1881 has only increased by 10 per cent. Ballinahinch has an area of 194,584 acres; valuation per acre, 2*s.*; the population has decreased 26 per cent in a few years. Moycullen has an area of 220,233 acres; valuation per acre, 1*s.* 6*d.*; the population had decreased 19·44 per cent between 1841 and 1881. Ross has an area of 98,631 acres; valuation 1*s.* 3*d.* per acre; the population had decreased in that period 15·35 per cent. Mark that in some of the poorest baronies there has been an actual increase of population in the last 10 years. I now come to the rich baronies. Athenry has an area of 25,782 acres; valuation per acre, 9*s.*; the population, which in 1841 was 8,179, had decreased in 1881 to 3,793, or 53·62 per cent. Dunkellin has an area of 83,372 acres; valuation per acre, 8*s.* 6*d.*; the population, which was in 1841 28,207, had decreased in 1881 to 11,958, or 57·60 per cent. Kilconnell has an area of 64,819 acres; valuation per acre, 10*s.*; the population, which was 17,162 in 1841, had decreased in 1881 to 7,569, or 55·88 per cent. Longford has an area of 99,504 acres; valuation, 10*s.* per acre; the population in 1841 was 33,069, and in 1881 it had declined to 13,137, showing a decrease of 60·27 per cent. Finally, Loughrea, with an area of 65,179 acres, valuation 7*s.* an acre, had a population in 1841 of 18,797, which in 1881 was 8,597, there having been a decrease of 54·26 per cent. Well, Sir, I ask if the House can have a tale more instructive than this? You talk about the evils of Ireland. What has been the result of this system against which we have struggled, and for struggling against which I am to stand on my trial next week—the system which has driven from nearly every acre of good land in Ireland as fine a population as ever put spade into the earth; driven Irishmen to America to become dynamitards and generally haters of English rule, or driven them to become torments to you by congesting the mountain sides of Connaught? Listen to what the statistics relating to the levelling of houses in the baronies of Galway tell us. In the barony of Athenry 700 houses were levelled in 40 years; in the barony of Dunkellin 2,200 houses were levelled in 40 years; in the barony of Kilconnell 1,700; in the barony of Longford 3,300; and in the barony of Loughrea 1,500 houses. I ask any English Member, be he Conservative or Liberal, whether, in view of the facts I have stated to the House, can you wonder that you have disorder, crime, and outrage in Ireland? Can you wonder that this is so, especially when you remember that probably not one of these 6,000 or 7,000 houses levelled in Galway in 40 years, was levelled without leaving a family as a curse to your rule? To hear at this time of day men talk about solving the Irish Question by migration or emigration, or by any of the other pacifics which have been preached, investigated, and tried before and failed, is ridiculous. I have always entertained a strong view on the question of migration, and it is this—I have never altered it—that the migration of the population of Ireland must be a gradual, a slow, a very slow, process to be a successful one. It must arise from natural causes just as the crowding of the population of bad districts arises from the operation of the law. Give the people fair play, give them a little assistance, where assistance is seen to be useful; but above all things give them liberty. They will find their own way back to the rich land of their own country without the assistance of the most noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington), or the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), who now governs Ireland; and I warn the Chief Secretary that if he attempts, no matter how good and humane his intentions may be—if he attempts any policy of migration—it used to be emigration, but now it is migration which is to cure the ills of Ireland—if he attempts any policy like that, to be carried out by an English Executive, while the power exists of evicting Irish peasants, it will be treated as a policy of extermination. He will meet with nothing but disaster, with abuse from all sides, and he will leave Ireland, like many of his Predecessors, cordially cursed by all sections of the Irish community, though he himself may be firmly convinced that he is the most deserving and most ill-treated of men. Before I sit down I wish to say another word, though I know it is not of the smallest use. [*Interruption.*] I am not likely to trouble the House again for a fortnight or three weeks, because I have some particular business to attend to in Dublin, and, possibly, if the Attorney General for Ireland succeeds in his present plans, I may not trouble the House for a year; but what I want to say is this—I have read, and read with care, the speeches delivered by the Liberal Unionists during the autumn, and what puzzles me most is this—that all of them, whether they be of the Chamberlain wing or of the Hartington wing, seem to base their whole attitude towards Ireland upon suspicion and distrust; they say you must guard yourselves against all danger from Ireland. If you believe that, why do not you say it honestly, and govern us as a Crown Colony at once? If there is never to be peace and good fellowship and love between the Irish and English people, throw the mask away altogether and let there be open war. We do not want that, and we have said so honestly; but so long as the present Executive exists in Ireland—aye, if it were to exist for 200 years—so long will the present state of mutual hate and distrust continue. But what I cannot understand is why hon. Gentlemen persistently shut their eyes to the fact that the basis, the foundation, the only foundation, of the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) is that he proposes in the future to trust, not to suspicion, not to safeguards, but to the hope that there will be another future; a future in which a condition of things which, recollect, has never for a single hour, with the exception of a few brief years, existed between Ireland and England for 700 years, a condition of things in which it will not be necessary to provide, as the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Bury (Sir Henry James) would, against every possible method of annoyance we could inflict upon England or England inflict upon us, but in which the two nations can agree to reside together; in which there shall no longer prevail between England and Ireland suspicion and distrust, and hatred on the one hand, and misunderstanding and dislike on the other. I take it that the main object of the remaining years of the life of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) will be to do away with that which he considers to have been a cursed and hateful condition of things in the past. He bases his future policy, and bases all the future relations between the two countries, upon the faith which seems strong in him—that it is not impossible to bury the past in oblivion, so far as it is one of hatred and mutual distrust; and to trust that whatever arrangement is to be arrived at between the two countries, it shall be worked on both sides with good faith, with trust in each other, and with an honest and mutual desire to carry it to a successful issue.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. John Morley.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

TOWN HOLDINGS.

NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEES.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Select Committee on Town Holdings do consist of Twenty Members."—(*Colonel Nolan.*)

MR. T. E. ELLIS (Merionethshire): I do not wish to object to the appointment of this Committee; but I should like to call attention to the fact that most parts of the Kingdom which are interested in this question, are represented upon the Committee, except Wales. Upon enquiry from those who take an interest in the question, and from the evidence which Members from Wales can give, I think it can be made clear that no part of the United Kingdom is so closely and vitally affected in the question of Holdings as the Principality. It is not too much to say that there is scarcely an artizan's house throughout the industrial districts of Wales that is freehold. Almost all the houses of the working men in the Principality have been built on short leases. I see there are three Irish Members on the Committee. These hon. Gentlemen were in the last Parliament able to summon witnesses from Ireland, so that the whole case, from an Irish point of view, has been set before the Committee. I do not complain of the representation of Ireland upon the Committee; but I put it to the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Nolan), who moved the appointment of the Committee, whether the Committee cannot be increased, so that Representatives of Wales may be put upon it?

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I, of course, have nothing to do with the formation of the Committee, except so far as the three Irish Members are concerned. I should be very glad indeed if some Welsh Members could be placed upon the Committee; but I hope that if there are any considerable additions to the Committee, a fourth Irish Member will be appointed. In the last Parliament, the Committee consisted of 27 Members, and now it is reduced to 20, and the Irish Party have agreed to have three Irish Members instead of four upon it.

Ordered, That the Select Committee on Town Holdings do consist of Twenty Members:—The Committee was accordingly *nominated* of—Mr. Gibson, Mr. Tyssen Amherst, Sir John Ellis, Mr. Beadel, Mr. Baumann, Viscount Folkestone, Mr. Bartley, Mr. Elton, Mr. Compton Lawrance, Sir Henry James, Mr. Asher, Viscount Wolmer, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Fry, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Edward Russell, Mr. A. H. Acland, Mr. Crilly, Mr. Gray, and Colonel Nolan, with power to send for persons and papers.

Ordered, That five be the quorum.—(*Colonel Nolan.*)

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT, 1869, AND AMENDING ACTS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, to inquire into the operation of "The Endowed School Act, 1869," and the amending Acts, and to consider and report how far it may be expedient to amend the powers exercised under them by the Charity Commissioners.

Ordered, That the Committee do consist of Eighteen Members:—The Committee was accordingly *nominated* of—Mr. William Abraham (Glamorgan), Mr. Cohen, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Mr. Dillon, Mr. John Ellis, Lord Francis Hervey, Mr. Staveley Hill, Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Courtney Kenny, Mr. Story-Maskelyne, Mr. Charles Parker, Sir Lyon Playfair, Mr. Francis Powell, and Mr. John Talbot, with power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That five be the quorum of the Committee.—(*Sir Lyon Playfair.*)

COTTAGERS' (ALLOTMENTS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Chaplin, Bill to facilitate the provision of Allotments for Cottages, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Finch-Hatton, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Viscount Curzon, Mr. Charles Hall, Captain Selwyn, and Viscount Grimston.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 161.]

PERPETUAL PENSIONS.

Ordered, That the Select Committee on Perpetual Pensions do consist of Seventeen Members:—The Committee was accordingly *nominated* of—Mr. Mundella, Sir Richard Webster, Mr. Edward Russell, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Biddulph, Mr. Curzon, Mr. Salt, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Jennings, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Mowbray, Mr. William Lowther, Mr. Bryn Roberts, Mr. Vernon, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Chance, and Mr. Bradlaugh.—(*Mr. Bradlaugh.*)

House adjourned at One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 8th February, 1887.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE—Standing Orders Committee, Earl Waldegrave *added* *v.* Lord Hopetoun.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Glebe Lands* (16).

Third Reading—Pluralities Act Amendment * (14), and *passed.*

GLEBE LANDS BILL.

BILL PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

VISCOUNT CROSS, in rising to present the Bill, said he wished to draw attention to two objects which they all had in view in dealing with glebe lands. One was to facilitate the sale of glebe lands in England, and the other was to take advantage of such sale of glebe lands, for the purpose of securing that which would undoubtedly be very beneficial to a certain class—namely, a large number of small allotments. As to the first object, he might say that the Bill was not compulsory; it was permissive; and, in the second place, it did not compel anyone to sell glebe, unless he liked, and it did not supplant any of the existing legislation, but simply supplemented that legislation, and provided easier, readier, and safer methods of sale. He would point out that in former times it was said that there was no such good investment for anyone, and especially for the clergy, as green fields; and, in olden times, no doubt that was true, because green fields could not be done away with, and were really considered a safe investment, yielding a safe and ready return. But this Bill proceeded on the assumption that it was expedient the country clergy should be relieved from being owners of land, if they wished. It was also expedient that so much land should not be held in mortmain, as at the present moment. He would remind their Lordships that great changes undoubtedly had come over the question since the idea as to green fields prevailed. In the first place, they were not so good an investment as formerly; and, secondly, there were now a large number of more profitable and safer investments than green fields opened to the general public, and the public preferred these investments to those which involved more trouble and yielded less return. Other changes had taken place which had forced people who had to do with agriculture to cultivate land in a more scientific way than was the case in former times. This, combined with foreign competition, involved a larger expenditure, and more capital, than previously, and the clergy were unable to provide that increased expenditure. The changed value of agricultural products also made a great difference, and good tenants were now much more difficult to obtain than formerly. In many cases not at all; and where they were, only when the land was in good condition. Neighbouring landlords had it in their power to reduce rents from 20 to 50 per cent, but it would be simply ruinous for the clergy to do that. Then there was a worse point behind, and that was the case of the tenant who, not able to pay his rent, threw up his farm. It was then thrown on the hands of the poor clergyman, and what was he to do with it, if he had no money to buy stock for it? Besides, clergymen had little time to devote to farming. They had little experience as landlords, and less as tenants. Incumbents were looked upon as tenants for life, and, in recent years, tenants for life could, under the late Earl Cairns's Act, no matter what restrictions had been imposed, sell their life interests, and have the proceeds invested in, if not safer, more profitable securities than land. It seemed rather anomalous that, whereas ordinary tenants for life could sell land without asking anybody's consent, clergymen, who were really tenants for life, were not allowed to employ the same easy and cheap process, especially now, when in many cases their incomes were so small. He submitted that clergymen were not the best men to farm and cultivate lands, and declared that this measure would be a relief to them, for, whilst simplifying the method of dealing with glebe lands, the Bill would save expenditure. It might be asked why the Queen Anne's Bounty Board or the Ecclesiastical Commissioners should not carry out the provisions of the Bill; but, as to the first, they have not a sufficient staff, and were a very numerous Body; and, as to the latter, they had already too much to do, and had large sums of money to deal with. The Bill provided that the Land Commissioners should have the duty of carrying it out. They were men of great experience as to the value of land, and had had much to do with enclosures, and, besides, they were not overburdened with work. If, therefore, a clergyman wished to sell glebe, the Bill provided that he was to apply to the Land Commissioners, who would consider his application. It would never do to let a clergyman, who had only a life interest, sell the glebe, simply to put money in his pocket; and, therefore, certain conditions were placed on the sale. He must, in the first place, give notice of his intention to the patron, and also to the Bishop and the Land Commissioners, and the Land Commissioners were not to sanction the sale in any way, unless they were of opinion that it would be for the benefit, not only of the incumbent, but of the benefice itself. The Bill, moreover, would prevent the Commissioners, and any clergyman selling glebe, from including in the sale the parsonage house, or any outbuildings, gardens, or appurtenances, and, in fact, any part of the glebe land which they considered to be necessary for the convenience and enjoyment of the parsonage house. The object of the measure, indeed, was simply to enable a clergyman encumbered with a glebe estate to get rid of it, and it was not intended that the State should be put to any cost in the matter. The Land Commissioners were merely made use of as the persons most convenient to conduct the transaction, and all the costs would be borne by the vendor or purchaser; and the Commissioners could, if they thought fit, order some security for costs to be given. The clergyman himself might conduct the sale, if he chose; but he could only do it subject entirely to the same rules as if the Land Commissioners had the management of the transaction. After the glebe was sold, the purchase money was to be paid to the Land Commissioners themselves; and they were then to give a certificate to the purchaser, which should be taken, when it was registered in the Land Registry, as an absolute and indefeasible title. Therefore, the costs of legal proceedings would be much lessened, if not entirely obviated, as compared with the existing practice. When the purchase money came into the hands of the Land Commissioners, they would be empowered to invest it in Government securities, or in debenture stocks of any railway company in Great Britain or Ireland, under certain conditions, such as that it must be the stock of any company which had for 10 years previously paid a dividend on its ordinary stock. The clergyman also would not be allowed to sell the reversion of minerals. The investments fixed by the Bill, as their Lordships would see, were not of a character involving any possibility of doubt, and would not be subject to that fluctuation of income from which the clergy had so seriously suffered. It was proposed that the money should be invested in the names of the bishop, the patron, and the incumbent himself; and provisions would be inserted for the purpose of preventing the possibility of such investment being lost, through the carelessness of trustees. It had been said that the clergy were very anxious to get rid of their glebes when their houses were dilapidated, so as to avoid the necessity of repairing them; but, in order to meet any such cases, the Land Commissioners would have power to apply a portion of the purchase money to provide for the repair of dilapidations. As to the second part of the Bill—namely, the purchase of allotments—it was proposed by the Government that, until some county authority was set up, the Sanitary Authority should have power to buy the land, and that it should rest with the Land Commissioners when they sold it for that purpose, if they could do so without loss to the Church, to offer portions of the property to the Sanitary Authority, in order that poor persons might obtain allotments. Power was given to Sanitary Authorities to borrow money for the purchase of the land, with that view. With regard to the notices to be given, as the circumstances of different cases were so various, it was proposed that the Land Commissioners should have power to make the necessary rules, with the approval of the Lord Chancellor, in order to carry out the provisions of the Bill. In conclusion, he hoped that the measure would meet with the assent of their Lordships.

Bill to facilitate the sale of glebe lands—*Presented* (The Viscount CROSS).

EARL GRANVILLE said, we all had great pleasure in welcoming the appearance of the noble Lord opposite (Viscount Cross), in that Assembly, as we generally did one who had distinguished himself in "another place;" but, at the same time, he must say he thought that the noble Viscount, probably through his inexperience, had rather strained a privilege which he found here, but which, if I remember right, he had not in that "other place," in moving without Notice the first reading of a Bill. In that way, the noble Viscount had introduced an innovation, which he (Lord Granville) hoped would not be allowed in the future. The usual practice in their Lordships' House was, that any statement in regard to the objects of a Bill should be made when it came on for a second reading. There were some exceptions to that rule, particularly when Law Lords presented Bills. They frequently gave an explanation of the objects of the measure on the first reading, but never, as far as he knew, without giving previous Notice of their intention to do so; and he thought it was better it should be so. It was quite by chance that he had come down to the House, because there was merely formal Business on the Paper; and no doubt other Peers were in the same position. It was, therefore, as it were, only through excessive zeal on his part that he was enabled to hear the statement of the noble Viscount; and he thought it would be more convenient if the ordinary practice in regard to giving notice of such statements were adhered to.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The Marquess of SALISBURY) said, he did not quite agree with the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) as to the practice of the House. He believed that not only Law Lords, but other Peers, frequently stated the objects of their Bills on the first reading, in a similar manner to that used by his noble Friend.

EARL GRANVILLE: Not without giving notice.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he must confess that the noble Earl might be right as regarded the necessity of a Notice; indeed, he was afraid that he was himself responsible for having misled his noble Friend in regard to that infant prodigy, the Bill under notice. However, the subject had been before the world for some time, and no doubt the noble Earl's knowledge and capacity were quite equal to taking in the subject of his noble Friend's statement, even without Notice.

THE EARL OF SELBORNE said, the practice was that Notice should be given that such and such subjects would be brought forward, and, that appearing on the Notice Paper, every Peer knew what was to be done.

Bill read 1ª. (No. 16.)

House adjourned at Five o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 8*th February*, 1887.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—Committee of Public Accounts, *nominated.*

PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—Southampton Harbour.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Glebe Lands * [162].

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS—*Second Reading*—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) * [127].

PARLIAMENT—COUNTY OF LONGFORD (NORTHERN DIVISION) ELECTION—CLERICAL ERROR.

MR. SPEAKER called the attention of the House to the Return to the Writ for the Election to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Longford (Northern Division), in the room of Justin M'Carthy, esquire, who, having been returned as a Member for the said County of Longford (Northern Division), and also for the City of Londonderry, had elected to sit for the City of Londonderry, by which it appeared that Mr. Timothy Michael Healy, returned as Member for the said County of Longford (Northern Division), in the room of the said Justin M'Carthy, esquire, was by a clerical error described in the Return as Mr. Timothy Michael Healey, instead of Mr. Timothy Michael Healy, and Mr. Cox, Member for East Clare, having stated upon his own knowledge that the surname of the Member for the said County of Longford (Northern Division), was Healy, and not Healey.

Ordered, That the Clerk of the Crown do attend this House forthwith with the last Return for the County of Longford (Northern Division), and amend the same by correcting the clerical error therein.

The Clerk of the Crown attending amended the Return accordingly.

QUESTIONS.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS—COST OF CONSTABULARY.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the total cost to the British taxpayers, inclusive of special allowances, provisions, travelling and car expenses, of the force of 150 Constabulary employed during the last three weeks on special duty in connection with the Glenbeigh Evictions?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Inspector General reports that the total cost under these heads of expenditure is £421 17*s*. 9*d*.

MR. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.) asked did that include the additional amount of extra pay to 135 of these men?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I have included it in the answer.

THAMES PRESERVATION ACT, 1885—CONSERVANCY BYE-LAWS.

MR. STORY-MASKELYNE (Wilts, Cricklade) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether Thames Conservators have framed any bye-laws for the preservation of order and of public rights on the River Thames; and, whether they have taken any steps to carry out the duties laid on them by "The Thames Preservation Act, 1885?"

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Last year the Conservators of the River Thames framed a set of bye-laws under the powers conferred on them by Parliament in 1885, in which—in consequence of Petitions which had been received—the Board of Trade suggested some alterations. These alterations have been accepted by the Conservators; and the amended bye-laws, after publication, will, in due course, be submitted for approval by Order in Council.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (SCOTLAND)—POOR AND SCHOOL RATES IN SKYE.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether he can supplement the information contained in Paper C. 4772, of 1886, by stating the amount of arrears of Poor and School Rates on the assessment for the year ending Whitsunday 1886, in the Island of Skye, due at the 1st of September last by owners, by tenants of holdings of over £30 of annual rental; and by tenants of holdings less than £30 of annual rental respectively?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): The records of the Board of Supervision do not distinguish between the arrears of tenants of different rentals, and the information asked for by the hon. Member could not be obtained for some weeks. I can, however, at once state that whereas on the 27th of March last the arrears of rates from owners and tenants together amounted to £5,200; the whole of these arrears had been paid by the first week in December, with the exception of a sum of £60 15*s*., which was remitted in consideration of the poverty of those from whom it is due. This answer will perhaps be accepted by the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) as a reply to the Question he has put down for Friday next, February 11.

POST OFFICE—FOREIGN TELEGRAPH STATIONS.

MR. STAVELEY HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford) asked the Postmaster General, If he will give directions for a fresh compilation of the List of Foreign Telegraph Stations, as at present there are 17 appendices to the original list?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member, I have to state that a new List of Foreign Telegraph Stations is being compiled, and it is expected that it will be supplied to all Telegraph Offices in the United Kingdom in April next.

ARKLOW HARBOUR ACT.

MR. W. J. CORBET (Wicklow, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What progress has been made with the works at Arklow Harbour; whether anything has been done in regard to the north pier or any dredging at the entrances of the harbour and, what progress is being made with the works at Greystones?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.) (who replied) said: The south or main pier at Arklow has been completed, with the exception of some unimportant work which is expected to be finished early in April. As regards the north groyne, the concrete blocks have been made, and the contractor has given notice that he will be able to proceed with the work early in March; but before anything further is done, the question of the incidence of the cost of this portion of the work will have to be determined, in accordance with the provisions of the Arklow Harbour Act. It is hoped that dredging will not be required at the harbour entrance. In continuation of the reply which I made to a Question of the hon. Member on the subject of Greystones Pier and Boatslip in September last, I have to say that a fresh contract for the execution of the works was entered into, but continued bad weather has prevented any considerable progress being made. If adequate progress is not made by the new contractor, the contract will be determined, and other steps taken for the completion of the works.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND)—DELAYING PAYMENT OF RESULT FEES.

MR. BLANE (Armagh, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the National School Teachers are frequently delayed in the payment of the result fees due to them two or three months after the examination; if so, can he state the cause of delay, and what steps he proposes to take to secure more prompt payment by the Commissioners of Education?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): If the hon. Member will mention any case in which he thinks undue delay has occurred, the Commissioners of National Education will be happy to investigate it. Speaking generally, the Commissioners can only say that every effort is made by their Department to secure prompt payment; and that when delay, such as is mentioned in the Question, occurs it is the result of irregularity in the claim which necessitates inquiries and correspondence.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—CONSTABLE FOSTER.

Mr. O'HANLON (Cavan, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Constable Foster, late of Meath, but now of County Derry, served in Belfast during the late riots; if, after returning to Meath, he took so ill that he had to go to hospital for a period of three weeks; if, on leaving hospital, his doctor ordered him to a northern station for the good of his health; if, for spending a few hours with his friends the night before his transfer, he was ordered back from County Derry to County Meath at his own expense and fined; what was the amount of the said fine; will this fine keep him back in his right to promotion; and, will the Government reconsider this matter?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, that the constable named had served in Belfast during the riots, and subsequently became ill, and was transferred to Meath, as mentioned in the hon. Member's Question. Before he proceeded to the North he absented himself for five hours, and was convicted before a Constabulary Court and fined £2. The fine would, as far as it went, militate against promotion. There did not appear to be any ground to proceed further in the matter.

POOR LAW (METROPOLIS) — CASUAL RELIEF AT ST. GEORGE'S WORKHOUSE.

Mr. MACLURE (Lancashire, S.E., Stretford) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether the action of the Guardians of the Poor as regards the applications for casual relief on Friday nights at St. George's Workhouse, has received the sanction of the Local Government Board?

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Ritchie) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): The Question of the hon. Member, no doubt, refers to the case of James Ayling, who was charged at the Marlborough Street Police Court with refractory conduct while an inmate of the casual ward of the St. George's Union. As regards the detention of the man over Sunday, his detention was authorized both by the Statute and the Regulations of the Board. At the casual ward referred to it is the case that each casual pauper is placed in a separate compartment, and the construction of the ward in separate compartments had the sanction of the Board. This arrangement is regarded as a boon by the wayfarer who is *bonâ fide* travelling in search of work, as it secures him from close association with persons of the ordinary vagrant class, while the habitual vagrant regards it with disfavour as it prevents the association which he prefers. It is not under any Regulation of the Board that the casual paupers are detained in separate compartments on Sundays, when not present at religious service. The arrangement appears to me to be open to objection, and I have given instructions that the Guardians should be communicated with on the subject.

DOGS—LIABILITY FOR SHOOTING STRAY DOGS.

Mr. M'LAREN (Cheshire, Crewe) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the unsatisfactory state of the law regarding the liability of farmers who shoot stray and possibly mad dogs found wandering among their cattle, as shown by the case of "Legh *v.* Tickle," tried in the Northwich County Court, on November 17th 1886, in which the defendant was fined £15 for shooting a dog he believed to be mad which was wandering on his farm; whether he is aware that great damage is frequently done to farmers by dogs which are not mad biting their cattle; damage for which the farmer usually can get no redress, either because he cannot trace the owner, or because the owner is without means to compensate him; and, whether he will introduce a short Bill to give farmers reasonable protection from such damage, and power to shoot dogs which are found straying in their fields, and which they have reason to believe will injure their cattle?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said, he had read in the newspapers the case to which the hon. Member referred. The learned County Court Judge decided that the conduct of the farmer was, under the circumstances, unjustifiable, the behaviour of the dog forming no reason for its destruction. He was not aware that great damage was often done to farmers by dogs which were not mad biting cattle. He was informed that dogs injuring property might be properly destroyed by the owner of the property. He could not undertake to introduce a Bill giving farmers power to shoot stray dogs.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE WINTER ASSIZE COURTS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether, at the recent Winter Assizes in Ireland, accused persons from the whole of Munster, with the exception of the county and city of Waterford, were tried in Cork; whether accused persons from the county and city of Waterford and other remote Leinster counties were tried in Dublin; whether enormous expense is incurred by the system of transferring prisoners and witnesses to distant counties, and much inconvenience results from the consequent absence of the Constabulary from their own counties during the prolonged sittings of the Irish Winter Assize Courts; whether there is any reason to doubt that a Circuit of the going Judge from county to county, or the grouping of a lesser number of counties, and the consequent increase in the number of Courts, would involve much less inconvenience and expense; and, whether the present arrangement conveniences anybody except the Judges and the Crown counsel?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) (Liverpool, Walton) (who replied) said: In reply to the first paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, I have to answer in the affirmative. There is some, but not enormous, expense occasioned by transferring prisoners and witnesses, and some inconvenience from the absence of Constabulary; but greater inconvenience and expense would result from carrying out the suggestion in paragraph 4 of the Question. The present arrangement has been found satisfactory and for the public convenience.

REGISTRATION OF PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS (IRELAND)—POLLING DISTRICTS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the statement made in *The Freeman's Journal* of the 3rd instant, that at the recent contested election for South Donegal numbers of voters had, owing to the present arrangement of polling districts in that constituency, to travel distances of 15, 20, and 27 miles to record their votes; whether he is aware that a similar state of things exists in nearly all Irish county constituencies; and, whether the Government intend to propose this Session any legislation on the subject of the registration of Parliamentary voters which would provide for a re-adjustment of the present system of polling districts?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I have no doubt that the statement to which the hon. Member refers is a fact, for in a very sparsely populated county like Donegal some voters must come a considerable distance to record their votes; and as there are several counties in Ireland of the same kind, very likely it happens in other counties beside Donegal. The Government do not intend to propose any legislation in reference to the subject.

MR. COX (Clare, E.): Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to speak of this division as a sparsely populated one?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: It is sparsely populated as compared with others.

MR. COX: Is it not one of the congested districts?

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Did the right hon. Gentleman make any inquiries on the subject?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: No more than I have stated.

LAW AND JUSTICE—WINTER ASSIZES ACT—TRANSFER OF PRISONERS AND WITNESSES.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the remarks of Mr. Justice Grantham at Chelmsford, reported in *The Standard* of the 2nd instant, as regards the enormous expense and inconvenience involved in the system of transferring prisoners and witnesses from one county to another, made necessary by the Winter Assizes Act; whether there is any reason to doubt that a Circuit of the going Judge from county to county would involve much less inconvenience and expense;

and, whether the Government propose to take any action in the matter?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said, that his attention had been called to the remarks of the learned Judge. He could only say that the question of public convenience and public expense was very fully considered when the present arrangement was made.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—CITY OF CORK MILITIA ARTILLERY.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is true that an Officer who has hitherto had no connection with the City of Cork Militia Artillery has been appointed to the command of the Regiment, in the room of the late Lieut.-Col. J. Thackwell; whether great dissatisfaction exists among the Officers of the Regiment; whether the dissatisfaction is caused by the appointment of a stranger, in lieu of the promotion of one of the Officers in the Regiment; whether Major Dunbar Abbott resigned his Commission in consequence of such an appointment; whether there is any foundation for the statement supplied by the Military Correspondent of *The Irish Times*—namely, that other Officers meditate following his example; and, whether it is true the corps numbers only six Officers?

THE SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): No appointment has been made in the room of Colonel Thackwell. I am not aware of dissatisfaction existing amongst the officers of the regiment. It is true that there are only six officers; but I cannot say what they meditate.

DR. TANNER: The right hon. Gentleman has not stated whether Major Abbott resigned.

MR. E. STANHOPE: I am informed that Major Abbott resigned his commission before the death of Colonel Thackwell.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—MONAGHAN MILITIA—ORANGE LODGES.

MR. P. O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any members of the Permanent Staff of the Monaghan Militia are members of the Orange Society, and in the habit of attending the monthly Lodge meetings; whether a member of the Militia Staff resides in the premises known as the New Orange Hall, where one of the Orange Lodges holds its meetings; if so, whether such conduct on the part of Militia Officers is within the meaning and in violation of the Queen's Regulations "peremptorily prohibiting the attendance of officers or soldiers at Orange Lodges;" and, what steps he proposes to take to enforce obedience to the Queen's Regulations in Monaghan?

THE SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): I am informed that no member of the Monaghan Militia Staff belongs to the Orange Society, or attends Orange meetings; and also that no member of the Staff resides in the New Orange Hall.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—GUNS SUPPLIED TO ARMY AND NAVY.

COLONEL HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) asked the Surveyor General of Ordnance, If he can state when the Return asked for on 20th September 1886, showing the Number, Description, Cost, &c., of the various Iron and Steel Guns supplied by the War Department to the Army and Navy respectively from 1855-6 to 1885-6, will be laid upon the Table of the House?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): This Return, the preparation of which has entailed much labour, will, it is hoped, be ready within the present month.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (IRELAND)—LORD CHARLEMONT'S ESTATE—INTERFERENCE OF THE POLICE.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the following statements made in *The Freeman's Journal* of the 13th January 1887, with reference to Lord Charlemont's estate in Tyrone—

> "I have learned that during the past week patrols of police visited the houses of respectable Protestant farmers and inquired if they had paid their rent; and, if not, when they were going to do so. The Secretary to the Tenants' Committee has received special attention from the police, who followed him to houses he entered to ascertain what his business was. To one tenant they even went the length of suggesting or dictating what he ought to do—

a piece of audacity that would have provoked strong resentment if it had been repeated. These farmers are all Protestants. Mr. Arthur Byrne, the chairman of the last meeting, was also visited and subjected to much annoyance. In reply to a remonstrance from one tenant, the police stated they were complying with the orders of superior officers. Owing to this conduct, a good many tenants were intimidated from attending the meeting to-day as they feared some coup;"

whether such statements or any of them are true; and, whether it is the intention of the Government to place the Royal Irish Constabulary at the disposal of Irish landlords free of charge in the capacity of rent warners and state bailiffs?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The newspaper report mentioned attracted attention at the time, and inquiry showed that the statements contained in it reflecting on the action of the Constabulary are altogether erroneous.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—DETECTIVE CONSTABLE KERR.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Detective Constable Kerr, of the Irish Constabulary Force, lately charged in the Belfast Police Court with the abduction of a girl under 17 years of age, is the same person who has been employed for some years as a Government reporter at Nationalist meetings in Ireland; whether, after it had been deposed in the police court that Kerr had brought the girl into a house of ill-fame, having been previously turned out of a lodging-house, Kerr was admitted to bail on his own recognizance; whether he failed to appear at the further hearing of the case; and, whether the police authorities have allowed him to emigrate, and have taken no steps to secure his arrest in the country to which he has emigrated? I wish also to ask the right hon. Gentleman if he is aware that it was only on Saturday last, when notice of this Question had appeared in the local Press, that steps were taken to recover the bails forfeited?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I am not aware of that fact. I should imagine that steps would have been taken at once. I am informed that the detective constable named was charged as stated in the Question. When admitted to bail it was not on his own recognizance merely. He was required also to find two sureties in £25 each. It is not the case that he was allowed to emigrate. When he failed to appear the police took every step in their power to prevent his leaving the country and to secure his arrest. If, however, as is believed, he has succeeded in escaping to America, he could not, as I am advised, be arrested on the charge there.

MR. SEXTON: Was he a Government reporter?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I have said so.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT—SALE OF COAL IN THE MIDLAND MINING DISTRICTS.

MR. P. STANHOPE (Wednesbury) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been directed to the system of measuring coal, when sold in canal boat loads, which extensively prevails in the Midland mining districts; whether he is aware that, owing to the rough method of measurement adopted, and the absence of any system of control by weight, coal merchants are enabled to demand and exact an exaggerated and undeclared overweight, to the serious detriment of the coal owners, miners, and ratepayers of these districts; and, whether, if this practice is an illegal act in contravention of the provisions of the Weights and Measures Act, he will take steps to enforce the law?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth) (who replied), said: The Board of Trade are aware of the practice referred to by the hon. Member; but they have no power to enforce the Weights and Measures Act, or to require the adoption of any particular mode of weighing coal. The practice has not been the subject of a legal decision.

RABIES AMONG DOGS—POLICE PRECAUTIONS.

MR. H. S. WRIGHT (Nottingham, S.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether in view of the continuance of rabies amongst dogs in various parts of the country, and having regard to the fact that dogs afflicted with the disease are migratory in their habits, the Government will take into consideration the advisability of enforcing the muzzling of dogs all over the Country simultaneously for a sufficient period to stamp out the disease?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER (Lord JOHN MANNERS) (Leicestershire, E.) (who replied) said: The Rabies Order of 1887 gives full power to Local Authorities to make provisions for the muzzling of dogs, or for keeping them under control in the manner directed in the Regulations made by Local Authorities. The Government do not propose to take any further steps at present.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACTS — THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

MR. COGHILL (Newcastle-under-Lyme) asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, Do the Charity Commissioners receive regularly the annual Financial Statement required from Governors of Endowed Schools by Schemes made under "The Endowed Schools Act, 1869," and Amending Acts; if not, in the case of those Schemes which do not require the Governors to furnish this account to the Charity Commissioners, will they amend the Clause of those Schemes relating to the publication of accounts, so as to require an annual Financial Statement to be sent to them in all cases?

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) (Kent, Dartford): Under the provisions of Section 44 of the Charitable Trusts Amendment Act, 1855 (18 & 19 Vict. c. 124), the Trustees of all endowed charities (including endowed schools) are required to render accounts to the Charity Commissioners in the manner set forth in that section; and, consequently, the duty of rendering accounts is imposed upon the Governors (as Trustees) of endowed schools, not with reference to any particular scheme, but by Statute.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE'S ESTATE, QUEEN'S COUNTY.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that the Marquess of Lansdowne has, through his agent, served notice on the Poor Law Authorities of his intention to evict thirty-nine tenants on his property at Luggacurran, Queen's County, within the Athy Union?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I am informed that the minutes of proceedings of the Guardians of Athy Union contain an entry of the receipt of notices to the above effect.

THE PARK (METROPOLIS)—ST. JAMES'S PARK.

MR. HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked the First Commissioner of Works, If any decision has been arrived at as to the possibility of opening to the public the roadway in St. James's Park from Storey's Gate to Marlborough Gate?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): I am glad to say that I have obtained the sanction of His Royal Highness the Ranger for this purpose; and I hope that within a few days the arrangements will have been completed for throwing open the roadway from Marlborough Gate to Storey's Gate, just as the roadway between Marlborough Gate and Buckingham Gate is now available for the use of the public.

ARMY CONTRACTS—CARTRIDGES FOR QUEENSLAND.

MR. HUNTER (Aberdeen, N.) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether a contract for 500,000 cartridges for Queensland has been given to a German who has no manufactory, and will have to set one up before he can make cartridges?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF THE ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter) (who replied) said: No, Sir; that is not the case. The contract has been given to a well-known English firm.

ARMY—INSANITARY STATE OF DOVER BARRACKS.

MR. NORRIS (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, since the death of Lieutenant Herbert Jarrett, of the Buffs, in December last, from typhoid fever, said to have been contracted at his quarters in the barracks at Dover, any official inspection of those barracks has been made; and, if so, with what result;

whether any measures have been taken, or are being taken, to remedy the insanitary condition of certain quarters in these and other barracks from which complaints have been received; and, if he will state who is responsible for the general supervision of such matters of vital importance to the health of our officers and men?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The barracks at Dover have, since Lieutenant Jarrett's death, been most carefully inspected by the principal medical officer and the Commanding Royal Engineer, who have failed to discover any insanitary condition which would account for that sad event. The drains were in perfect order. The water has been analyzed, and found quite fit for human consumption. Even the milk used at the mess was tested without result. There was a little dampness found in the officers' quarters, which is now being remedied; but it was quite insufficient to account for an outbreak of typhoid fever. The general responsibility for sanitary matters rests with the principal medical officers of districts acting under the General Officers commanding. Immediate steps are always taken to remedy such defects as are brought to light.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. NORRIS,

MR. E. STANHOPE said, that he was not aware whether similar complaints had been received by the War Office with regard to the insanitary condition of the barracks at Portsmouth and at Dublin.

PUBLIC HEALTH—HYDROPHOBIA—M. PASTEUR'S SYSTEM.

MR. COGHILL (Newcastle-under-Lyme) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Government intend taking any steps to found an institution in London, similar to M. Pasteur's in Paris, for the gratuitous treatment of persons who have been bitten by mad dogs?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's) said, his right hon. and learned Friend had requested him to answer the Question. A Committee was at present sitting for the purpose of investigating M. Pasteur's system of treatment; and when they had concluded their labours their Report would be considered by the Government.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—SALARY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

MR. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, When the Correspondence between the Treasury and the Irish Government, relative to the salary of the Attorney General for Ireland, will be laid upon the Table?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): To-night, Sir.

CIVIL SERVICE WRITERS—THE TREASURY MINUTES.

MR. GENT-DAVIS (Lambeth, Kennington) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether any steps have been taken to carry out the provisions of the Treasury Minute, dated December 1886, relating to the Civil Service Writers; and, whether the bonuses referred to in the Minute have yet been paid; and, if not, whether he can state to the House the causes of the delay?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): The Treasury Minute referred to is in course of being carried out; but this being the first occasion, there has been a delay of a few days. The payment of bonuses will immediately commence. I may point out that effect is given to the Minute as from July 1 of last year.

THE CIVIL SERVICE—RETIREMENT OF WRITERS.

MR. GENT-DAVIS (Lambeth, Kennington) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he can assure the House that, pending the Report of the Royal Commission on Civil Establishments, writers will not be compulsorily retired from the Civil Service except for misconduct or refusing to serve when called upon?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): I am not aware of any intention to remove copyists from the register compulsorily, as it is anticipated that sufficient vacancies will occur by voluntary retirement. I do not think it necessary or desirable to give any formal assurance.

ARMAGH TOWN COMMISSIONERS—AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it was in accordance with the practice of the Irish Local Government Board that the financial accounts of the Armagh Town Commissioners for the year ended 31st December 1885 were not audited by the Board's Auditor, Colonel Studdart, until the 12th of July 1886; whether the ratepayers of Armagh were deprived of the opportunity of attending before the auditor, by the holding of the audit upon another date than that which had been fixed for the purpose by public advertisement; whether the auditor took note of the fact that the rates levied in Armagh are the highest allowed by law, and that on the 31st December 1885 there was a deficit of over £300, though all the rates leviable up to the 23rd August 1886 had been spent, leaving no money available for eight months of municipal administration; whether repeated applications to the Local Government Board to hold an inquiry have proved ineffectual; and, how the complaining ratepayers can obtain redress?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): I am informed that there is no time fixed by the Local Government Board for the audit of these accounts. The audit should be carried out once a year. I am not aware that objection was taken by anybody to the course pursued, and I learn that a mistake was made with reference to the figures quoted by the hon. Member, and the mistake was corrected in the local papers the following week. The Local Government Board have no power to make the inquiry which the hon. Member suggested; but if any person felt aggrieved by any specific occurrence of the kind, he could appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench.

LABOURERS' (IRELAND) ACT AND LABOURERS' COTTAGES — ARDEE UNION.

Mr. CAREW (Kildare, N.) (for Mr. T. P. Gill) (Louth, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, after a long delay, and after a Question had been asked in this House on the matter, a Local Government Board Inspector held an inquiry in connection with a scheme for labourers' cottages in the Ardee Union last October; why is it that, although this inquiry was held nearly four months ago, no Report has yet been issued by the Inspector, notwithstanding repeated applications for such Report by the Ardee Board of Guardians; and, whether the Chief Secretary will take steps to see that the desire of the entire locality with respect to this scheme for labourers' cottages is complied with by the Local Government Board?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W): The scheme under the Labourers' Act in the Ardee Union necessarily took time, as it was of a very extensive character, and there were various matters in dispute between the Sanitary Authority and the owners of land proposed to be taken as alternative sites. The Report of the Inspector was, however, made some weeks ago. It is under the consideration of the Local Government Board, and will be communicated to the Guardians with as little delay as possible. No doubt the carrying out of the schemes under the Labourers' Act could be much more promptly effected if they were not so numerous. But the fact is that great pressure is put on the Local Government Board staff by reason of the extent to which the provisions of the Act are taken advantage of; and the schemes of the several Boards of Guardians to some extent stand in each other's way. A temporary addition was made in the autumn to the staff of the Local Government Board in order to enable them to deal more rapidly with the matter.

PRISONS (IRELAND) — RE-ORGANIZATION—INCREASE OF SALARIES OF OFFICIALS.

Mr. M'CARTAN (Down, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the settlement referred to in his reply on 7th September last had yet been made as to the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Prisons to increase the salaries of the officers, now that the re-organization of staffs and the amalgamation of prisons have taken place?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W): The revision of the salaries of prison officers in Ireland, based upon the recommendations of the Royal Commission, has been finally settled by the Treasury and the Irish Government, and will take effect from April 1 next.

BELFAST RIOTS—THE CONSTABULARY.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether there is a police station in the extensive and populous district lying between Old Park Road and Crumlin Road, Belfast, where Catholics have been frequently of late insulted and assaulted on their way to and from their daily labour; and, if there is no station in this district, whether one will be established there; and whether, whilst numerous constables are placed on the Falls Road, where need for their service scarcely ever arises, the Shankill Old Lodge Road, Old Park Road, and the district lying between Greenmount Road and Limestone Road, are left without the necessary police protection?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Inspector General has reported that there is a police station in the vicinity of the Crumlin Road. Very few complaints have been made of Roman Catholics having been insulted in the locality; but in the cases which have occurred, the offending persons were made amenable, and were punished. With regard to the district referred to in the second paragraph, the Inspector General reports that two new barracks have recently been erected, and that a third is being got ready as quickly as possible. It is believed that ample protection will be thus afforded.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS.

MR. MAHONY (Meath, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that the evictions carried out at Glenbeigh during the week commencing the 10th January, were carried out by a person purporting to act for the Sheriff, but who had no proper authority for so acting; whether the Magistrates at Killorglin Petty Sessions, held on 24th January, unanimously refused information against 25 persons charged with obstructing the Sheriff's Deputy during the course of these evictions, on the ground that the said Deputy had not been legally appointed; whether this person, during the course of the evictions, was protected in his work by a force of police; whether the houses of which he took possession were handed over to Mr. Roe; whether many of these houses were burnt and levelled by Mr. Roe; and whether Mr. Roe was protected by a force of police whilst engaged in this work?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I cannot express any opinion as to whether or not the Sheriff's Deputy had authority to act. The Government have no control over the Sheriff, who, as I am advised, is responsible to the Court from which a writ issues for the due execution of such writ. If any person considers himself aggrieved, he has his legal remedy. I believe the magistrates refused information on the ground stated. The Sheriff's Deputy, and Mr. Roe, were protected by the police; the houses of which possession was taken were handed to Mr. Roe; and 10 of them were destroyed.

MR. M. HEALY (Cork) wished to know whether he was to understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that the Government would not inquire whether the person who conducted the evictions in question had legal warrant for his action or not?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: We have every reason to suppose that he had such warrant.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS.

MR. MAHONY (Meath, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it was on the requisition of the Sheriff, and for the purpose of protecting him in the execution of his duty, that a force of police was drafted to Glenbeigh before the recent evictions; whether this force was subsequently employed in many cases after the Sheriff had completed the eviction and handed over possession, for the purpose of protecting Mr. Roe while engaged in demolishing and burning the houses; whether the Sheriff was greatly hindered and delayed in the execution of his duty by the police being thus used for other purposes than the one for which they were requisitioned; and, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Correspondence which took place between the Sheriff and the Government on this subject?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): It was the duty of the police to protect the agent (Mr. Roe) while engaged in carrying out legal processes at Glenbeigh, and they did so. I am not aware that the Sheriff was, in consequence, greatly hindered and delayed in the execution of his duty. I am informed that there has been no correspondence on the subject between the Sheriff and the Government.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked whether, after the Sheriff had completed his legal function, and handed over possession to Mr. Roe, and desired the police to accompany him to the next eviction, the Police Inspector was entitled to keep his force on the spot for the purpose of protecting Mr. Roe while burning the houses?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Not against the wish of the Sheriff; and I do not believe that that was done. I am not aware that the Sheriff had any reason to complain of the delay. If he had, I have no doubt he would have complained to the Government.

MR. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Sheriff is one of a firm of land agents in the County of Kerry, and is, therefore, not likely to complain of any action of this kind?

[No reply.]

LAND (IRELAND)—GLEBE LAND TENANTS.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is the intention of the Government to deal with the case of the Glebe Land Tenants during the present Session; and, if so, when the Bill for this purpose will be introduced?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I have already made a statement in reply to a deputation, on which, I believe, the hon. Member attended, and I can add nothing to that statement.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).—THREATENED EVICTIONS IN ACHILL.

MR. CHANNING (Northampton, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been drawn to the impending evictions on estates in the Island of Achill, and to the miserable and helpless position of the majority of the tenants, and to their general inability to pay the rents and arrears of rent claimed from them, as evidenced by the recent report of Mr. Tuke, detailing the operations of the Seed Potato Fund, and describing the condition of the tenants in Achill; and, whether, in view of these impending evictions, he is prepared to take any immediate steps to provide, by legislation or otherwise, a more humane and satisfactory solution of the difficulties of the tenants in Achill than a repetition of the scene recently enacted at Glenbeigh?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): We have no information that evictions are pending in the Island of Achill.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES.

MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will lay upon the Table a Return giving the following particulars with respect to jurors directed to "stand by" by any Crown Solicitor in any criminal trial in Ireland arising out of the relations between the owners and occupiers of land in that country, and held during October, November, and December, 1886—namely, date and place where such trial was held; name of defendants thereat; number of jurors there directed to "stand by" by the Crown Solicitor; the religious denomination to which such jurors belonged, and the number of jurors of each denomination; the religious denomination to which the jurors or jury as sworn belonged, and the number attached to each denomination; and the verdict given by the jury?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): We have no official sources of information from which such a return could be obtained as the hon. Member desires, and I cannot undertake to procure it.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): Does not the Crown Solicitor keep a record?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Not that I know of.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT—LOCAL TAXATION.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON (Shropshire, Oswestry) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he will make arrangements for a statement to be presented to the House on Local Taxation, showing the increase or decrease of the rates and the indebtedness of Local Authorities during the past year, before the Budget, according to the precedent adopted in 1876?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster), in reply, said, he regretted that it was not in his power to give an undertaking to do so; but a Return was being prepared, and would shortly be in the hands of hon. Members, giving the latest particulars with regard to Local Taxation and liability down to the 31st of March, 1885.

PUBLIC HEALTH — CONTAGIOUS DISEASES HOSPITALS IN GARRISON TOWNS.

MR. C. T. D. ACLAND (Cornwall, Launceston) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the annual grant towards the expenses of hospitals for contagious diseases in certain garrison towns has been withdrawn, and whether any other method of maintaining them is proposed; and, if not, what it is intended to substitute for these institutions; and, whether the managers of other hospitals have shown great unwillingness, or have entirely refused to admit cases of contagious disease?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) (who replied) said: Parliament will be asked to vote a sum of money in aid of beds in local civil hospitals affording accommodation for lock patients; and I am at present in communication with the authorities of certain garrison towns with a view to ascertain to what extent co-operation may be expected on their part. I believe that the managers of some hospitals have objected to admit patients of this class; but I have no positive knowledge on the subject.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [NINTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [7th February], proposed to the Question—[See page 84.]

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the 8th paragraph, to insert the words, "But humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the relations between the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland have not been seriously disturbed in the cases of those owners who have granted to their tenants such abatements of rents as are called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce, and that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is not to be found in increased stringency of criminal procedure, or in the pursuit of such novel, doubtful, and unconstitutional measures as have recently been taken by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland, but in such a reform of the Law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people."—(*Mr. Parnell*).

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Debate *resumed.*

AGRARIAN AFFAIRS (IRELAND).

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne): Mr. Speaker: In stating the reasons for the vote which I propose to give on the Amendment before the House, I shall not travel over those minute details of recent history which have made very proper matter for some hon. Gentlemen who have previously addressed the House. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) points to future policy, as well as to past administration, and in the observations with which I shall venture to trouble the House I shall rather look to the past with a view of getting any light, such as it is, that it may shed on future policy. The pith of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork, in my judgment, lies in the proposition that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish affairs is to be found—

> "In such a reform of the Law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people."

In view of that part of the Amendment, and considering that, in my judgment, it points to the most vital fact in the present situation, I may say, at the outset, that I shall have no hesitation in going into the Lobby with the hon. Member for Cork. We, here, contend at this Table, and at other tables, in the words of the Amendment, that there is no remedy for the crisis, which is not connected with reform in the system of Irish government—a reform such as shall win and secure the confidence of the Irish people. Has anything happened since last Session to give evidence to the country—I will even say to give evidence to their own side—that Her Majesty's present Advisers have grasped the present situation in Ireland? Has anything happened to make us believe that they have found a clue to the difficulties of Irish government? We need not go back further than the last three, four, or five months of their administration to indicate to us very clearly—as is evident from the very remarkable speech made last night by the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hanbury)—that even among their own most faithful followers there is a conviction that they in no sense possess a definite and intelligible policy in Ireland. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) the other night said that Ireland was always in a state of crisis, sometimes arising from climate, sometimes from political and artificially manufactured causes, and sometimes from fires which, he says, are always smouldering underneath the surface of Irish society. But we were led to suppose, and we were told that the accession to power of a Government which would exercise a firm and resolute administration in Ireland, would put an end to all those crises. On the contrary, there has been no abatement—not the slightest—in the state of crisis, in its essence and substance, since the accession to power of the right hon. Gentlemen opposite. Not for one single day has there been what they describe to their own supporters as firm and resolute government. It is all very well to come down to this House with sounding phrases about law and order. During the Recess their whole policy was very different indeed from anything like firm and resolute administration. The charge of Chief Baron Palles at Sligo did not indicate that he had any confidence in the firm and resolute administration of the Chief Secretary and his Colleagues. The noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), speaking in December, rather charged the Government with too lax an administration than with one too stringent. If there is evidence on the other side that no confidence has been established in the minds even of their own friends from the policy of Her Majesty's Government, still less is there likely to be any such confidence created in our bosoms. I am not going over the story of the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork. I will only point out that the Bill was rejected on two allegations of the Government, and that each of those allegations has been absolutely exploded by the action of the Government themselves—I believe that within 24 hours of the rejection of the Bill the Government felt that these allegations were exploded. The first was that there had been no fall in prices; and I have still ringing in my ears the rapturous declamation of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) as to the rise in the price of wool. The second allegation was that the Land Commissioners, in fixing the judicial rents, had taken into account a possible decline in prices. Both these allegations are exploded, and we have not heard a single hon. Gentleman, since the Session began, get up and defend either of these propositions. What is the conclusion to be drawn from the failure of the two allegations upon which the rejection of the Tenants' Relief Bill was based? The conclusion is that there was a real evil, and that there was a real grievance on the part of the poorer tenants of Ireland, and that those who had had their judicial rents fixed were exposed to substantial wrong. That being the case, the conduct of the Chief Secretary shows he was perfectly aware of this grievance, this wrong, and this danger. He was aware of it because he at once set to work to carry out that process of which so much has been said, which consisted of putting pressure upon the landlords to grant fair abatements. Where there is a real danger, it is surely the duty of the Legislature to find a legal remedy, and it was because we failed, and because this House failed, to take the first step in providing a legal remedy, that some mischief—which, as I trust I shall presently persuade the House, has been exaggerated—has taken place. I know that there are those among my right hon. and hon. Friends who say—"It is true that a remedy was needed, but the

Tenants' Relief Bill of the hon. Member for Cork was not the right kind of remedy." Why did they not say so before the rejection of the Bill? I ventured to point out at the time that Amendments might be made in the Bill in Committee which would have had the effect of getting rid of some of the most valid of the objections to the Bill. Many of those who have since declared the Bill would have furnished no remedy took no part in the discussion or in the Division upon it. Why did they not help us to find a better way? I have not a word of criticism upon the Chief Secretary for endeavouring to keep the peace between landlord and tenant. On the contrary, I think the course taken by the right hon. Baronet is such as will commend itself to everyone as a good and sound policy of administration. But I am surprised that the right hon. Baronet is so modest since Parliament has met, as to the part he took in persuading the landlords to deal fairly with their tenants. He has endeavoured to minimize his own virtue; he is one of those who "do good by stealth and blush to find it fame." It may be that the right hon. Baronet and the hon. and learned Attorney General cannot erase from their recollections the tremendously solemn and impressive harangue made to me, when sitting on the opposite side of the House, by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland, upon the intolerableness of any Member of an Executive Government presuming to interfere between man and man in the matter of judicial rent. The right hon. Baronet, who knows Ireland as well as most Englishmen, must know and must have foreseen from all the course of Irish history that in Ireland, above all countries in the world, where you have a real grievance and a substantial wrong without a legal remedy, you may be perfectly sure that some portion of the people, at least, will resort to illegitimate methods of obtaining redress. That is the history of Ireland in a nutshell—unredressed grievances, moral wrongs without a legal remedy, and then the resort to illegal acts to secure justice. Popular discontent among the poorer tenants in Ireland has always led to irregular, illegal, and very often criminal expedients; and it is because the leaders in Irish affairs, those whom the majority of the Irish people look up to and trust, are not listened to in this House, because they have no share in guiding the administration of their country, that they are often driven to expedients and devices which, if they had had a more responsible training, they would be more likely to hold aloot from. I will not consent to argue the treatment of Ireland upon the narrow grounds of technical administration. *Nisi Prius* is all very well, but it is not everything. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) was perfectly right when he said that a great deal too much attention had been paid to the Plan of Campaign in this debate; that, in fact, it had not been very largely or widely operative; and that, on the whole, over the greater portion of Ireland rents had been very fairly paid and legal obligations very fairly and honourably acknowledged and met. I entirely agree with the noble Lord in that judgment. I have never felt that there was any justification either for the enthusiastic benediction bestowed by my hon. Friend the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) upon the Plan of Campaign, or for what I must take leave to call the violently exaggerated censure of my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington). My noble Friend, speaking on the 7th of December, said that the principle of the Plan of Campaign

> "would lead to the complete and profound subversion of every principle upon which, hitherto, social order has been based."

That was two months ago. But my noble Friend, speaking last week, said—

> "I do not mean to say that anarchy, or anything approaching to anarchy, has prevailed over the greater portion of Ireland; I believe at the present moment order does exist in a very large portion of the country."

Well, that is a very fair reason for thinking that the policy and the principles which the noble Lord had announced two months ago as a complete and profound subversion of social order have had no such effect as he had anticipated. I think there has been enormous exaggeration in all the language that has been used about the Plan of Campaign. I will venture to say, at the risk of being misunderstood, two things about the Plan of Campaign. The first is that, so far as we have yet heard in the course of this debate, there is no evidence that in consequence of the adoption of the Plan of Campaign there has been the actual perpetration of any marked substantial injustice. I will say, secondly, I believe that even those who are most passionate against the Plan of Campaign will admit that a combination of that kind, limited as that combination has been, is better than those grim associations which have set their mark on Irish agrarian history—secret societies and secret murder clubs. I will say another thing—if I am called upon to pronounce a judgment upon the Plan of Campaign, and upon the principles on which it rests, I must be permitted to pronounce a judgment in full. However immoral, however unjust, however unpatriotic you may consider the Plan of Campaign and the action taken under it to be, I do not hesitate to say that I do not regard it as any more immoral, any more unjust, any more unpatriotic than the action of those landlords whom the Chief Secretary himself denounced at Bristol as harshly exacting the rights of property while performing none of its duties. I will fortify myself by an authority. My right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) did me the honour the other day to quote a sentence from one of my too multitudinous utterances on the Irish Question. I should be sorry to fall behind my right hon. Friend in any polite attention of this sort. Some time in 1885 my right hon. Friend said—

> "I do not see why a sufficient remedy for the eviction of poor tenants in Ireland should not be found without any proceedings which can fairly be described as dishonest, and when I speak of confiscation I do wish that the landlords would exercise a little reciprocity. When an exorbitant rent is demanded, which takes from a tenant the savings of his life, when a man is taxed for his own improvements, that is confiscation, and it is none the less reprehensible because it is sanctioned by the law."

It is impossible in a country in the condition in which Ireland now is, to form any judgment worthy of the responsibilities which lie upon this Legislature, if you look at the social situation in Ireland merely as lawyers may look at it in a Court. We have been taxed in the course of this debate with not launching out into denunciations of the Plan of Campaign. It is a ludicrous doctrine that because we happen to agree with the hon. Gentleman below the Gangway as to the best way of governing their country, that, therefore, we are to be called upon to express judgment upon everything they may say or do. I, for one, repudiate any such doctrine. [*Ironical Ministerial Cheers.*] Yes; but you yourselves do not practise that doctrine. I see sitting behind the Ministerial Bench the hon. Member for East Belfast (Mr. De Cobain), who has within a few days been held up by an official Commission to public censure and reprehension for writing an incendiary letter upon which much of the blame is to be laid for the bloodshed, disorder, and violence that have taken place in Belfast. We have not heard any of you condemn that action of the hon. Gentleman. None of you have cut yourselves off from that action or passed any censure upon it. Why should we be called upon to express opinions upon anything and everything done by political allies? When you ask us to hurry on to platforms or to come down here and rail at or revile hon. Gentlemen from Ireland, I say that you are taking one of the most fatal courses to the Union you value that can be taken. I will tell you why. Depend upon it that nothing can be so fatal to the Union as the conviction in the minds of the Irish people, that there is no Party or individual in this House which is not always ready upon the slightest provocation to come down here, or to go into the country sermonizing, bullying, scolding, and lecturing them. It is most important for the peace of Ireland, as well as for the Union, that they should feel that there is a Party here who will not be led to repeat the old fault of supposing that everything said and everything done by Irishmen is best treated by harangues, lectures, and bullyings from us in this House. Let there be no mistake. We are under no obligation to support every Motion made in that quarter of the House. I do not suppose that from that quarter of the House the Motions are all sure to be more wise and deserving the support of sensible men than those from any other quarter; but I am not sure they will be less so. At all events, we shall not be driven by any taunts as to our going on our knees to the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) into forgetting the fact that the attempt to govern Ireland with sublime disregard of the advice and assistance, the opinions and the wishes, of the Representatives of the Irish people is the most vain and futile attempt that was ever made. The House must have been rather struck last night by what fell from the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) when he described himself and his friends as being ignorant of the doings and policy of Her Majesty's Government, and when he described how they were unable to learn anything, except what they might hear through private channels, of what was being done by the Chief Secretary and his lieutenants. This brings me to make a few remarks upon a subject not mentioned so far in the course of the debate—the removal of Sir Robert Hamilton. I am not going to argue the question whether it is or is not desirable to displace the permanent head of a department when there is a change in the Parliamentary Chiefs. I will not argue it, because I am sure there are not two opinions in the House as to that subject; we are all agreed that it is in the highest degree desirable that no such policy should be pursued. Nor am I going to attempt to say a word about the official loyalty of Sir Robert Hamilton, nor to bear my testimony, whatever it may be worth, to the fact that Sir Robert Hamilton has never overstepped by a single hair's breadth the lines of his strict official duty. For I am perfectly sure that neither the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary nor anyone else would make any charge of that kind against him. What I want the House to consider is more important than any merely personal point. Let the House consider the effect of the removal of Sir Robert Hamilton on the chances of the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary getting true information, and learning the true state of things, in respect of the government of Ireland. There are some races of which it is said that they look into your eyes when you ask a question to see what kind of answer you would like. I think it is most undesirable that officials, especially in a country like Ireland, should be placed under any temptation to acquire a habit of that kind. But I must say it will be a miracle if Irish officials, with all their loyalty to the service, do not for the future think twice before they give full and independent opinions on points of administration and policy that come in their way, which may be disagreeable to the Parliamentary Chiefs. I think the effect of what has been done will be in that direction. Sir Robert Hamilton, it is true, has been hustled upstairs, but he was a conspicuous man, with powerful friends; but a small man without powerful friends may think that the telling of disagreeable truths will end in his being hustled downstairs. The chances of governing Ireland under the present system are not, in my judgment, very good at the best; but there can be nothing more fatal to those chances, small as they are, than that the Chief Secretaries, who, as the First Lord of the Treasury knows, are very transient and fleeting personages—for there have been nine within the last seven years—nothing can be more fatal than that they should be deprived of every chance of having the fullest and the most naked truth as to every detail in connection with the government of Ireland. Sir, there is one other point in connection with this subject which I wish just to mention. It is said that some changes are going to be made which will end in the Office of Under Secretary being made a political Office, the occupant of which is to go in and out with the Parliamentary Chief. Whether that is true or not I do not now ask; but I wish to make one remark upon it which bears upon the Amendment. It is that the effect of any action of that kind will inevitably be to throw the real power of Irish administration into the hands of the lawyers. Well, Sir, I think that those who know best the history of Irish administration since the Union will agree that nothing is so responsible for the hatred and the unpopularity and failure of the Castle administration as the predominance of the legal element in carrying out that administration. I am reminded by what I have said about lawyers of the rather remarkable and interesting exhibition of the legal view and the legal mind which was made last night by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes). The House is acquainted with the facts of the Sligo juries at the Assizes. We have heard, in the course of the debates, that when these Catholic peasants were brought up for trial, in the case of two batches at least of them, there was not one single Catholic on the jury. In the case of other batches, I believe the exclusion was not quite so rigorous; but in these two cases so it was.

Now, considering the predominance of the Catholics in the population of the district, one might have supposed that such a result could scarcely be due to accident. All doubt on the point was put an end to last night by the right hon. and learned Gentleman plainly avowing that it was not accident but design which had excluded all Catholics from these cases. We know what the books tell us about trial by jury. The blessing of trial by jury is that the accused has the charge against him sifted and decided by 12 of his equals and his neighbours indifferently chosen. According to the right hon. and learned Gentleman, they are not, by any means, indifferently chosen. The right hon. and learned Gentleman actually laid it down that the legal representatives of the Crown would have been guilty of dereliction of duty, and that it would have been impossible to secure a fair trial, if the Crown had not exercised its privilege in order to secure the attendance of men of independent thought. Now I do not believe that in the racy and exuberant history of Irish humour there is a nobler euphemism than this. A man of independent thought is a man to whom the Crown can trust to give you a conviction. Sir, I do not believe that an English Minister ever before came to this House and made such an admission. The position assumed by the right hon. and learned Gentleman comes to this—that no Catholic can be a man of independent thought. It comes to this—that it would be a dereliction of duty if the Crown were to allow the Catholics their fair share of the rights and the duties and the burdens of common citizenship. And yet, with maxims like this, and practices like this, we are surprised that we cannot govern a Catholic country. I will now go on, if the House will extend me its indulgence, to notice one or two suggestions that have been made in the direction of policy—suggestions which may influence, and which, no doubt, will influence, the minds of hon. Members. I shall vote for the Amendment, because I think it points to the only policy on which Ireland can be governed—the only policy upon which England can be relieved; but I naturally turn, with the greatest eagerness, in every direction, for a substitute for the policy which we advocate. My noble Friend the Member for Rossendale, the other day, gave, at Newcastle, his notion of the direction in which we ought to look for a substitute for the Bill of the late Government; and it came to the prescription commented on by my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo the other night, that we ought to look in the direction of emigration and migration. The proposition of my noble Friend is, that the British Government might, with local co-operation, local assistance, and through local agencies, do much in the way of assisting emigration or migration from some of these congested districts. The point of the proposal is that the British Government should do this. But forced and large emigration is not a process which you can carry out when you will without regard to the labour market of the world. You cannot carry out emigration without regard to the feelings of the country to which you propose to send your emigrants; and what is likely to be the feeling of our Colonies, or of the United States, at what they justly term a pauper invasion? Who can believe that these poor, broken creatures, who have just had their houses burnt over their heads at Glenbeigh, broken in spirit, with their frames emaciated by hunger, body and soul worn out in the long struggle with the harshness of Nature, and the worse harshness of man—who believes that they will be welcomed in new countries which require all the energy, all the spirit, and all the physical strength of the population? I may remind the House of the experience of that zealous and benevolent man, Mr. Tuke, who, in his emigration work, found that he had aroused antagonisms—not political antagonisms—which rendered it impossible that much more could be done at that time. Mr. Tuke left a record of his opinion, which I think bears very precisely upon the views of my noble Friend. Mr. Tuke said—

> "Though what was needed was a permanent Board of Emigration, which with a suitable staff both in Ireland and America should, from year to year, and not spasmodically, deal with a limited number of applications for emigration, and advise in each case as might seem the best, yet it must be fully admitted that no such Board could, in the present state of Irish politics, be formed."

That was in 1884. The hon. Member for the Poplar Division of the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Sydney Buxton) is well acquainted with the facts of this movement, and will be able to correct me if I am mistaken. Mr. Tuke said in 1884 it was hopeless to think of having that Board of Emigration which he regarded as essential and indispensable. I want to ask anyone who looks in this direction whether he thinks that in 1887 the state of things is more favourable for a Board of Emigration than it was in 1884? The noble Lord the Member for Rossendale knows very well that if a Board of Emigration was impossible in 1884, it is much more impossible in 1887. [“No!”] We heard the hon. Member for East Mayo last night. I do not think his language was very encouraging for anyone who looks to emigration under British control as a likely way to solve the Irish difficulty. I do not believe, therefore, that this panacea of my noble Friend is at all likely to be a substitute for the reform which we attempted to carry out. It is often said—“If you will only settle the Land Question you need not trouble yourself about Home Rule.” The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), in his most able speech the other night, said something about the Land Act of 1881. Mr. Goschen says the Land Act of 1881 is a gigantic failure. But although I always pay great respect to Mr. Goschen's remarks, I never have thought he showed a precise and specific knowledge of Ireland. The hon. and gallant Gentleman, however, knows Ireland very well, and I never listen to him speaking on Irish affairs without feeling that he has the welfare of his own country at heart. He says the Land Act of 1881—it is his own language and not mine—“laid the foundations of the true solution of the Irish Question.” The hon. and gallant Gentleman meant some extension of land purchase. Now, when we think how we have moved in the matter of land purchase since 1870 by successive stages, I think we must not be too sure that even the largest and most generous measure of land purchase, unless it were accompanied by something to satisfy Irish political opinion, would have the effect which the hon. and gallant Member and all of us desire. Think how you have advanced in your inducements for tenants to become the owners of their holdings. In the Bill of 1870 the advance of the Treasury was two-thirds of the price, with 4 per cent interest. In the Bill of 1881 the advance was three-fourths at 3½ per cent, and a term of 35 years. In 1884 Mr. Trevelyan brought in a Bill which advanced three-fourths of the purchase money at 3¼ per cent, repayable in 40 years. But in 1885 the Government then in Office, which was, in effect, the present Government, made a further step of the most serious kind; they agreed by the Act, which is called Lord Ashbourne's Act, to make the whole advance repayable in 49 years, being an enormous extension of the privileges which had been granted by the previous Bills. I cannot, for my part, imagine any terms being invented more favourable to the Irish tenant, if he is inclined to purchase, than those of Lord Ashbourne's Act. Yes; but they are not terms very favourable or safe to the British Treasury. That, however, is not my point for the moment. It is that, even with a temptation so enormous as that—apparently, so irresistible—the Irish tenant has not shown any very great anxiety to become the purchaser of his holding. The Act has, indeed, not been long in operation. But it has been quite long enough if the Irish tenantry meant to avail themselves of its provisions—quite long enough to show that, considering the reduction made on the judicial rent and what he was paying before 1881, the tenant will be sitting at something like 40 per cent less than he was five or six years ago. If an offer of that kind is not jumped at, does it not lead to the opinion that there is something in the temper and frame of mind of the Irish tenant which proves that in that direction you need not look for a solution of your difficulty? Even if it were otherwise, it has a fatal defect in the minds of many of us; and I am glad to be able to dwell upon the fact that my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) has recently stated that he is opposed to the extension of an arrangement which involves the Treasury in such risk, and which, besides, has the political danger of bringing the British State into direct relations with the individual Irish tenant. Sir, I will only say further upon that suggestion that, do what you will in the way of land purchase, no scheme will be workable or safe which is not backed by local authorities, who, in turn, are backed by a central Government resting upon the public opinion of the country. I, therefore, must express my own emphatic disbelief in any remedy being found for the present or other agrarian or political crisis in the direction of land purchase if unaccompanied by some other measure which, in terms of the Amendment, "shall meet the needs and gain the confidence of the Irish people." I wish to say a word on the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Bath (Mr. Wodehouse). My hon. Friend said that he will vote for coercion. But he said rather more. He said the reason he would not subscribe to the doctrine that coercion had always failed was the intermittent application of such laws in obedience to the exigencies of political Parties. Now, Sir, sincerely I would ask my hon. Friend whether he thinks, in this ingenuous and artless aspiration, that the exigencies of political Parties are coming to an end now? If my hon. Friend will look back for six or seven years, he will find that in 1880 the Government dropped the Peace Preservation Act. In 1881 the same Government brought in a tremendous Coercion Act. In 1882 they let out of prison men who had been locked up under it, and then proceeded to pass in many respects a still more stringent measure—the Crimes Act. In 1885 there was a change of Government, and the Government which came in dropped all coercion, and declared their intention of administering Ireland by the ordinary law. In June, 1886, the same Government said, "We must have more powers." In 1887 we now see that they are going to turn back to their former judgment, and again to ask for new and exceptional powers. Now, I ask my hon. Friend and the House whether it is possible, in the face of an experience of that kind — so many vacillations, so many turns about in both Parties; I do not accuse one Party of being more vacillating than another—to expect that all the exigencies of Party, now of all times in the world, are coming to an end, and we are to have a just, a steady, and permanent policy carried out in Ireland? Why, even in the course of this debate we have seen that there is no unanimity among those who support the Government. The hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hanbury) last night told us that he should be disinclined to support this coercive legislation, unless it were extended all over England. There was domestic separatism in the Unionist camp, because the hon. Member for the Cirencester Division (Mr. Winterbotham) said he could not support coercion at all. Therefore I ask hon. Members who look to coercion as a policy how they think that policy is to be accepted by the House, and how long it will be carried out by a Government, even if they are fortunate or unfortunate enough to get their Bills carried? Sir, it is not in that direction that there is anything to be hoped for the better government of Ireland, and I will remind the House that the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) said last year that he did not believe for a moment that a renewal of the clauses of the Crimes Act would have had any effect in dealing with the National League. He said, in his judgment, what was wanted was something stronger and quite different. The noble Lord's advice in that respect seems to me to be perfectly good, and I hope Ministers will even now, if it is not too late, reconsider the decision which has been foreshadowed in the Queen's Speech. I am perfectly sure that nothing will come from carrying out that decision but an increase of the difficulties and troubles with which they and all of us have to deal in Ireland. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington said the other night we might make ourselves perfectly easy, because Home Rule was now practically at an end, and that if he could only go into a room with hon. Gentlemen from Ireland, where what they said could not be heard, he would get them to confess that their aspirations had now no chance of being satisfied. The noble Lord is not a trustworthy prophet, in matters affecting Ireland. Well do I remember one afternoon, in the Parliament of 1884, he made a remarkable speech, in which he was dealing pretty faithfully with the right hon. Gentleman the present Leader of the House. He was remonstrating with the Conservative Party for hesitating about the extension of the franchise to Ireland. He made this prophecy, which he urged the House and his Party to accept from him. "Depend upon it," he said, "if you only extend the franchise in the counties you will find in the Irish counties a Conservative set of influences which will soon put in order the Fenian and Nationalist tendencies of the towns." We all know how that prophecy has been fulfilled, and you may depend upon it that as that prophecy has been absurdly brought to naught, so will his prophecy about Home Rule be brought to naught. The Conservative Party will not act wisely, as it often has in the past, if it shapes its policy upon any such assumption. Last year the same noble Lord, speaking as the Leader of this House, and as the Representative of the Government, made a very distinct promise to the House and the Irish Party. He said that if the Irish Members would desist from their criticism upon certain Estimates then under consideration, the Government would be prepared to bring in measures, as early as might be, throwing the responsibility for local government and the operations of the Board of Works into the hands of the Irish people. Now, if you will not listen to our policy, is it not time that you should fulfil the pledge given by your own Leader for a consideration? ["No!"] The right hon. Baronet (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) shakes his head; but the pledge was certainly given.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): There was no consideration.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: The right hon. Baronet states that there was no consideration. Then, Sir, the pledge was still stronger; it was what lawyers call a voluntary promise. In any case, it was announced that the Government were prepared at that time to transfer large powers of local government—especially powers connected with the Board of Works—to the Irish people. What is there in the state of things at present to prevent persistence in that policy? It is ridiculous to pretend that because there are disorders—which I persist in calling slight disorders—in some parts of Ireland, you have a pretext for leaving your own promise unfulfilled. I do not think that is worthy of right hon. Gentlemen opposite. It is not safe—certainly it is neither prudent nor politic—to leave the field so bare of all Irish legislation when the Chief Secretary himself, and every prominent responsible Member of the Irish Administration, and when both sides of the House have agreed that remedial legislation for Ireland is in many respects greatly needed. The noble Lord the Member for Rossendale has before now said very strong things about the need in Ireland for local government and remedial legislation. He has given no reason why all that legislation is to be postponed, and why we are to be content with the barren and mischievous fare for Ireland of reform in her criminal procedure. You all hoped that when you had got rid of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian, and of our policy, this Chamber would be able to settle down to do good legislative work both for Ireland and Great Britain. I appeal to either side of the House whether there is any prospect before us of any such thing? I ask the House whether any Session ever began with less hope in the mind of any section of the House, less expectation, less intention of doing good work? [*Cries of* "Oh!"] I misunderstand the temper of the House if there is any buoyancy, any hope, or any expectation of getting on with legislation and Business for England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. I have never myself felt the atmosphere of the House so leaden. [*Ministerial cheers.*] You cheer that statement; but with whom does the fault lie? It lies with those who will not move out of the way what for seven years has been the standing obstacle to the transaction of the Business of the House, and a standing scandal upon its character. This leaden, moveless cloud will not lift from our deliberations, until you have achieved, as your first task, such a reform of the system of government in Ireland as will meet the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people; and it is because I have that conviction that I shall vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork.

MR. HOWORTH (Salford, S.) said, that the right hon. Gentleman opposite who had just sat down was free from the suspicion of insincerity. He was the original Home Ruler in the Liberal Party, and he was, in the opinion of many, the one Home Ruler whose convictions on the subject of Ireland were unqualified by other motives and other considerations. Having paid the right hon. Gentleman that compliment, he had to express his regret that the right hon. Gentleman should have said nothing likely to help the House to arrive at a right conclusion upon the matter before it. He had failed to find in the right hon. Gentleman's speech one single helpful sentence which would tend to mitigate the terrible difficulties of the position which they had to face. It seemed, as he took up one possible remedy after another, to pour contempt upon them, that he was prepared across that Table, where a great deal of gambling had taken place in former years, to throw down as a stake almost everything which was valuable to a politician. He had expected that a politician with his responsible antecedents would have refrained from adding one more irritating voice to the many heard in reference to Ireland, and would have done what he could to mitigate the mischievous effect of the language heard in many quarters. The right hon. Gentleman, however, had not taken that course. He had twitted the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) with falsely prophesying that if the Plan of Campaign were put into force it must lead to the disintegration of society in Ireland. But the reason why that result had not come about was that the Plan of Campaign had failed. If the Plan had succeeded all over the country, as its originators hoped that it would, matters now would be in a very different and worse condition. Then the right hon. Gentleman reproached the Government on account of the removal of Sir Robert Hamilton from the post of Permanent Under Secretary for Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman ought to bear in mind that Sir Robert Hamilton was not an Irishman but a Scotchman, sent over from London by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), for the express purpose of carrying out that right hon. Gentleman's policy. But he would not consider further the right hon. Gentleman's miserable polemics. He preferred more profitable subjects of discussion. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) in his speech spoke with the same passionless rhetoric with which he was accustomed to address the House, and which he thought was a great advantage to their debates. It enabled hon. Members to approach these questions apart altogether from the sentimental ornaments so often introduced, and it enabled the House to judge of these questions on their merits. The speech of the hon. Member for Cork and his Amendment were both in remarkable contrast with the speeches and Amendments made by him in the House on previous occasions. There was an absence of the trenchant and aggressive language, both in the Amendment and in the speech, which was usually heard from those Benches, and which seemed to him to reflect the preeailing feeling of depression which appeared to have overwhelmed the hon. Members from Ireland at this moment. It seemed to him to be natural that hon. Members should have a feeling of depression. In the first place, the first element which appeared to be producing it was the absence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian. Where was the right hon. Gentleman? Not long ago the right hon. Gentleman assured them that the only object he had in the few remaining years of his political life was to secure for Ireland a Legislature and a permanent Executive independent of this country. But now at the first pinch of battle he deserted his friends, and instead of being in the House to support them he found it more convenient to be elsewhere. He hoped that the House would have a reasonable explanation of this extraordinary position. It seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman owed a very considerable apology to his Friends below the Gangway for having deserted them at this juncture. If they looked at other factors in the problem the House would see that another reason for the depression among hon. Gentlemen opposite existed. This was the utter failure of the Plan of Campaign. ["Oh, oh," *and Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen who laughed and jeered would do a great service to the House if they would publish some statistics in regard to the Plan of Campaign, as to the number of estates on which it had been put in force, and the number of estates on which it had proved successful. He thought it would be a great surprise to the House if they only knew what an abject failure it had been. These and other matters rendered the outlook of the hon. Member for Cork and his Party rather more gloomy than it had been, and it was for this reason that they must feel in a position of great and grave uncertainty. He wished to make a special appeal to hon. Members on this occasion. It seemed to him that they had now only two courses left open to them if they were to retain that influence which they had possessed for a long time over the Irish people. They must either again let loose those revolutionary forces which pervaded the whole country two or three years ago, or they must be prepared to accept at the hands of those who were perfectly willing to give it to them on rational terms a policy which they might accept with the greatest possible credit to themselves. Hon. Members below the Gangway opposite had acquired a *prestige* in Ireland which made them the masters and not the slaves of Irish opinion, and if they were as willing as they were powerful to use that *prestige* and influence for the purpose of settling this question on rational and reasonable grounds, he believed they might use it with great honour to themselves and great profit to the country. Why was it necessary that they should continue to be a mere shuttlecock between the two great English Parties? Was it not possible for them to realize at last that they were this, and nothing more? Could they not make some advances to some other section of the House with whom they might arrange something of great advantage to their country? On his own side of the House there were a number of Irish Members, who represented Irish opinion just as much as hon. Members opposite. It was the continual gulf that existed between those two sections of Irish opinion which made it impossible for hon. Members to accept the propositions put before the House by the Representatives of Irish opinion. If it were possible to shake hands across the gulf; if it were possible for the two sections of Irish opinion to come to the House and say—"We agree that these great changes would be beneficial to Ireland, would be a rational settlement of this question, would tend eventually to the peace of the two countries," both Parties would be delighted to give what was asked. Here then was the difficulty. Members on that one side had some claims on the sympathy of their opponents. They had prevented Ireland from becoming a sort of poor relation by the side of England, with no attention paid to its needs; and, consequently, they were in a position at this moment to make offers to their real Friends on the Conservative side of the House, not only English Members, but Irish Members, who had the same yearnings as theirs, and who were wishful and ready to accept a modified policy, which would be acceptable to those who wanted it, if only made on rational lines. They were ready to press upon the House of Commons anything which should have the element of permanence if combined with equity. It seemed to him that this was the only policy which would ever secure for Ireland the satisfaction of her needs. But it was absolutely necessary that those demands should not be made merely by the Representatives of the Irish peasantry; but by them, in conjunction with those who represented Irish education, Irish wealth, and the other elements in Ireland which were the elements of stability. If it were possible for these two bodies of Members in the House to be persuaded that this was the only rational way in which the question should be settled, it seemed to him that the solution was more hopeful than that contained in the concluding sentence of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. In regard to the economical side of the question, it seemed to him a matter of regret that the right hon. Gentleman, with his great knowledge of the problem, should, instead of assisting to solve its exceedingly difficult elements, throw every obstacle in the way by means of mere futile criticism. Take the question of emigration. Who was there in the House who would not say that in the congested districts of Ireland the only possible remedy, whether imposed by that House or an Irish Parliament, was emigration? Either they must protect those poor people against the competition of foreign traders, or else they must emigrate them to some other place where it was possible for them to gain a livelihood. It seemed to him, therefore, that it was impossible that this problem could ever be solved except by a rational system of emigration. Why had emigration failed so often hitherto? Because it had had the opposition of hon. Members opposite, and because it had had the opposition of another powerful element in Irish society—that of the Irish priesthood. But one of the most hopeful signs he had seen in Ireland of late was the altered attitude of the priests on this question. They thought differently years ago; but now they had come to the conclusion that it was the only possible remedy. There were a number of people who talked about embarking in a great fishing industry on the West Coast of Ireland; but they forgot the enormous difficulties of nursing such fisheries, and the almost utter impossibility of bringing fish to market. One of the great difficulties attending emigration hitherto had been that it was of the character of individual emigration. He did not believe in it, for the effect on the Irish peasant was that he was transplanted at once to an American town, where he not only lost his character for respectability, but the influence of the priest as well. These people should be emigrated in communities, their priest being taken with them. In spite of the fears which the right hon. Gentleman had sought to excite, many countries would be glad to have them. Australia and Canada would be willing to have those poor creatures if we emigrated them in a rational fashion. Canada, of course, like other countries, did not desire to have her population enormously augmented by a great influx of extremely helpless people from Ireland; but she would be delighted to have her magnificent western lands planted by Irish colonists who would go out, with some hope of success, in small communities; and he hoped the problem would be faced by the Government in that way. That done, he would then like to see some system of arterial drainage introduced into parts of Ireland, where it would add, at all events, to the material prosperity of the country. He could not help thinking that it was on those lines that the problem would, with more hope than the right hon. Gentleman had expressed, be presently solved. Nor did he fail altogether to hope that it would be solved with considerable assistance from hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway. As one who, on many an occasion, both in print and in speaking, had sought to throw light on this question—he hoped in a fair way, and without the use of exasperating language—he would venture to appeal to hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite to forego a good deal of what they deemed the ideal solution, and to accept rather its practical side. Those hon. Gentlemen would have nothing to fear in regard either to *prestige* or position, by accepting the more rational solution, and they would make Ireland a more prominent factor in the world's history than it had hitherto been. Let there be less of the miserable rancour as between the classes they represented and those represented on this side of the House, and let the Irish Members on one side of the House endeavour to make terms with the Irish Members on the other. In this way Irishmen would increase their national importance, and would be helping the House in the solution of these questions. He did not like to hear one set of Irishmen abusing another set. It was not true that the gifts of the Irish race were confined to one set of Representatives only. It was, on the other hand, a remarkable fact that the drolleries and witticisms made by Irishmen on one side of the House always found their warmest welcome among Irishmen on the other side, and it would be a great loss to that community if they were not both represented in the Legislature. He wanted them, laying aside wrangling, and gibes and jeers, to unite in making a common demand upon that House, in the same way as demands from Scotland were made, which would be listened to and responded to by hon. Members as the genuine expression of the feeling and the opinion of Ireland. It was with that view that he had ventured to intervene in the discussion, to stop, if possible, the torrent of recrimination, and to draw the debate into more fruitful and promising fields.

Sir EDWARD GREY (Northumberland, Berwick): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must ask the House for its indulgence in addressing them for the first time; but I will, at any rate, promise that my remarks shall be brief, and that they shall not add to the torrent of recrimination of which the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Howorth) has already complained. We shall be called upon shortly to give our votes on the most important Amendment to the Address proposed by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell).

I mean to vote for the Amendment; and, as I know that my vote will be subject to many interpretations—the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, for instance, said that Members sitting on this side of the House are actuated by very qualified motives—I wish to make clear the reasons why I intend to support the present Amendment, and why I am sure I shall never have to regret my decision. It will be said that those of us who vote for this Amendment will, in doing so, endorse the Plan of Campaign, which is declared to be hopelessly illegal, and hopelessly immoral. I am not concerned to defend the question, whether the Plan of Campaign is illegal or not. I think, perhaps, the best that can be said on that ground is, that whether it is technically illegal or not, it has, at any rate, endeavoured to supplement the law by purposes which are opposed to the spirit of the law as it now stands; but, before I pass any condemnation on the morality or immorality of it, and before hon. Members pass any full condemnation upon it, I ask them to remember who are the authors of the Plan of Campaign. The authors are the Irish Members. The Irish Members may be actuated by the motives which have been complained of, and which have been called in question. Some hon. Members may believe that the Irish Members are actuated by improper motives; but, at any rate, I think everyone will agree that the Irish Representatives do know the circumstances and conditions of the Irish peasantry. Before the Plan of Campaign was instituted they were far better aware of what was going to happen in Ireland than the Government were; they recognized that the condition of affairs in many parts of Ireland during last autumn would be desperate. They felt that desperate conditions called for desperate remedies. I therefore think that, before we pass any full condemnation on the morality or immorality of the Plan of Campaign we must remember that the Irish Members, in instituting it, have been subject to temptation from which mercifully most English and Scotch Members have been free. And I will say this further, that if hon. Gentlemen are disposed to condemn the Plan of Campaign, they should also be disposed to censure Her Majesty's Government for the action, tending in the same direction, which they took. I do not, however, wish to condemn the action of the Government for a moment; I believe that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) was inspired by generous and humane motives; but I do ask hon. Gentlemen opposite to remember that what is justifiable reason for the action of Her Majesty's Government ought, even in their opinion, to be some palliation for the line taken by the authors of the Plan of Campaign. This I must say before I leave this part of the subject, that neither the Plan of Campaign nor the action of the Government can be looked upon as other than temporary expedients; and that it does not matter whether the Plan of Campaign is illegal or not, one thing which I think Home Rulers in this country have grasped thoroughly is, that the longer the settlement of the Irish Question is delayed so much more objectionable will many phases of that question become. Upon that ground we ought to welcome an early solution of the Irish problem. I should like now to say a few words upon a still more important part of the Amendment which we are asked to consider. It is that part which applies to the future policy of Her Majesty's Government, that part which applies to the coercive proposals which are to be brought before the House. Hon. Members object to the term coercion; they say it is a nickname which has been applied to an entirely unobjectionable policy. It may be a nickname; but it is a nickname which has fitted the policy carried out so admirably that we are unable to get rid of it. But to adopt for a moment the term which is applied to this policy by hon. Members opposite, and to speak of the policy of the enforcement of the law, it must be admitted that this is enforcement of the law by unconstitutional methods, or, at any rate, by methods which are foreign to the British Constitution. I believe I am right in saying that the British Constitution includes as two integral parts—trial by jury and the Habeas Corpus Act. Both of these parts have been suspended when we resorted to the policy of the enforcement of the law in Ireland. Some time ago the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) gave advice to Her Majesty's Government which was so simple that I may venture to repeat it. It was, do not legislate until you know. The Government have acted on that advice. Before they have legislated on any subject, they have appointed a Commission to inquire into the subject; they have appointed Commissions to inquire into certain phases of the Irish Question. I wish they had gone a little further, and appointed a Commission to inquire into the effect of a coercive policy as regards Ireland. I think that such a Commission might not unreasonably have been expected to produce a Report which would have included, among other things, four main statements. First, that the policy of coercion has been tried by Lord Spencer and Sir George Trevelyan to its uttermost limits and has failed, and that it is extremely difficult to say whether it is possible to repeat the experiment again; secondly, that it has become so unpopular that, even many Members opposite, seeing its failure demonstrated, have foresworn it as an evil thing, and declared that they will never vote for it again; thirdly, that coercion, whenever it has been tried, has operated merely as a temporary check—it has been possibly one step forward towards the suppression of a temporary outburst of outrage and crime, but it has always been two steps backwards in the solution of the one great question—how are we to govern Ireland? Fourthly, that this coercive policy has, more than anything else, diminished the security of property in Ireland; that it has done so in this way, it has brought property in Ireland to look for its security to outside influences, and not to inside influences. Internal influences in a country are contentment, satisfaction between class and class, and general prosperity; these act automatically, and outside influences have to be summoned in whenever they are wanted. These outside influences have been brought into requisition in regard to property in Ireland, but can anyone say that, even with Her Majesty's present Government in Office, property in Ireland is as secure at the present moment, and as freely changes from hand to hand, as property in England? If that is so, surely it is because some difficulty is found in calling in outside influences; and because you can never, by outside influences, give the property the same security which is obtained from inside influences and from good government. Now, the Coercion Bill which has been promised will be framed specially and exceptionally to deal with the Plan of Campaign, and, it may be, will succeed. What then? The Plan of Campaign will be succeeded by something else in Ireland, it may be succeeded by a general system of "Boycotting," or by something worse; and Her Majesty's Government must then proceed, if they are consistent, with other exceptional measures to meet other exceptional circumstances. They will get deeper and deeper into the mire, and the result will be that they will possibly, at last, have to be dragged out of the mire with the aid of a rope extended to them by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). Now, Sir, the two policies before this House are the policy contained in the Amendment, and the policy of Her Majesty's Government. The policy embodied in the hon. Gentleman's (Mr. Parnell's) Amendment is simply a policy of responsibility. Why should we think that it will fail? Surely, a policy of responsibility has succeeded in England before now, when individual Members have been found transgressing. Hon. Members opposite can think of instances in which violent and injudicious sentiments have been expressed by Members of their own Party, sentiments which have caused not a little anxiety to the Party generally. But I will not pursue that point further, the policy of responsibility has been tested in other countries. We find it has succeeded in Hungary, in the United States, in Switzerland, and elsewhere. It has been said that none of these instances apply to the case of Ireland, because they and it are not on all fours; but none of these were exactly the same as each other. They are as different from each other as the case of England and Ireland is from them; and I think some conclusion may be drawn from this experience. There had been difficulties; but with a different set of conditions to be provided for in the different cases, self-government has succeeded. In Ireland we have a set of conditions and of details for the proposed self-government differing from the conditions and provisions existing in the other cases to which I have referred; but I fail to see why Ireland should not, as all these other countries have done, participate in the advantages that have accrued from being repsonsible for their own Government. The policy of Her Majesty's Government may be roughly described as confidence in itself as a British Government sitting at Westminster; but the question is, whether the country have reason to place confidence in that Government. Was not that the policy they advocated last September? Was it not the one general answer to the Tenants' Relief Bill of the hon. Member for Cork, that, if hardships were likely to arise, confidence should be placed in the Government to set the matter right? What has been the result? Evictions have taken place which have caused a feeling of shrinking and shame to pass through this country, and the Government, while admitting that fact, have endeavoured to throw the responsibility upon others. What does Her Majesty's Government propose to do in regard to the congested districts in Ireland? It is already known that many tenants have pledged their future crops to pay their rent; so that the question must again arise. What is to be done in their case? If confidence is to be placed in the Government, how is it that there is no mention in Her Majesty's Speech of the condition of affairs in the congested districts of Ireland? What I do feel most strongly is that we want this question of Irish Government and of Irish distress really faced. I believe that it will be best faced by a Land Purchase Bill on good security, and I am convinced that as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) has said to-night, such a Land Purchase Bill can only be made to work through the responsible authorities in Ireland. If an Irish Parliament is not to be allowed to solve the difficulty of congested districts in Ireland, is there any chance that the House of Commons will face the question? In the first place, the House of Commons has not, and never will have, the time, because the exigencies of Parliamentary Government will never leave it the time. It has not the knowledge, as past experience shows, and if it had it is doubtful—looking back to the Devon Commission—whether it would use the knowledge. But if it made an honest attempt to solve the difficulty from the information it has acquired, it is very probable it would fail, as it has continually failed, from not understanding the feelings of the Irish people. There is, consciously or unconsciously, a conviction that the Irish people ought to be in love with emigration, that they ought to be pleased to leave their wretched hovels, and the country where they are so badly off. But from all I have heard of the Irish peasants, that is not the case. Certainly, in trying to carry out any scheme of that kind, the House of Commons lacked tact. From not understanding the feelings of the Irish people, we in Westminster set our hands heavily upon the most tender parts of the Irish character. I believe an Irish Government will be in every way more qualified for the task. Irish Members have proved that they have far more of the necessary knowledge for it than English Members have. They understand the Irish people; and the result of leaving the task to them will, I believe, be the taking up the difficulty of the Irish land with unwavering resolution, with tact, and with a thorough understanding of the Irish people. Ireland will, by degrees, be relieved of some of her misery and distress, and the British Parliament will be free from the strain which is injuring the Constitution, upsetting the Business of the House of Commons, and embittering the feelings of the people of the two countries.

COLONEL WARING (Down, N.) said, he would endeavour, in discussing the question upon its merits, to avoid the exaggeration which had too often characterized speeches with reference to the condition of Ireland, and to speak the truth, without fear or favour. He, unfortunately, laboured under considerable disadvantage; because he did not fulfil any of the conditions which seemed to be usually recognized as a qualification for speaking on Irish subjects in that House. The hon. Member for North-West Lanarkshire (Mr. Graham) had laid it down, as a first qualification, that the speaker should never have been in Ireland. He (Colonel Waring) was free to admit that, as far as he could judge, hon. Gentlemen opposite who spoke upon Ireland usually had that qualification, and derived what knowledge they possessed from having conversed in a railway carriage with a commercial gentleman of more or less intelligence. He wished he could entirely apply the same description to some hon. Gentlemen on his own side; but one speech had been made from those Benches which had convinced him that, not only had the speaker not been in Ireland, but that if he had the advantage of conversing with a commercial traveller he was a singularly unintelligent one, or the hon. Member was strangely slow in receiving information. He (Colonel Waring) had, unquestionably, the misfortune to be one of those grievances which the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) and his followers would remove from Ireland. He was a small landowner; but he was also an Irish tenant farmer, paying a rent of over £200 a-year, and paying a rate per acre which would make some hon. Gentlemen's hats rise off their heads when they knew how heavily he was rack-rented. He was, in fact, one of the down-trodden Irish tenants, of whom so much had been heard, and it was very hard, he thought, that the Plan of Campaign had not been brought to his relief.

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): Have you got a reduction of rent?

Colonel WARING said, he was sorry to say he had not; but he was carefully attending to what had been done by hon. Members opposite in these cases, and, no doubt, when the hon. Gentleman opposite had instructed him how to go about it, he should receive a reduction. Putting that, however, on one side, he intended to address himself to the one short paragraph of the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork, which spoke of rent abatements which were called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce. He thought he should be able to show that the state of prices, if not very greatly exaggerated, had, to some extent, been misstated, and that, in all probability, it would be proved, on careful investigation, that the great depreciation which was alleged to have taken place was, more or less, not borne out by facts. It was far from his wish to deny that a depreciation of a serious character had taken place; but in dealing with a question of this kind, it was only right and fair that they should take a series of years for the purpose of reliable comparison before drawing their conclusions. He did not, therefore, think it unfair to make his calculation on the basis of a comparison of present prices with those of 30 years ago, when a valuation of Ireland, that of Sir Richard Griffith, was taken, which he knew was discredited by many. An average taken of the 36 years previous to, and including 1885, putting one thing against another, showed that the year 1885 was an average year out of those 36 years. A tenant farmer of his acquaintance, and one not strongly in sympathy with the landlords on this subject, had made a valuation of the financial results of cultivating five acres of land with the usual crops in 1852 and 1886. He had made the calculation very carefully as to each crop, and he found that, after making allowances for the increased cost of labour and all the outgoings, the net profit in 1852 was £24 16*s*. 3*d*., and in 1886, £28 8*s*. 11*d*. No doubt, the Sub-Commissioners had proceeded on a different basis, and statements had been made in that House by the hon. Member for North Meath (Mr. Mahoney), who had been a Sub-Commissioner, which represented that there had been a tremendous fall in prices. He (Colonel Waring) was not prepared to place much confidence in those opinions; for the chief qualification for a Sub-Commissioner had apparently been that he should have previously failed in one or more walks in life. The four or five articles of produce which formed the basis of Griffith's valuation had all, with the exception of wheat, risen from 17 to 57 per cent in 1885; and the articles not included as the basis of Griffith's valuation, but which were largely produced in Ireland, and live stock had, as compared with 1852, risen from 41 to 193 per cent. Taking the 36 years since 1852, the year 1885, as he had said, appeared to be a fair average year. The hon. Member for Cork asserted that prices were still falling. But that he (Colonel Waring) emphatically denied. The only things that could be bought cheaper were hay and straw; and that was because the crops last year were so good that they were equivalent to the crops of two ordinary years. He thought it was clear there had been some exaggeration in regard to the fall in prices, which appeared to him to be assumed without any data on the part of hon. Members opposite, who, to say the least, were interested in the matter. The decline which had occurred in one commodity was not without cause. Attention had already been called to the matter, and that was the great deterioration in the quality of the young stock offered in the Irish markets. He regretted that it was so, but thought it was largely owing to the fact that the landlords, who usually kept breeding establishments, for the improvement of stock, had been forced by the circumstances of the time to discontinue those establishments, and the result was a deterioration in the quality of the stock. Again, it was said that the tenant should be able to "live and thrive." Nobody would more fully endorse that opinion than he (Colonel Waring); but the question was, What sort of a tenant was meant to be kept at the expense of the landlord? Was it to be a lazy, idle, unintelligent tenant, or was it to be a man of fair and average industry? The question, he thought, ought to be answered by the Nationalist Members at once. The great fault and curse of many of the Irish tenants, and one that existed long before the Land League was established, was the indolent procrastination of the people, and their unwillingness to tackle to a job—the feeling that was expressed in the Spanish *manana* — the way in which they put off doing what they should immediately apply themselves to, that being locally known as doing a thing, "Please, God, on Monday." Procrastination, in truth, had been largely the cause of what had happened in Ireland, and had that been discouraged by what had been done by the late Government? It had not. The legislation of the late Government had held out a premium to the lazy and untidy tenant, to make his land look to the eye of the Sub-Commissioner as unattractive as possible, so that he should obtain a reduction in his rent. Hundreds of such cases had come within his (Colonel Waring's) own personal knowledge. They had heard a great deal about the Glenbeigh evictions— and those evictions were much to be regretted—but it was clear that the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork would not have prevented them. That Bill, as far as he (Colonel Waring) could judge, would only apply to cases in which the tenants had judicial rents fixed. It was not for him to pry into the finances of the National League; but he would only make this remark—that during the past few weeks, although only £200 was subscribed for the evicted tenants, no less a sum than £3,000 was subscribed for "general purposes." Was it unreasonable to ask, why more money should not have been given to the evicted people, looking at the funds possessed by the National League? Could not the League, out of that £8,000, even have spared something to assist the landlords? [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members might laugh, but he did not think that would have been a misappropriation of the money which had been subscribed for "general purposes." Surely, the loss which had resulted in Ireland from the fall of prices and other causes of the depression of agriculture ought not to be thrown entirely upon the landlords, nor ought the whole class of landlords —the majority of whom, it was admitted, had shown fair consideration to their tenants—to be made to suffer for the harshness or imprudence of a comparative few. The effect of all previous legislation had been to punish the landlords, and it was not too much to ask now that, in any future measures, they might be treated with some show of justice. There was one thing upon which he believed the followers of the hon. Member for Cork would agree with him (Colonel Waring), and that was the question with regard to the thriving and unthriving tenant. Was it fair to blame the landlord for the position of the tenant who would not properly and skilfully cultivate his land? If a case could be shown him (Colonel Waring) in which the tenant had been industrious, and still could not thrive, then, undoubtedly, that was a case in which something should be done for such a person. Another difficulty was, how to ascertain whether the tenant could pay or not. On that point he could throw some light, from an incident which had been mentioned to him. A tenant, one day, came to the office of the agent, it was supposed, to pay his rent. The first thing he did, however, was to assure the agent that he had not a farthing about him, and that the agent, if he persisted in demanding the rent, would have to put the tenant out. After some parley, however, the tenant thought he might just be able to pay a half-year's rent, and that would take from him the last penny that he possessed. The agent then asked to see what the tenant had in his pocket whereupon the latter drew forth a bundle of bank notes, and with these the tenant offered to pay the rent. On counting the notes the agent found that they amounted to the full year's rent, and for that he expressed his readiness to give the tenant a receipt. Suspecting that something was wrong, the tenant pulled out a bundle of bank notes from his other pocket, and his consternation might be judged from the fact when he exclaimed—"Sure, I gave you the wrong bundle." The agent, however, got the full rent. Judging from that fact, in his (Colonel Waring's) opinion, a very large proportion of the tenants in Ireland could have paid the rents demanded of them if they thought well to do so. The landlords, certainly, had a hard time of it, and that despite the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), who, in referring to the Report of the Bessborough Commission, entirely acquitted the landlords of any undue harshness towards their tenants. What were the measures now proposed by the hon. Member for Cork? The hon. Member recommended an alteration in the Land system, and a new system of local self-government for the Irish people. He (Colonel Waring) denied that the proposal of the hon. Member would do what he expected from it. It would not remove the evil, and spare the good landlords. It would simply punish good landlords, and secure a reduction in the rent, no matter whether it was high or low. Surely, it was rather hard that the good landlords should suffer for the sins of the "residuum," as the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) called them. Now, they had heard a great deal about evictions; but evictions, he would remind hon. Members opposite, were by no means so peculiar to Ireland as they seemed to imagine. Such things occurred in other parts of the British Empire. Even in the happy hunting-grounds of the United States—which he might call the Land of Goshen of the Nationalist Members, evictions frequently occurred. It would appear from a letter which had been received from a North of Ireland tenant, who had emigrated to the United States, that the system which prevailed in that part of the State of Illinois, where the writer of the letter had settled down, was equally as bad as anything that existed in Ireland. The writer of the letter mentioned the case of a tenant having been evicted from his holding 14 times in 14 years; but no doubt that statement will be received with contemptuous mockery by the Nationalist Members. He might say that he had lived among his own tenants since the Reign of James I. [*Laughter.*] Since that time his family had resided in Ireland among their tenants, and, although perhaps he ought not to say so, they had always been respected. With regard to evictions, there was very great difficulty in dealing with them; because, in numerous cases, it was impossible to say whether the tenant could pay or not. In many cases they could pay, although they declared they could not. He had been informed also, on good authority, that even some of the Glenbeigh tenants who were evicted could, and would, have paid their rents if they had been advised from certain directions that it was prudent for them to do so. Much had been said about looking at this question of Ireland with regard to the future; but he wanted to look at it in respect to the present, because so far the present state of things had been misrepresented. There was reason to believe that they had touched bottom in Ireland; prices were steadily rising and things were improving, and he trusted that this fact would be recognized. [Mr. BIGGAR: Oh no!] Well, he could tell hon. Members that pork especially was going up. They were told that it was necessary to do something to satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people; and, at the same time, hon. Gentlemen opposite stated that nothing short of the extreme measures proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian could secure that end. But, speaking for himself and for those whom he represented—and these were not the "classes," who, he might add, had given him but little encouragement to enter Parliament—after what they had seen and heard, it would be impossible for him and hon. Members who sat with him on that side of the House to support anything resembling the propositions of the late Prime Minister. They thanked the Government for what they had done in the matter of the Plan of Campaign by way of delaying any proceeding with regard to it, though their action might have been less tardy. In so doing, the Government had given the Nationalist Members an opportunity of uttering sentiments which they had concealed from that House during the discussion of the Tenants' Relief Bill. Had the Government acted more rapidly, they would have lost the declaration made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), when speaking the other day at Castlerea. That hon. Member said, in the course of the speech which he made on that occasion—and he (Colonel Waring) would ask the attention of the House to the words—

> "In the day of our power we will remember them."

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I rise to Order. It is not fair for the hon. and gallant Member to take a single expression from my speech, and not give the context. My words were, that—

> "Those who signalize themselves now as enemies of the people, in the day of our power we would remember them."

COLONEL WARING said he had selected a few words used by the hon. Member in the peroration of his speech. If those words were not accurately reported, perhaps the hon. Member would now withdraw them.

MR. DILLON: Will the hon. and gallant Member quote my exact words, giving what precedes and what follows?

COLONEL WARING said, he had quoted the hon. Gentleman's own words. He did not think it necessary to read to the House the long and excited oration delivered by the hon. Member on the occasion in question; but the passage from which he quoted was this—

> "Those who have signalized themselves now as the enemies of the people, in the day of our power we will remember them."

If the hon. Gentleman did not mean it, of course he could get up in his place and say so.

MR. DILLON: The hon. and gallant Gentleman has invited me to get up and repudiate or acknowledge those words. I have never the least hesitation in acknowledging any words I have used. What I did say was this. I said that if

> "Men who signalized themselves by exceeding the law as the enemies of the people, that we would remember them in the days of our power."

But I immediately went on to say—

> "And if they wished promotion they must go to some other country to look for it,"

clearly pointing to what I meant by that.

COLONEL WARING said that, in his view, the explanation given by the hon. Member fully confirmed his quotation. The argument he (Colonel Waring) founded upon it was that the affectionate words addressed to his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Saunderson) and himself (Colonel Waring) by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), to the effect that he could not spare a single Irishman, in his speech last night, were practically worthless; because, if the Parnellites only got Home Rule, their first business would probably be to proscribe their opponents, as was done in the Irish Parliament of 1689. The landlords had already been told that all they could expect was first-class tickets to Holyhead. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had warned them that the sands in the glass were running out. Perhaps they might now only get third-class tickets. They had been urged to accept the safeguards and guarantees with which his scheme was to be surrounded. They cared not for those safeguards, and did not believe in the guarantees. There was but one safeguard, one guarantee, upon which they relied, and that was a safeguard, a guarantee, which no Parliament, no Government, had given, and no Parliament, no Government, either Irish or Imperial, could take away.

MR. E. ROBERTSON (Dundee): Sir, the hon. Member who has just sat down has given us a great deal of interesting information. He talked a great deal about the various kinds of residuum, and he has presented himself as a residuum from the distant ages of James I. To such unrivalled experience as his must be, any criticism I can offer will be entirely irrelevant. Therefore, I shall proceed at once to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), for the purpose of supporting which I shall make a few observations. Hon. Members below the Gangway will pardon me for saying that although I have no hesitation at all in supporting this Amendment, it appears to me somewhat colourless and inconsequential. It is inconsequential because it presents the demand for Home Rule apparently as arising entirely out of the agrarian grievances in Ireland. I do not know whether the hon. Member for Cork meant to present it in that way, but for my part I consider there are other classes in Ireland besides the agricultural classes, and that Home Rule is to be supported, not as a remedy for agrarian grievances, but on its own merits, and its own merits alone. I think the hon. Member might have insinuated the scheme of Home Rule with more courage and more detail. That is what I mean by saying I find the Amendment somewhat colourless. In making that somewhat depreciatory criticism, I do so for the purpose of pointing out that it leaves all the less excuse for those Members of the Liberal Party who are going to vote against it. Those Members of the Liberal Unionist Party who are still Liberals ought, I think, to feel themselves at liberty to support it, for the reason that it commits them to so little. For my part I do not hesitate to say, notwithstanding what has been said on the other side about the passing away of Party feeling in this House—I do not hesitate to say that the most extreme scheme of Home Rule that has ever been proposed from the Irish Benches is not a sufficient excuse for any Liberal supporting a Tory Government in power. I say so now also, notwithstanding the comparatively harmless character of the present Tory Government. The present Tory Government might, perhaps, become formidable on one condition, and I think one condition only. In the remarkable apology of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) which was begun ten days ago, and will be resumed, I suppose, six weeks hence, and which, at all events, is not nearly complete—there was one statesmanlike recommendation to his own Party. He said, that the one condition of their continued existence as a body was to combine resistance to Home Rule with a sweeping reforming programme for Great Britain. I do not stop to comment upon the morality of this combination—granting justice to Great Britain, and withholding justice to Ireland—but I recognize that upon ordinary principles that would be a formidable policy if there was any chance of hon. Gentlemen opposite adopting it. I do not believe for a moment that we are going to have from them anything like progressive legislation for Great Britain, or for Ireland either. Something they may give. They may give us a sham Land Bill, or a sham Allotments Bill, or a sham University Bill, and various other shams which may easily suggest themselves to hon. Members; but I venture to predict that at the end of the Session their culminating achievement in the way of progressive domestic legislation will be the innocent little Bill which the Attorney General has introduced for the purpose of dispensing with the attendance of Registrars at Nonconformists' marriages. I am sorry to see so few of my hon. Friends who are Liberal Unionists in the House, but I venture to offer a remonstrance to those Liberal Unionists who are still Liberals against the line of conduct they propose to take. I do so with less hesitation because I sympathize very strongly with some opinions to which they have given expression. I sympathize very strongly with the one point which I believe is a point of cardinal importance to them—namely, the maintenance of the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament in any new relations we may make with Ireland. I am myself free to insist on any conditions in any Home Rule scheme that we make supremacy plain, indisputable, and obvious to all men both on this side the Channel and on the other side of the Channel. My hon. Friend the Member for East Gloucestershire (Mr. Winterbotham), who is a prominent Member of the Liberal Unionist Party, will forgive me for saying, that I have never reconciled myself to the line of action which he, professing the views I know he entertains, and with which I so largely sympathize, took with regard to that measure. What is my hon. Friend's first and last condition about Home Rule for Ireland? Is it not simply that the maintenance of the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament should be made plain and indisputable to all and sundry? Well, I venture to remind the House that that condition has been accepted—accepted in terms by the responsible Leader of the Irish Members in this House. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), speaking on the last night of the debate on the Second Reading of the Home Rule Bill—I wish he had spoken on the first night, because his words would then have had more effect—speaking on the last night of that debate, he said—

"We have always known since the introduction of this Bill the difference between a coordinate and a subordinate Parliament, and we have recognized that the Legislature which the Prime Minister proposes to constitute is a subordinate Parliament."

The hon. Member went on to say by way of defence for his own position—

"There are practical advantages connected with the proposed statutory body."

It was not very often indeed that the hon. Member called it a Parliament at all. He was as guarded about that as he was about the Plan of Campaign last night. The hon. Member said—

"There are practical advantages connected with this proposed statutory body, limited and subordinate to this Imperial Parliament as it undoubtedly will be. "We feel," he said, "that under this Bill the Imperial Parliament will have the ultimate supremacy and the ultimate sovereignty."—(3 *Hansard*, [306] 1171-2.)

That is a most important declaration, because it carries with it not only the admission of the principle for which my hon. Friend contends, but it involves also any detail and any guarantee which my hon. Friend or anybody else may think relevant to the securing of this ultimate and dominating supremacy. I would do my hon. Friend the justice to say that in the late Home Rule Bill there were clauses and provisions which certainly tended to throw some doubt upon the supremacy of Parliament. There was the exclusion, for instance, of the Irish Members from this House—an exclusion which was repudiated not by the Irish Members themselves, but almost unanimously by the people of Great Britain—simply from an instinctive sense that by excluding these Members the moral authority of this Parliament might be to some extent impaired. I give my hon. Friends credit for all that, and I go further and say that so far as the main purpose is concerned I agree with them. By the supremacy of Parliament, however, I am not quite sure they mean the same as I do. I mean the supremacy of the House of Commons. That the House of Commons should be as supreme after the passing of the Home Rule Bill as it is now is one of the necessary conditions of the settlement of the Irish problem. But while this Parliament is, I hope, to be supreme in Ireland, whatever legislative changes may be brought about, I do not think that it is at all necessary that the House of Commons, or any other branch of the Legislature, should be perpetually interfering in Irish affairs. I think the one conclusive test of the success of a Home Rule scheme would be absolute absence from interference on the part of this Parliament with the management of Irish affairs by an Irish Parliament. That is what I look upon as the necessary test of the success of any such scheme. The Liberal Unionists on this point appear to me to be under the domination of what I may call a master fallacy. They appear to believe—and, indeed, it is the sole logical ground of their position—that there is no alternative between constant interference on the part of the Imperial Parliament and a supremacy which shall be merely nominal. The right hon. and learned Gentleman, the Member for Bury (Sir Henry James), is the political philosopher of the Liberal Unionist Party. He made a speech the other day at Manchester, in which, as usual, he gave expression to the favourite fallacies of his section. I want to cull a few flowers of fallacy from the right hon. and learned Gentleman. The first is this. He says—"We must either govern and guide Ireland or we must give it up." That is not the right hon. and learned Gentleman's own remark. The right hon. and learned Gentleman's is not a very original mind, but this remark comes from Lord Derby, one of his Colleagues. Lord Derby, in the various Parties to which he has belonged, has been throughout nearly the whole of his adult life the Member of a Government which has been engaged in attempting to govern and guide Ireland. Has he succeeded? Has any Party of which he has been a Member succeeded in governing and guiding Ireland? If this wise maxim, which was laid down with all solemnity by the right hon. and learned Gentleman, is true, what is the conclusion to which history compels us to yield but this—that Lord Derby and his kind, the members of the governing classes, having failed to govern and guide Ireland, we must give it up. Then the right hon. and learned Gentleman speaks, in this Manchester speech, of what he calls the impossibility of foreign and external management being with one Power and internal management with another. That is what he says is an impossibility, and he gives a practical example, derived from his own impression, of how this impossibility would work out, because, he says, under a Home Rule scheme you could not call out the international obligations involved in an extradition treaty. When I read this remark of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, I wondered whether he had ever heard of such a community as the United States of America. I never looked upon the United States as a foreign nation in regard to this matter. They have our own language, our own laws, our own institutions, and they have applied these to their own conditions in ways which in many cases we might well imitate. But in the United States, if the right hon. and learned Gentleman had desired to state in a sentence that which is the keynote if not the essence of the system, he could not have chosen words other than he used. The very essence of the whole system is that foreign and external management is given to one power, and that internal management is given to another power. The Federal power with which we deal in the matter of extradition is confronted on every side in the Union with, I will not say a hostile power in the shape of a State Government, but an independent, an exclusive power—a power which can and does say to it, "Thus far shalt thou come, and no farther." That example, which I think ought to have been known to all intelligent students of politics, should have been sufficient to warn the right hon. and learned Gentleman from committing himself to general propositions of so astounding a character as that to which I have alluded. I should like to ask what Member of the Liberal Party has ever committed himself to a scheme of Home Rule which would prevent us from carrying out our international treaty obligations. I for one have no such intention, and I do not believe that any Members of the Party with which I act have any intention whatever of assenting to a scheme which would weaken in the least degree the power of the Imperial Government for the fulfilment of all Imperial obligations. Let my hon. Friends who dissented from the last scheme, but who agree with us on the general principle, come forward and submit to us and to the Irish Party whatever scheme they may think best intended to secure the object which they profess to have in view—namely, maintaining the strength and supremacy of the Imperial Parliament—and I am certain no reasonable device for this purpose will be objected to by hon. Members on this side. I regard it as an essential part of a Home Rule scheme that we should maintain our Imperial strength and supremacy; and I deny that either by us or by any section of this House the consideration of any proposal whatever is precluded by anything that has passed in this House or outside it. Before I sit down I want to say one or two words about what I may describe as the other extreme view in the Liberal Party on this question. I am sorry to observe that atttempts have been made on the part of a section of the Liberal Party to drive the Liberal Unionists of all shades out of the Liberal Party. With that attempt I cannot sympathize. The chief offender in this campaign against all Liberal Unionists has been the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). That hon. Gentleman in recent times has been going up and down the country raging like a roaring lion, seeking what Liberal Unionist he might devour. He has been assuming to speak in the name of the whole Radical Party. He has been dictating what he calls conditions of surrender to those Members of the Liberal Party who do not agree with him and us on this question of Home Rule. For my part, I do not recognize the hon. Member for Northampton as entitled to speak with the authority which he assumes. I do not regard him as entitled to set up shibboleths of any kind to the Liberal Party. I recognize in all political matters but one Leader, to whose unrivalled experience and unparalleled services I should always be willing to yield my own judgment on almost any political question. I can accept the word of command from no sub-leader, and I recognize in no such sub-leader the right to drive out of the Liberal Party those who say—and say honestly—that, notwithstanding their divergence from us on this question, they are still in all essential respects Members of the Liberal Party. I distrust extremely the extravagance and dictatorial tone assumed, not only by the hon. Member for Northampton, but by some other Members from whom we might have expected better things. I distrust that hon. Member very much, as Mr. Newdegate, formerly a Member of this House, used to distrust the late Mr. Whalley, whom he regarded as a Jesuit in disguise. I sometimes think that so determined is the hon. Member to prevent reunion that he is in secret a Conservative. His action, if he succeeds, will delay Home Rule by delaying the reunion of the Liberal Party. There are among the Liberal Unionists many who, but for this misunderstanding on the question of Imperial supremacy, would have voted for Home Rule last Session; and who will vote for it next time if that is made clear in the sense of the words of the hon. Member for Cork. My view is that so far as Liberals are concerned the present is a time for conciliation—I do not say for compromise, but for conciliation. This great question of Home Rule for Ireland bristles with difficulties of all kinds. Our great difficulties will be the difficulties of detail. What is dreaded more than anything else is not that this Government is going to stop the way very much longer. I have no belief in their stability. I have no such belief, notwithstanding that they have the sure support of the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), and the very uncertain, unsteady, and stumbling and staggering support of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. J. Chamberlain). Nor have I much belief in the conversion of the ultra section of the Liberal Unionists. I am addressing not so much those who follow the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale as those who owe allegiance neither to him nor to the right hon. Gentleman. The extremists among the Liberal Unionists are perishing before our very faces. The extreme section is day by day breaking up. It is perishing by what I may call a slow and gradual process of suicide. Their champion—the champion of all England—who presented himself as such to the people of Liverpool last week, presented himself last night in Hanover Square as a Tory. He is one of their champions gone over to the Tories. That is not all. There is an election in the North of Ireland. The Liberal Unionists have a candidate of their own, and one of them, being in trouble about his political soul, has consulted the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale. And what is the noble Lord's answer? Is it to vote for the Liberal Unionist? No; it is to vote for the Conservative. Therefore I say the extreme section of the Liberal Unionist Party is melting away, and merging itself gradually in the Party which for the time being is represented by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. I do not believe that such a Government, with such a policy, with such principles, can stop the way very much longer against any kind of reform. What I rather dread is that Power will be upon us before we are ready for it—before we have recognized, much less considered, one tithe of the practical difficulties with which the Irish Question is surrounded. Therefore it is I have ventured, in a spirit of perfect loyalty to Home Rule and the Liberal Party, to protest against the exclusive and dictatorial policy which has been taken up by some hon. Members. I think their policy is a mistake. I think they should welcome all to the solution of this question. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said very truly the other day that this question could not be settled except by accepting contributions from all minds. I would add we should invite the experience of all peoples and all times. I am for conciliation. I do not want to break that Round Table and burn it. The Leeds Conference put forward this plank in its platform—that no scheme of Home Rule would be satisfactory to them which would not satisfy the Irish people. I accept that principle heartily. I venture to suggest that it should be extended. I hope the time may come when the Irish people will say that no scheme of Home Rule will be satisfactory to them which is not satisfactory also to the people on this side of the Channel; and I believe that time will come. I do not believe this question is beyond the political genius of this country to solve. I believe that in the fulness of time a solution will come; and my heartiest desire and prayer is that, in the end, there shall be added to the majority of the Irish people, and the majority of the Welsh people and Scotch people, who have already declared for Home Rule—I hope there will be added the majority of the English people also.

MR. H. S. WRIGHT (Nottingham, S.): Notwithstanding the speech which has just been delivered by the hon. Member opposite, I cannot forget the forcible speech delivered last night by the hon. Member for Bath (Mr. Wodehouse), which certainly gave no promise of surrender on the part of the Liberal Unionists. Whatever the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) may appear to be at first sight—however warily and ambiguously it is worded—there can be no doubt whatever that its aim is a separate Parliament for Ireland, which is to bring about a final separation of Ireland from the United Kingdom. It was the same question that was before us last summer, and was rejected by all who desire to see the Union maintained. What we all desire to see is the restoration of prosperity to Ireland. But how is Home Rule going to give prosperity to Ireland? The hon. and gallant Member for North Galway (Colonel Nolan) has told us that there are about 150,000 holdings in Ireland under five acres, and he said "Make them ten acres." That might be a very good thing to do, but would it not involve a series of evictions in regard to some of the existing tenants? The hon. Member also appealed to the Government to carry out the "Dartford programme" by developing the resources of the country, especially its drainage systems and fisheries. I maintain that the present Government have all along intended, as soon as it was practicable, to carry out the programme laid down by the noble Lord the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, and to give to Ireland all it needs to increase its prosperity and to develop its resources. But I say that the intentions of the Government have been blocked by the conduct of the Irish Nationalist Party in instituting the Plan of Campaign. I trust that the hon. Members opposite will see that if they desire to do justice to their own country, as well as to Her Majesty's Government, the Government ought to be afforded a chance of doing something for the restoration of prosperity in Ireland. Unfortunately, the land question in Ireland is inextricably mixed up with trade questions, and I maintain that the trade of Ireland materially suffers from the one-sided system of Free Trade which has been introduced into that country. No doubt in former days England destroyed the trade of Ireland. Free Trade has destroyed Irish industries, and we are doing the same in regard to our own industries in favour of foreign nations. If there were a separate Parliament in Ireland, one of the first uses to which Home Rule would be put would be to give protection to Irish manufactures, but I fear it would be protection against England. For my part, I should like the whole British Empire to be mutually protected against free goods from foreign manufacturers. In England the land question is a great question, as well as in Ireland. We have many tenants who are suffering quite as much as the Irish tenants. If we could only restore trade and prosperity to Ireland the Land Question would soon, to a great extent at all events, solve itself. Last night, the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hanbury) made some remarks which I could neither agree with nor altogether understand. He said that the Government must have "clean hands" in dealing with Ireland. Now I thought that the present Government were being blamed for having, if anything, done too much in the excess of their benevolence. Their action was dictated by the interests of humanity, and who will blame them for what they did? I hope to see trade and commerce brought back again to Ireland under the influence of wise legislation, but no one has ventured to say what good Home Rule, or a separate legislature, would do for Ireland in the way of bringing about a revival of trade. Will it make better crops, or ensure to the tenants better prices for their butter and other commodities? Do hon. Members think that it would encourage British or any other capital to go to Ireland? [Mr. BIGGAR: We do not want it.] I am of opinion that in order to develop the trade of Ireland a good deal of capital would be required, but hon. Members opposite seem to know better. An hon. Member said the other night, in reference to the Bill of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), that the proposals which the right hon. Gentleman brought forward last year almost wrought a miracle in the constituencies of the United Kingdom. Yes, Sir; but it was a miracle of conversion on the part of the right hon. Gentleman himself, who, in the short space of a few months gave up all the convictions of a long life, but, nevertheless, the right hon. Gentleman says that he is not even converted yet to Separation, but is desirous of preserving the union of the two Kingdoms. The real object of hon. Members opposite is separation, and that we are prepared to resist. They seem to speak in two voices. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Mr. John Morley) has interpreted one of the two voices with which hon. Members opposite have spoken. They have one voice when speaking in England, and another in Ireland. They have even a stronger voice when speaking in America, but a different voice altogether in this House. In Ireland they speak their minds; but in England they speak in a mild, hushed and dove-like voice; and the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary seems to have listened only to the soft, mild voice of conciliation, and to have closed his ears resolutely to that other voice. I maintain, however, that it is the utterances in Ireland and America which we are justified in regarding as the true utterances of hon. Members opposite, and as representing the true meaning of the Irish Nationalist Party. Those utterances in the face of all they have proclaimed as their demands for so long a time past I cannot disbelieve. I will not detain the House longer; but I wished to make these observations upon the Amendment, because I am of opinion that whatever may be said about its conciliatory tone, the one issue raised by it is no more nor less than that of the continuance of the Union of Great Britain and Ireland, or the entire separation of Ireland from Great Britain.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.) said, Mr. Speaker, I almost regret that the Motion for counting the House was made, and I doubly regret it now, because I see departing from the House the hon. and gallant Member for North Down (Colonel Waring), who of himself may be regarded as representing more than 40, inasmuch as he has told us that he concentrates within himself the whole of a great race since the time of James I. [Colonel WARING returned to his seat.] I was delighted to hear the tone in which the hon. and gallant Member spoke to-night, and I shall be doubly delighted to hear that tone more frequently repeated on both sides of the House. I maintain that it is quite pertinent to the Amendment to express a hope that as far as possible hereafter there may be the same conciliatory tone of language between the Irish Members on this side of the House and those on the other, as there is between the Irish and English Members. Passing, however, from that matter I must confess my astonishment that the hon. and gallant Member for North Down has not been able to see that which has been apparent to the rest of the world—namely, that there has been a large fall in the prices of produce.

COLONEL WARING (Down, N.): No; what I said was that the fall of prices has been exaggerated.

MR. E. HARRINGTON: The hon. and gallant Member says that the fall in prices has been exaggerated. May I remind him that his hon. and gallant Colleague (Colonel Saunderson), the Leader of his Party, as they are pleased to call it, has actually given a reduction of something like 25 per cent upon the fall of prices. Several others have done the same thing.

COLONEL WARING: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member, but if he will wait until the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh is in his place he will probably find that he is mistaken.

MR. E. HARRINGTON: I was really speaking in no antipathy with the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, but I will readily take any correction from my hon. and gallant Friend. This however, is not a mistake — namely, that the Unionists who profess that the unity of England and Ireland must be maintained, and that the Legislative Union which exists between England and Ireland must also be maintained upon its present footing—some of the Unionists who have spoken in this House have admitted that there has been such a thing as a depreciation of prices. Formerly some of them maintained that there had been no fall of prices, but they had since then given a reduction to their own tenants, and have thereby acknowledged the depreciation which we have alleged. We have been informed that wool was going up, and we are told to-night that the price of pork has gone up, and, therefore, that there is no agricultural depreciation. I do not know what may have affected the price of pork, perhaps the Liverpool election may have had something to do with it; but it is well known that there has been no general improvement in agricultural prices. Hon. Members cannot deny that with regard to a large class of tenants whose holdings have been under discussion in the course of this debate—the class of tenants engaged in the production of small stock, that within the last three years there has been a reduction in the price of two-year-old stock of at least 70 per cent. The hon. and gallant Member opposite appears to assent to that. It has been sought to divert the debate from its real merits by discussing the question of congested districts. I think it is only fair to remember what was stated by the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) last night, that the lines and boundaries of the congested districts are conterminous with the mountainous sea-coasts of the poorer localities. There has been an enormous fall in the price of the stock reared in those districts. A great deal has been said already in this House, at a time when I had no opportunity of listening to it, on the subject of the Glenbeigh evictions. I feel that, important as the question is, I almost owe an apology to the House for attempting to enter at any length into the question again. I will promise the House not to say much upon it, but I feel that it is necessary to revert to it shortly because, although it has been clearly gone into and put before the House in a very able manner, there seem to be some points which have not been grasped by hon. Members, who appear to be either wilfully blind or to possess a peculiarly defective vision on any special Irish subject. Glenbeigh is what hon. Members opposite have been pleased to describe as a congested district. I am able to assert that there has been a fall of between 60 and 70 per cent within the last few years in the price of produce in that district; and if that is so I would ask hon. Members how it is possible that the people in such a district in Ireland can pay the present high rents that are demanded from them? I do not speak especially of Glenbeigh; but I warn you that there will be many Glenbeighs in Ireland if you do not pay attention to the arguments which are put forward on this side of the House in support of the Amendment. All through the congested districts, that is, all through the mountainous coast-line of Ireland, there has been a failure in the fishing interest and an enormous fall in the price of the small stock reared and sold in these districts. The consequence has been that the people have been really in touch-and-go with starvation, and if the spirit of the Amendment is not accepted by the House and the Government, I maintain that you will have many repetitions of the awful scenes which it has been recently my painful duty to witness in Glenbeigh. I am not very well qualified to speak on the question of prices, but I think it will not be denied by hon. Members on either side of the House that in regard to the one item of stock in the agricultural districts of Ireland there has been in the last three years a fall of from £6 10*s.* to £2 10*s.* Consequently, if the rents fixed by the Commissioners were just three years ago, it follows that such rents are unjust now, and that it is unjust not only for the landlord to claim them, but for this House to back up his claim by British bayonets. It has been asserted that the Irish Sub-Commissioners who have had to deal with the fixing of rent were selected for that task for the reason that they had no particular aptitude for any other line of life, and, therefore, might well be appointed Land Commissioners. It is a notable fact that the only honourable exception was the case of my hon. Friend the Member for North Meath (Mr. Mahony); and it is also a fact that one of the first acts of the Government was to discharge my hon. Friend—the only man who was equal to the work the Sub-Commissioners were appointed to do. That is a specimen of the Government of Ireland, and it must be remembered that the Amendment we are dealing with to-night rests entirely, but nevertheless strongly, on the question of the Government of Ireland. I own I was somewhat surprised at the unfortunate criticism of the Amendment by an hon. Member on the Liberal Benches a short time ago, when he stated that he thought the pith of the Amendment was to put the agricultural question in the foreground, and then to declare that Home Rule follows as a necessary consequence from the agricultural difficulties of Ireland. Now I do not read the Amendment in that light; but I think that it speaks fairly and clearly for itself. The Amendment runs in these words, and I hope I may be permitted to read it in the light of the comments which the hon. Member has passed upon it. The words are these—

> "But humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the relations between the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland have not been seriously disturbed in the cases of those owners who have granted to their tenants such abatements of rents as are called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce: and that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is not to be found in increased stringency of criminal procedure, or in the pursuit of such novel, doubtful, and unconstitutional measures as have recently been taken by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland, but in such a reform of the law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people."

Sir, we do not claim that Home Rule is to be a specific remedy for agricultural distress and for the agrarian difficulties of Ireland; but what we do assert is that Home Rule is an alternative which ought to place itself before the minds of Her Majesty's Ministers far and away in preference to the specific they are proposing—namely, the reform of criminal procedure in Ireland. No doubt, it is painful to come here, after labouring in vain, as we did last year, to induce Her Majesty's Government to grant to us a partial and temporary measure, because we believe that if that measure had been accepted the people of this country and Parliament would have been in a better mood for doing justice to Ireland. It is painful for us, after all the promises we got then of immediate attention to the grievances of Ireland and of remedial measures, to ask you for bread, and to receive only a stone, and a promise of further chains. We have had enough of chains and coercion in Ireland. During the last 87 years 56 measures of coercion have been passed for Ireland, and Parliament is now asked, in the year of Her Majesty's Jubilee, to pass another Coercion Act. Very recently we had circulars flying all over the land, at the instance of one who in the course of nature will probably succeed to the Throne, inviting the loyalty and affectionate regard of the people of this country and of Ireland towards the Sovereign to be exhibited in the celebration of Her Majesty's Jubilee. Sir, as an Irishman, I should be very ungallant if I did not wish to the Gracious Lady who fills the Throne many happy returns of the year, and that all domestic happiness may attend her in the Jubilee which is now about to be celebrated; but while we have the best wishes towards Her Gracious Majesty, we cannot forget the wives, the sisters, and the daughters of those among whom we have been bred and reared. We wish for them some alleviation of the hard life they have had to endure; and we say to this House, to the British people, and to the world, that there can only be a partial demonstration of loyalty from the Irish people so long as Her Majesty's Jubilee is being celebrated by the burning of the roof-trees over the heads of our impoverished people. I am very sorry to say that the present Government of Ireland does not belie the traditions of those which have preceded it. The present Government is dangerous to England. It is shocking the sensibilities of the world, and it will continue to do so, so long as the appeals which are made to it from these Benches in earnestness and sincerity are treated with contemptuous indifference. The Amendment raises the question of the novel and unconstitutional methods by which the government of Ireland has been carried on. I have great respect for the arguments which have been put forward, upon both sides of the House, in reference to the humanity and consideration of the Government; but I appeal to hon. Members to listen to what I am going to say upon that subject. If it be right for the Chief Secretary to display humanity and consideration, and if it be right for the House to endorse it, then, in God's name, why not legalize humanity and consideration, and make humane and considerate laws for Ireland, or give the Irish people the opportunity of making such laws for themselves. I shall probably be met by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite with the assertion that they are ready to make such laws; but we have to judge them by their acts. When we brought forward, last year, a Bill whose mainspring was humanity and consideration for those who were unable to pay the rents demanded of them, how was it met by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite? The Bill of the hon. Member for Cork was rejected. I think it was as honest a measure as could fairly be put forward for the acceptance of this House. There were no rights to be abolished, no privileges to be curtailed; but the essence of the Bill was that in cases where the tenants were manifestly unable to pay their rents, if those tenants came forward and paid half a-year's rent, until, upon inquiry, it was found out what they really ought to pay, they should not be evicted. A great deal of eulogium has been passed on the conduct of the Chief Secretary, in which some kind friends of ours have joined; but I would say that if the Government are prepared in this House to sanction the recent action of their Chief Secretary in Ireland, and of all those who have acted under him, how was it that the Government which boasts that it was a kindly act—an act of kind and generous consideration—how was it that they did not legalize that kind consideration, and make it the law of the land, instead of allowing men to be flung out on the road-side, and the industry of their lives confiscated in a moment? It has been stated that if the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork had been passed it would not have affected such cases as those which have been referred to in this House. I grant that in the form in which it was presented to the House it would not have covered the case of the Glenbeigh tenantry; but I would remind hon. Gentlemen that when the Bill was presented to the House they were only asked, in voting for or against it, to say whether the essence of the Bill was good or bad—whether the principle was good in itself. If the second reading had been assented to, it could have been amended so as to cover the whole ground that was desired. I have no doubt that if hon. Members who now criticize the shortcomings of the Bill had only voted for the second reading, and indicated the direction in which it ought to be extended, we should have met them in a very liberal spirit; but when it is stated that the landlords have acted with consideration for their tenants in Ireland, when it has recently been stated by the noble Lord the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer that the case of the Glenbeigh tenants was an evidence of the consideration of the Irish landlords; I felt on reading those statements at the scene of the evictions by the light of the burning and demolished cabins of these poor people, that there was in them something akin to what Shakespeare has told us, and which I will slightly paraphrase by saying that "the smoke of the Glenbeigh huts came between the wind and his nobility." The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) probably thought that his resignation would occupy the attention of the House for the whole of the present Session, and he felt indignant that such an unimportant matter as the demolition of a dozen houses of the poor people of Ireland, and the eviction of some score of tenants, should for a moment divert that attention which he considered ought to be bestowed upon him. All I can say is that I fail to see the humanity of the assertion which the noble Lord has made. If hon. Members want information on the matter, let me point out to them that the Arrears Act was passed to cancel outstanding debts which had become due in regard to small and impoverished estates; but the fact is that the landlords, by their action, have prevented many of the tenants from availing themselves of the benefit of the Arrears Act, and of giving them the option of starting afresh and paying what rent they could pay upon their holdings. The result is that these tenants have been represented to this country as being so dishonest as to owe five and six years' arrears of rent. No doubt, it was the fact in 1883, the Glenbeigh tenants had fallen into two or three years' arrear; they were all evicted from the property, and the first knowledge they had of the Arrears Act was when, at one fell swoop, some 300 persons were rendered homeless. When I have myself seen the wives of evicted tenants nursing their tender infants beneath the bleak hill-side, their only shelter having been taken from them, I think it will be allowed that if I had not done my best to secure the sympathy of the public for their sufferings, I would no longer be able to claim as my own the commonest feelings of humanity. I have been blamed for interfering in the case of the Glenbeigh evictions; but grosser interference has been practised by the Government, as, for instance, when Captain Plunkett interfered to get certain rents reduced. These people, who have been evicted for two or three years' arrears of rent, have had the Crimes Act put in force against them. If they attempted to retake possession of their homes they were prosecuted. Let me mention one instance, to show how a coercion law works in

Ireland. While the tenant and his family who had been evicted were sheltering themselves in the cow-house of another tenant, upon a certain windy day in the month of November, 1884, the tenant saw the thatch being blown off of the house which he had occupied. That tenant, acting from impulse, seeing that it was the house in which he had been born, the house which probably might shelter him again, and which in reality has done so, obtained a ladder and proceeded to place some stones on the thatch to prevent it being blown away. There was an Emergency man on the premises and some police inside. The evicted tenant was arrested and prosecuted, and he received two months' imprisonment under the Crimes Act. I can verify the fact, because I had the privilege of serving for six months in the same prison, and I saw this man in gaol. I have no comment to make upon my own case. I do not ask for the sympathy of any hon. Member opposite; but I may tell them that I am free from crime in the matters which were imputed to me at the time of my conviction; and even if all which was charged against me was correct, it would not have warranted the extraordinary punishment meted out to me. I may add that the Crown Prosecutor met me some hours after, and he expressed his utter shame at the proceedings in which he had been forced to take part. My case, however, was nothing in comparison to that of this poor tenant, who was sentenced to two months' imprisonment for no other crime than that of saving the property of his landlord. Sir, I think the instance which I have given will show to this House that, in the words of the Amendment, strange, novel, and unconstitutional measures are likely to be resorted to by Her Majesty's Government, because they have already resorted to very strange methods in previous years. My hon. Friend the Member for Cork read a few sentences from one of the most extraordinary letters which has ever been given to the public in recent years, in connection with the government of Ireland. It is a letter written by Judge Curran, the County Court Judge of Kerry, to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Killarney, complaining of the course pursued by the parish priest of Glenbeigh. It will be said of Judge Curran, that he is one of the links in the chain of consideration which the Chief Secretary for Ireland is said to have manufactured recently for the Government of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman set aside the voice of Parliament, and, apparently, the voice of the Cabinet, because his action in no way tallies with the words of the Marquess of Salisbury. He appears to have relied upon General Buller, Colonel Turner, and County Court Judge Curran for the administration of law in Ireland, and to have carried that administration out in the most unconstitutional manner. In the first place, I maintain that it was unconstitutional to tamper with the Judges of the land. It is part of the British Constitution itself, that no Judge of the land can be removed from his position, except by a Joint Address from both Houses of Parliament to Her Majesty, and it would require the commission of a very gross offence to necessitate such a proceeding. A short time ago, certain legal gentlemen gloried in the title of Chairman of Quarter Sessions; but they were recently raised to the title and dignity of County Court Judges. There was one of these gentlemen in Kerry, a Mr. O'Connor Morris, who, although of some literary ability, was not, I believe, considered to be one of the most capable Judges, or, perhaps, I ought to say he was rather too capable. Where an ordinary Judge confined himself to the delivery of one judgment in the course of a case, it was no unfrequent occurrence for Judge O'Connor Morris to deliver four, and, on some occasions, even a fifth. For time out of mind, it had been a grievance that he should be in Kerry, and, some time ago, I believe that he himself applied for his removal, but the late Irish Lord Chancellor (Sir Edward Sullivan) said, "Let him stick there; you are more used to him than we are, and why inflict him on another county?" But although his application was rejected at that time, Her Majesty's Government have since thought fit to inflict him upon another county. When General Buller went down to Kerry, he seems to have arrived at the conclusion that Judge Morris was too much of a "Paddy, go easy" for these days, and there is no doubt that he instantly wrote to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and asked him, for goodness' sake, to send down another Judge, whom they could do something with. Judge Curran was accordingly sent to Kerry, and Judge Morris was shunted off to another county. When Judge Curran went into the County of Kerry, he went in with a flourish of trumpets, telling all the tenants to come into his Court and he would give them splendid reductions. He said that he did not wish that the League should go into his Court, but he would do everything for them himself. Almost simultaneously with the advent of Judge Curran was the advent of the new agent of the Glenbeigh property—a Mr. Roe, of Dublin—who has signalized himself by his recent barbarities. He called upon the tenants of Glenbeigh to pay five, six, and in some cases seven years' arrears of rent due from them. Hon. Members will probably think this a singular demand to make, when I assert that, legally, not one-half of these arrears were due, and, morally, none of them. These tenants had been evicted three years ago, when the Arrears Act, if availed of, might have cut away one-half of the arrears that were supposed to be owing at the time of their late eviction. There were emergency caretakers employed to prevent them from re-entering their farms, and they were several times prosecuted, fined, and imprisoned for re-entering them. These are the men who have been described as having been in full possession of their farms for six and seven years; that, as I have said, accounts for three years. How about the first three years? If that estate had been in the normal condition of other estates, the landlord or the land agent would have said, when he saw that it was hopelessly impossible to extract three years, that he would take the gale and get a contribution from the Government which would have wiped off the arrears, as has been done in other parts of Ireland. Surely that disposes of both the legal and the moral obligations of these tenants. I believe that if I could capitalize the results of the industry and the exertions of these poor people upon that stony and wretched soil for generations, it would realize sufficient to buy out the fee-simple of a farm on the richest plain in England. Well, Sir, the case of these tenants came before County Court Judge Curran. Some 70 decrees were obtained, and what was the actual state of the case? The land agent had offered to take a year's rent which was proposed to be credited to the tenants up to the 1st of November 1885, leaving them still one year in arrear, and then all the other arrears were to be wiped off. I do not think that that was a very generous offer, although it has been put forward as such by those who have spoken on the landlords' side of the question. Many of the tenants did not go into Court, because they believed it was utterly impossible to improve their condition, and they thought that the same powers were inherent in the County Court Judge as in his Predecessor. They said—"We owe five or six years' rent, which we will be called upon to pay, and we have no defence." Some of them who were more 'cute than the rest, went there, and they found that Judge Curran had a new method of administering the law in Ireland. When the tenants presented themselves in Court, Judge Curran called the first man up and said—"Will you pay a year of the arrears of rent and costs?" The tenant said—"I cannot do it." Judge Curran then said—"Then I shall have to issue a decree against you for the entire arrears"; whereupon the tenant said—"I had better take the smaller evil of the two, and you had better decree me for one year's arrears." This is represented to have been the consent of the tenants; whereas 10 of the tenants were coerced into making that agreement. The County Court Judge kept his decrees in his pocket. It was his duty then and there to have signed them, and to have sent them off in the ordinary way; because, after all, he was only performing the functions conferred upon him by the law. He has no power to abridge or alter the law, and I assert here that neither has he any power of arbitration. His only duty is to administer the law. He withheld the decrees, kept them in his pocket, and actually afterwards, in collusion with General Buller, the pet, the joy, and the gallant soldier of the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who was sent down to put down Moonlighting and cope with crime in Kerry—I am sorry to say that he has left crime very much as he found it, and that he only concerned himself with meddling with the County Court Judge and the tenants—in collusion with General Buller, Judge Curran brought the decrees down from one year to half-a-year, altering the date of payment from the 1st of November 1885, up to the 1st of May 1886, thereby blotting out a considerable portion of the rental of the estate of an Irish landlord. Will the hon. Gentleman opposite say that that is not a novel and unconstitutional method, at all events, of dealing with the landlords of Ireland. Let me not be mistaken or misunderstood. If it had entered into the mind of Judge Curran or General Buller to wipe off all the arrears, and to start the tenants afresh with fair judicial rents, I should have been the first to applaud their act; but it is because the arrangement was a mere mechanical one, not taking into consideration the wants, the wishes, and the capabilities of these people; and because the people have been punished for not abiding by it, that I now protest against the course which has been pursued against the tenants of Glenbeigh. I trust that, with the assistance of sympathetic friends, we shall all be able to make a repetition of such scenes impossible in any part of Ireland. I do not think it is necessary that I should refer further to that special matter; but I propose to deal, in a few short sentences, with the political aspect of this question. An hon. Member on the other side of the House—I believe it was the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Howorth)—some time ago remarked that when the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) made a joke, it was as readily appreciated on these Benches as upon those opposite; and now I ask the hon. Member, when he said that Irish Members understand each other, to follow up his assertion to its logical conclusion by sending the Irish Members to their own country in order that they may frame laws on subjects which they understand better than hon. Members here. The hon. Member also said that hon. Members opposite had been visibly impressed, notwithstanding their hostility to us, by the pathetic appeals which have proceeded from this side of the House. That is a further reason why they should give their countenance to the policy I am advocating. The hon. and gallant Member for North Down (Colonel Waring), a short time ago, said he was doubtful whether, in these days, it was an honour to be an Irishman. I am afraid it is one of those honours which will stick closer to that hon. and gallant Member than even the military honours which, I am sure, he has worthily received. He cannot attempt to deny that he is an Irishman; and, to demonstrate his nationality, he indulged to-night in what even we Irishmen regarded as a glorious "bull." The hon. and gallant Member said that he had been in his farm since the reign of James I. I have no desire to wish the hon. and gallant Member out of it in a hurry; if there ever be a James XXI., I hope he may still be found there. As if to prove their nationality, the hon. and gallant Member for North Down and the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh always indulge in this kind of "bull," and whenever either of them rises to speak, we are sure to have a "prize bull" from one or other of them. The hon. Member for Salford has expressed an opinion that Irishmen if left to themselves best understand each other. Then, in Heaven's name, why do hon. Members opposite not let us do it? The hon. Member drew a singular conclusion from that position. He said that hon. Members on those Benches understood the Irish people, and that there are Members on this side who also understand the Irish people. They both understand them well; but he went on to say—"When you want to deal with an Irish question, keep every Irish Member on both sides out of it." I was greatly impressed with the clear and the intellectual argument of the hon. Member that, because Irish Members, who hold different views, yet mutually understand one another, and mutually understand their country, therefore they should be entirely prevented from having a voice in legislating for that country within the walls of this House. Why should this House studiously refrain from consulting the Irish Members, and getting information from them, in preference to obtaining it from some stray commercial traveller they might pick up in a railway carriage. I was glad to find that, during the last autumn and winter, many hon. Members went over to Ireland and made inquiries on the spot into the condition of the tenants and the character of the proceedings against them. I can testify to the fact, because I saw them myself in the West. I rejoice that such a policy has been resorted to—a policy of real examination and inquiry of those who complain of grievances. It is one which I believe will be the means of securing the salvation of the country and of restoring to us that legislative independence which is ours by right and by moral and divine law. Hon. Members have been paying visits to Kerry, which have not been mere transitory visits like the 24 hours' expedition of the right hon. Gentleman the present First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith). It is not by a visit of that kind, but by a process of thorough inquiry into the facts and into the actual condition of the people, that Liberal Members of the British House of Commons have come back to this country surcharged with real knowledge of the state of affairs. It will require a little time for that knowledge to be diffused throughout the country; but when it is diffused I believe the electorate will rise up and demand and compel justice to Ireland. But whether that be so or not, whether the voice of this country shall, in the near future, order you to do justice to Ireland, or whether this House will be gradually weaned from the voice of justice, our mission here is to speak the voice of our country, telling you that the Irish people have been grievously wronged, and that wrongs which some of you think have departed into the domain of ancient history, are still being daily perpetrated and will continue unless you establish the means of doing justice on the spot by men who understand the wants and wishes of the people who have to be legislated for. When we bring forward Irish grievances here, we only excite the laughter of hon. Members opposite, and if we have no remnant left of our ancient liberties, we have still some remnant of our pride and scorn to be hawking our grievances before you, amid your jeers and sneers. There are a hundred matters which we have daily to let pass, because we know how they would be received as long as right hon. Gentlemen consider it their duty simply to advise Her Majesty, in the 50th year of her Reign and government of Ireland, to continue repressive legislation until Ireland is fit to receive those legislative liberties which are enjoyed by England, Scotland, and Wales. I have to apologize for the discursive remarks I have made, and I will only, in conclusion, impress the fact upon hon. Members opposite that it has at last become their duty to follow out to the letter the policy which was indicated, but not carried out, by Her Majesty's Government when they declared themselves to be a Government of examination and inquiry. I invite them to come over themselves to Ireland and see for themselves what is the real character of the government of that country. I give them a guarantee that they will not be molested in going through the country, and if they come over with a fair mind to inquire into the wants and wishes of the Irish people, they will be loyally and affectionately received; but it will be worse than useless if they continue to study, as they have hitherto done exclusively, the interest of one class—that of the landlords alone.

Mr. HOZIER (Lanarkshire, S.) said, he could not help wondering how many of the hon. Members who now call themselves Home Rule Liberals would not have supported the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) had it been introduced or suggested 14 months ago. In this respect the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) occupied an almost unique position, for he had all along been a Home Ruler; he had always, in a Parliamentary sense, professed Home Rule principles. When, in the autumn of 1885, there was a general *Index Expurgatorius* of the Liberal Party published on the authority of the hon. Member for Cork, and signed by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), from that *Index Expurgatorius* the name of the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton was expressly excluded. He thought that the hon. Member could, in these circumstances, claim some small amount of consistency for his conduct in regard to the Question of Irish Home Rule—for, in his case there was no special need to find salvation, like the late Secretary of State for War (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman), because in this matter at any rate he had no original sin. On the score of his comparative consistency and his position in the Separatist Party, the hon. Gentleman's utterances on the Irish Question deserved careful and earnest attention, which was more than could be said for his familiar Friends on the Opposition

Benches above the Gangway. There were no speeches more eagerly waited for or more eagerly listened to than the speeches of the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton; but at the same time the Members of the House had one very good cause of complaint against him. That hon. Member was too much inclined to reserve his tit-bits, his sparkling epigrams, and his highest flights of oratory for the platform rather than for Parliament. The hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton was good enough to go to Scotland and enlighten Scotchmen on the Irish Question. He did enlighten them very much. He distinctly explained to them in Glasgow why it was necessary, as often as possible, to introduce such Amendments as that now before the House, and to press them to a Division, and, in fact, he disclosed to them his Plan of Campaign. The hon. Member's object was no doubt a most laudable one from his point of view, but it was doubtful whether it would so commend itself to the Members of that House and the people of this country at large, as to afford any real and proper excuse for a deliberate waste of the time of the Imperial Parliament. The hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton spoke at Glasgow on the 10th of December last, and was reported on the following day in *The North British Daily Mail*, the organ of the Separatists of the West of Scotland, and the organ of the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), to have said—

> "All I know is this—and I think that Dr. Cameron will bear me out—that we mean in the next Parliament to rub Mr. Chamberlain's nose in the mire. We shall have Resolutions, we shall have Amendments every evening—good, sound Radical Amendments. Mr. Chamberlain will have to choose either to vote for them or against them; and it seems to me, if we can judge by what he says at present, that he will vote against them, in which case he will come away from Parliament as naked and as ashamed as old Joseph of the Bible was after his interview with the wife of Potiphar."

Thus they had seen that the object of the Amendment was to rub the nose of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) in the mire; and with regard to that elegant extract, he (Mr. Hozier) thought there were two questions which might be fairly put to the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton. In the first place, who was pointed at in the elegant simile as representing the erring wife of Potiphar, from whom Joseph of old succeeded in making his escape; and, in the next place, did the hon. Member pretend that the conduct of Joseph of old, on the occasion referred to, was in any way blameworthy? That speech of the hon. Member naturally excited the greatest enthusiasm among the Separatists of Scotland; and in *The North British Daily Mail* there appeared an article next morning, headed "Mr. Labouchere's Speech," in which it was said it was the fashion of the superior persons in politics—of bigoted Tories and stolid Whigs—to affect to look down on the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Labouchere) as being something less than a serious politician; but they were much mistaken. That politics might be a game of shuttlecock with such as the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), but were with the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Labouchere) an earnest pursuit in the course of popular progress. After his brilliant feat of oratory at Glasgow, the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton went to Dublin, and need they be surprised that the toast of his name at the Mansion House of Dublin was received with rapturous applause, and by the band playing the strains of "The Minstrel Boy?" He (Mr. Hozier) had already ventured to say that the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton occupied an almost unique position in that House, with regard to having initiated the Irish policy of those who were called the Leaders of the Opposition, inasmuch as the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Labouchere) had been all along in favour of such a system of Home Rule for Ireland as that embodied in the Irish scheme of the late Government. But it was rather curious to investigate how his lieutenants, as he supposed they must be called, on the Front Opposition Bench came to be converted to his views. In *Truth*, on the 6th of May last, the hon. Member (Mr. Labouchere) said—

> "The Irish — Archbishop Croke and his clergy especially—are gushing a good deal over Mr. Gladstone, and *United Ireland* grows quite eloquent over the manliness of Lord Spencer. All this is very touching and amiable, but after all truth is the first of virtues, and truth compels me to say that these statesmen were converted to Home Rule by a process

> precisely similar to that by which, in my youth, I remember to have been converted to the Latin Grammar. If the Irish want to gush over anybody they had better gush over Messrs. Parnell and Davitt. They held the birch, and the most that can be said for our British statesmen is that they have taken it very kindly and profited by it, especially Sir William Harcourt."

Well, that being so, and the lieutenants of the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton having been converted to Home Rule in that way, how came it that so many other hon. Members of the Party opposite were converted, and that the late Government obtained even such a measure of support as they did receive in the country? Most undoubtedly it was entirely due to the extraordinary personal influence and personal popularity of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, exerted in the recent Election. If they looked at the political map of Scotland hon. Gentlemen would find that while the East of Scotland——

DR. TANNER (Cork, Co., Mid): I rise to a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I wish to know what the map of Scotland has to do with the Amendment before the House?

MR. HOZIER said, he believed he was in Order. If hon. Gentlemen looked at the map of Scotland coloured according to the political representation they would find that in the East of Scotland the Home Rule representation predominated, while in the West the converse was the case. This might be due either to the fact that the West of Scotland, being nearer to Ireland, was in a better position to judge of the Irish Question, or to the generally conceded fact that the influence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian was far greater in the East than it was in the West. It was all very well to say with the old proverb, "that the rose by any other name will smell as sweet," but as a matter of fact the Home Rule scheme would not have smelt anything like as sweet if it had not been for the name of the late Prime Minister. Supposing that the Home Rule scheme had been given to an astonished world as the joint production, and on the joint authority, of the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton and the hon. Member for the Camborne Division of Cornwall (Mr. Conybeare). What would have happened? It would have been considered in the light of a gigantic practical joke, and would have been laughed out of the House. Why, marvellous as was the magic of the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, it was terribly handicapped by the weight of the Home Rule scheme. Take, for example, his (Mr. Hozier's) own constituency—South Lanarkshire —it bordered on Mid Lothian; and in addition to that circumstance it had two important railway junctions in it, where, occasionally, between the snortings of the railway engine, speeches were emitted instructing Scotchmen that they must do their duty. In spite of all the influence, however, which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian was consequently able to exercise in the constituency, his (Mr. Hozier's) opponent found himself obliged to drop the Home Rule scheme, and to argue at his meetings that

> "the Bills are dead, are dead, are dead, and a good thing too. But you ought to support me because I voted to keep these Bills alive, because the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian wished me to do so."

Surely rather a curious line of argument, but one that certainly showed the influence of the late Prime Minister's name, both in a constituency and on a Member. At his opponent's meetings there were loud cheers for the grand old Leader, but there were few cheers for the brand new scheme. Thanks to the loyal aid of the Liberal Unionists he (Mr. Hozier) won the seat. He had no wish to call the Liberal Unionists by any better name than "truly loyal friends," and he earnestly trusted that in his case the friendship and co-operation would be a life-long one. Undoubtedly, in that Constituency, bordering on Mid Lothian and subject to all the influence of the great name of the late Prime Minister, they succeeded in turning what had been previously a minority of 1,338 into a majority—indeed, practically 2,000, calculating a change in the Irish vote, was changed into a majority —not a large majority indeed, but quite large enough to make his opponent a Peer of the Realm and to make him (Mr. Hozier) a Member of the House of Commons. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington warned the Unionists to be on their guard against idolatry—to be careful not to be merely going about and saying "Great is Diana of the Union." He trusted that no great Party would ever set up an idol; but if they did he earnestly hoped that that idol might be a principle and not a man. His constituency in returning him to Parliament wished to emphasize the fact that law and order must be maintained in Ireland. He was, therefore, glad to see, in the Speech from the Throne, that there were to be reforms in the legal procedure. There were three parts of the Scotch Common Law which might be applied with advantage to the whole of the United Kingdom. The first was the preliminary investigation before the Procurator Fiscal; the second, the special jury system; and the third, the change of venue. The Scotch people happened to have all this extra amount of coercion, but who, he asked, were the worse for it? The Scotch were not a down-trodden race, and did not pretend to be. On the contrary, he thought everybody would say that the sturdy independence of the Scottish race was one of their best and greatest characteristics. It might be urged that the law was a foreign law. He admitted that the law which had to be enforced was a foreign law if they meant by foreign law the old Jewish law of the Ten Commandments. He did not suppose anyone wished to enforce all the Ten Commandments by penal enactment, but there were two which must be enforced—the Sixth and the Eighth, "Thou shalt do no murder," and "Thou shalt not steal,"—in Ireland as in any other part of the Queen's Dominions in order that there might be real and true freedom in Ireland. It was possible that his idea of freedom in Ireland might be somewhat different from the opinion of hon. Members below the Gangway opposite. His idea of freedom in Ireland did not mean freedom to mutilate cattle, to commit moonlight outrages, and to murder; his idea of freedom was that honest men should be allowed to do their duty in that state of life to which they should be called. As to local government, he was strongly in favour of a generous measure of local self-government for Ireland, such as might be also applicable to Scotland, England, and Wales, but never in his wildest moments did he ever use the blessed word "simultaneity." He had all along been of opinion that it was possible to find much truth in the saying, "The more haste the worse speed," and that one might very easily "Legislate in haste and repent at leisure." As to the Land Question, he was always in favour of single ownership in land. He trusted that there would be some scheme for making the tenant the proprietor of the land which he tilled on easy and reasonable terms, and those whom he (Mr. Hozier) represented were strongly of that opinion. In addressing his constituents he rarely failed to quote the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) on that point. Speaking in the House of Commons on the 9th of April last year that right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I said I shall object to any scheme that involves the British taxpayer in excessive risks. Why is the risk of any scheme excessive? I have been myself an advocate of large schemes in England and Scotland, intended by the use of public money to turn a small tenant into the proprietor of the land that he tilled. I have not been unwilling to take the risk in such a case, but what I object to is to take a risk for what I believe in a short time will be a foreign country. For an integral part of the United Kingdom I am prepared to take a risk; but I am not prepared to take a risk in order to promote what is, in my judgment, a thinly veiled scheme of separation."—(3 *Hansard*, [304] 1194).

They could hardly expect, however, that any such moderate proposals as these would commend themselves to the servile followers of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, or to the followers of the hon. Member for Cork but he thought it was hardly part of the duty of the Unionist Party to try to fulfil the aspirations of those who had been rightly described as marching through rapine to the dismemberment of the Empire; nor, on the other hand, did he think that the Unionist Party need place much value on the opinion of those whose ideas of honour were such that it was their chief delight to denounce as turncoats and traitors those of their own familiar friends who in the summer of 1886 committed the terrible crime of remaining constant to the promises and pledges which they gave in the autumn of 1885.

MR. JACOB BRIGHT (Manchester, S. W.): Sir, the hon. Member who has just sat down (Mr. Hozier), in his desire to refute the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), seemed to me to forget entirely the question before the House. The hon. Gentleman is, I believe, a Tory Member for one of the constituencies of Scotland. Scotland is not accustomed to send a great many Tory Members to this House; and, therefore, not being able to send quantity, it makes up for it by giving us quality. I have listened with painful interest to much that has been said in the course of this debate, and I do not believe anybody can know anything of the condition of Ireland without feeling that the subject of Ireland, especially when it is brought before this House, is always a painful subject. But I have had other feelings in the course of this debate. I have felt strongly surprised that England should be so unwilling to abandon a task for which she has clearly proved herself through generations to be wholly incapable—I mean the task of governing Ireland. It is no discredit to England that she is incapable of governing Ireland. It is a difficult thing to govern one's own country. It is easy to make many mistakes in doing that. But it is much more difficult to govern a country at a distance from us, whose character and circumstances we know little about, and whose condition, in many respects, is wholly different from our own. I say it is no discredit to England to have failed. The discredit, if there is discredit, is in her determination to continue to govern when she knows she has failed—failed always—and is incapable of succeeding. The Irish are held to be a turbulent and a difficult people. I have always found them to be, in Ireland, about the most peaceable people of whom I know anything. They suffer at our hands indignities and insults of an extraordinary character; and any other people but this would resent these insults and these indignities with more force than the Irish bring to bear in regard to them. It has been shown in the course of the debate that we suppress meetings that are called for legal and needful purposes. It has been shown that we tamper with their juries in the most dishonourable fashion. And everybody knows that if there is a man in Ireland somewhat more influential, somewhat more respectable than his neighbours, that man has been pounced upon by the British Government and put in gaol. I say the British Government, because all Parties have been in this matter, up to this period, very much alike. The next person to be put in gaol is my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon). I suppose everybody knows that the Government can so manipulate the jury, before which he has to be tried, that they can put him in gaol if they like. They will have to determine what policy they will pursue—whether it is safer for them to give him freedom or to keep him in gaol. If his imprisonment would not injure his health, I confess I should not object to see the Government make the blunder of sending him to gaol; because the sooner and the more we pile up foolish deeds in regard to Ireland, the sooner the moment will come when we shall be enlightened enough to set her free and to give her her own Government. It was shown from these Benches, and not denied, that a Protestant may commit a grave crime, and commit it with impunity. He is tried by a Protestant jury—one that partakes of his prejudices, his passions, and his hatreds. That jury sets him free. But a poor Galway peasant is heavily punished for a slight offence. He is brought before a jury from which every man of his own faith has been excluded. I should like very much to see a packed jury in England, in order that the English people might know what it means. I should like to see a few Protestants in this country tried in certain cases by exclusively Catholic juries. If that were so, the eyes of the people of this country would be opened; they would see themselves as others see us. By what right do we govern Ireland despotically?—because we do govern her despotically. Ireland is under a Parliamentary despotism. Ireland sends 100 men to this House, and before she can get anything she asks she is obliged to convince some hundreds of men who know little of Ireland, and, up to recent times, have cared very little about Ireland. By what right do we govern Ireland? By the right of force. The only English-speaking people in the world whom we govern by force are the Irish. We have abandoned that system in every other place. We tried it with the United States, and they cast us off. We tried it with Canada, and Canada would have cast us off if the country had followed the advice of men who belonged to the Party opposite. But we ceased to govern

Canada by force, and from that moment Canada has been united to this country and is a close friend of this country. We govern Ireland by force, and we have lost Ireland—temporarily we have lost her. I believe we can regain her, and that Ireland may become a source of strength to this country. Is she not at present a great weakness? What does she do to assist us? Financially she does nothing. Does she assist our Army or our Navy? We keep 30,000 bayonets in Ireland in order to control the people. I say we have lost Ireland, as we lost the United States; and the only way to regain Ireland is to do that for her which we have done to every English-speaking people in every part of the world. I would like to make one or two very brief remarks on the question of evictions and the Plan of Campaign. The evictions that have recently taken place have been, I believe, perfectly legal transactions. I imagine those who have evicted their tenants were within their legal rights. But no one will dispute that these acts were acts of cruelty. No one will dispute that they have damaged the reputation of England throughout the world. If I had tenants to evict—poor, miserable, defenceless men and women and children —I would at least make one concession to them. I would choose the time of eviction in June instead of January. By so doing I should have at least the poor consolation that I was saving the old and the young, the half-clad, and the miserably feeble from mortal suffering. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) made a speech the other day in Newcastle, and I think I am right in saying that he endeavoured to defend these evictions, so far, at least, as to say they were not more cruel or more objectionable than evictions that take place regularly in our towns. Well, if that was the only defence that the noble Lord had to give, it would have been wiser to have passed the subject over in silence. What is the difference? In our towns, indeed, poor people are made to leave their houses or their rooms if they do not pay their rents; but that class of persons in our towns are migratory to the last degree. Instead of being driven out of the house because they cannot pay their rent, they leave the house by stealth to avoid paying it. Even where cases of cruelty occur—and it may be quite possible they do—yet evicting a tenant in Manchester or London is certainly not a sentence of death. But the Irishman who is evicted is very often driven from the cabin which he has built. He may have been born there; he may have lived there long years. His eviction is a more serious matter to him than eviction is to the people to whom the noble Lord referred. Now, the Plan of Campaign is said to be a scandalous thing, and I believe those who are most shocked at it are lawyers. There is, to my mind, something more scandalous in Ireland than the Plan of Campaign; and it is this—that there is no tribunal before which two men, each having an interest in the same property, may both go and have their differences settled, and that, under the present system, the stronger of the two claims to have the right to eject the weaker, and to deprive him of that which belongs to him. That, to my mind, is the greatest scandal. I believe it is admitted that the objects, at least, of the Plan of Campaign are good. I believe it is admitted that the results generally have been good. The results, too, have been greater than have been indicated by my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley). It is not merely those to whom the Plan of Campaign has applied who have got the benefit. The benefit extends much further; because in many cases, in order to avoid the application of the Plan to their estates, men have made reasonable concessions of rent. I do not blame the Irish Leaders for the Plan of Campaign. It would have been to me an extraordinary thing if nobody in Ireland had stepped forward at such a moment, and endeavoured to rescue the wretched tenant from the fate impending over him. In 1881 we passed a great Land Act. It was a revolutionary Act. It was a tremendous innovation. Why did we do it? It was owing to the circumstances of the time and the pressure upon the tenants. It is asserted by men who understand the question well that the pressure upon the tenants owing to the fall in prices has been as great last year as in 1881. That being so, it was incumbent on the Irish Leaders to come forward to do something to rescue these poor tenants. Now, is the Plan illegal? The lawyers tell us that it is; but surely it is reasonable to wait till we know exactly what the Plan is, and what means have been used for carrying it out. All this we shall know when it comes before the Court in Ireland. It is not surprising that the Irish people look upon it with confidence. It has the support and sanction of the highest ecclesiastic in the Church of the Irish people. It has been closely associated with the name of a Member of this House, a man whose character stands as high as that of any Member of this House — a man whose moral sense, whose sense of justice, I undertake to say, is as fine as that which is to be found on any one of the Benches of this House—I mean the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon). But, Sir, even when the law is broken in Ireland, in my opinion, it is not the same thing as when the law is broken in England. I hold that there is an important difference. There is a difference, in my mind, which no one can eradicate. When a law is not observed in England there is this to be said about it—that the person who is guilty of infraction of the law is disobeying an English law—a law made by his own people, a law made by those who understand the country and its wants. When an Irishman breaks the law he is not breaking an Irish law probably—he is breaking a law which, if I may quote the language of my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain), is the law of a foreign country. It comes from a place where Ireland is not known or understood, and it may be a law entirely inapplicable to the country. But I agree with those who maintain that disobedience to the law is a serious thing, and ought to be put down. But how should it be put down? Hon. Members opposite have got a plan. It is a plan that has been tried a hundred times, and a hundred times it has failed. We have got a plan—we, the servile followers of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian—we have got a plan, and it has been adopted by the English Liberals, not because it was given to them by the right hon. Gentleman, great as his authority has been, but it was adopted by the English Liberals because it was believed to be in harmony with the traditions of the Liberal Party, and with their highest principles. We say, put down infraction of the law, but do it by letting Ireland have Irish law. Take that plan, and there will be the same obedience to law in Ireland as in England. I believe the time is approaching when Ireland will make her own laws. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), in the last speech he made in this House, said the battle of the Union —I suppose he meant the Legislative Union—is over in Ireland, but that it has to be fought in England. I agree with the noble Lord. I think the battle is over in Ireland. When five-sixths of the Irish Representatives come to this House to declare against a Legislative Union, they have done nearly all that is in their power to do. But the battle has yet to be fought in England; and it is being fought out, I believe, with success in England. The character of the meetings tells for something. My right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bury in Lancashire (Sir Henry James) was present the other day at a meeting in Manchester. They very modestly took a small room. They did not expect to require more than a small room. But I have seen—and where I have not seen I have read accounts of—meetings in Manchester held in the Free Trade Hall and the St. James's Hall, two of the largest buildings in that town, and two among the largest halls in the United Kingdom. I have seen these halls crowded by enthusiastic audiences asking that the principle might be established that every people may have its own Government. Now, in fighting this battle in England to which the noble Lord referred, I think the Unionists are at a considerable disadvantage. Take their speeches. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) will excuse me for saying that I think some of his speeches on this question have had a melancholy character. Take my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham. His propositions are so conflicting, so varying, that they do not really attract the public attention, and they do nothing to command popular conviction. But when the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian is placed before the people, it is a clear policy which every man understands; and when I say every man, I mean large numbers of men, and an increasing number of men every day. The noble Lord the Member for South Paddington said the Tory Party was leaning upon a crutch. If I had the honour to sit on the other side of the House I should not care anything about a charge like that, provided always that the crutch was a sound one. I have known a crutch—a sound crutch—to out-last a natural limb. But what is this crutch on which the Tory Party leans? Why, it is made up, we all know, of very different material, and material very badly put together. It is a crutch which will fail in use; and I think there are indications in the last speech of the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale that show he has some uneasiness as to how long the crutch will hold together. But if I were an advocate of the Legislative Union between the two countries, what would most alarm me would be the fact that the case now rests upon the Tory Party. Whatever rests upon the Tory Party never rests long. Why, in the great contested questions of the present century, when the Tory Party has taken up a position with all the appearance of courage it shows now in taking up its position on this question, it has invariably been dislodged from that position. The political gains of the United Kingdom have always been the losses of the Tory Party. Unless, for the first time in this century, the Tories shall be found to be right upon a great national question and the Liberals wrong, it will not be very long before the Legislative Union will cease. But there is another fortunate indication for us—it is that the Liberal newspaper Press throughout the Kingdom, with very few exceptions, is in favour of giving to Ireland her freedom. The newspaper Press of London, true to its character, takes the Tory side. Look at *The Times.* Well, it is a happy thing for us that *The Times* writes as it does, because I have always seen that when *The Times* has zealously and passionately advocated a cause before the country, it has always been on the losing side in the end. It defended the Bread Tax; it advocated the endeavour to establish a Slave Empire in America; it defended the taxes on knowledge. I might go on repeating *ad infinitum* the cases, the bad cases, which *The Times* has taken up and energetically advocated. If I were at the end of the earth, and knew that a great contest was taking place in the United Kingdom, I should only have to ask what side *The Times* was taking to know absolutely what would be the final result. Those who do not want to go back to the Heptarchy ought to be in favour of Home Rule. It is the Home Rule principle, and that alone, which enables great Empires to hold together. Give up the Home Rule principle and the British Empire would dissolve. You would have the disruption that is so often talked about. The United States could not exist without that principle, nor Canada, nor some of the States of Europe. We hear a good deal now about the possibility of Continental war; and there is some anxiety in this country that our Fleets and Armies should be in good condition. I sometimes think the best preparation for war is a united people. And when I remember that 20 men out of every 100 in our comparatively small Army are employed in keeping down Ireland, I am inclined to question the wisdom of the statesmanship of this country. My right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain), the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), and the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), have all shown great alarm as to the possible disruption of the British Empire. Now, do they believe in those alarms, or are they merely simulating? They do not act as if they believed in them. If they believe that at the next General Election there is some reasonable chance that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) may be brought back to power, and that his return to power would be followed by the disruption of the Empire, surely they would spend their days and nights in instructing the British people, in order that they might avoid so terrible a calamity. But what happens? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham goes and suns himself in the Mediterranean, leaving everything here in the dangerous condition which he says exists. I do not know — it may be possible he went to study the condition of the Ottoman Empire. Seeing that it has been subjected to so many disruptions, he may want to know what the disruption of an Empire meant. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale goes over to Rome. Well, it is a delightful place. When I was banished from this House in the last Parliament I also went to Rome, and enjoyed it very much. But the noble Marquess said the other day he was wanted to act as a guard at home, and he laid special stress upon the fact that he would be here to keep charge. He took with him the right hon. Gentleman who sits opposite me (Mr. Chaplin), who also ought to have been doing something here to prevent the people going over that frightful chasm of which they speak whenever they make speeches on this subject. I believe these Gentlemen to whom I have referred will live to see the measure passed which they appear to regard with so much alarm; and I believe they will live to acknowledge that all those predictions of evils have followed the fate of all the predictions that have ever accompanied the passing of great legislative measures in this House.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) (Liverpool, Walton): Sir, anyone listening to this debate might suppose that we were still engaged in the debate of last summer. But the second stage of the Home Rule controversy is now reached. Since last summer the country has, by a considerable majority, pronounced a condemnation on the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), and the Government are bound to acquiesce in that decision. The country has pronounced in favour of the maintenance of the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland, yet speeches are now being made which are practically appeals for the Repeal of that Union. It was not incompetent for an association in Ireland to assert that certain laws of the country should not be obeyed, and that certain rights should not be enforced. I cannot but feel regret at certain observations that fell this evening from one whom I much respect. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) made some remarks in regard to social disorder in Ireland which were of a very dangerous character. The justification put forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian for Home Rule was the necessity of restoring social order in Ireland, and he pointed out the difficulty that there existed in getting juries to convict in cases of agrarian crime. Yet this evening the House has heard from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle a kind of condemnation which was really a justification and palliation of the Plan of Campaign, which has been decided by the Judges of the land to be illegal. The right hon. Gentleman remarked that two things could be said in favour of the Plan of Campaign—that it produced no substantial injustice, and that it was better to have a combination of this kind than murder and secret crime; but has the right hon. Gentleman made any inquiries which convinced himself that no injustice is done by this Plan of Campaign? Does he know anything of the circumstances under which the Plan of Campaign was adopted on the Marquess of Lansdowne's estate? But where is combination of this kind to stop? Are the Executive to permit any combination of men to set aside the decrees of the Courts of the country? If so, the supremacy of Parliament and the authority of the Government are at an end. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle laid stress on the fact that the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork was rejected. But he scarcely represented the circumstances under which that Bill was brought forward with correctness. At first the hon. Member for Cork suggested that three-fourths, then two-thirds, and then one-half of the rent should be paid under the Bill, so as to entitle the tenant to a compulsory credit and a stay of proceedings against him. The Government resisted it as unfair and unnecessary, and calculated to jeopardize the recovery of the other half of the year's rent. No doubt there has been a fall in prices and a strain upon the tenants; but, as has been pointed out by my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland, during the month of October, after the rejection of the Bill, rents were fairly well paid all over Ireland until the Plan of Campaign was started. The speeches which have been delivered by hon. Members opposite in Ireland plainly show that this Plan of Campaign was primarily intended to be used as a political instrument. If there was such a crisis among the tenants as to require the Plan of Campaign, how is it that the fact was altogether unknown to the trusted Leader of the Nationalist Party, who so late as the 22nd of December last stated that he did not propose to express any opinion, as he had not been consulted with regard to it? Is it not manifest that the hon. Member for Cork has held aloof on purpose, because it was seen that this was a very questionable and dangerous move, and because it was desired to preserve the appearance of strict Constitutionalism? Only a very limited number of the Party have thought it well to take an open part in the agitation, and certainly some of the most prominent Members of the troupe have not performed at all. That is one of the circumstances which induces me to believe that the alleged danger of the situation caused by the rejection of the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork has been, to some extent, exaggerated. On the 25th of January the hon. Member for North Wexford (Mr. J. E. Redmond), addressing a meeting in the County Tipperary, said that he "had told their kinsmen at Chicago that the very laws of Nature themselves would prevent the possibility of a peaceful winter in Ireland." That statement or prophecy was made in the month of August, before the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork was introduced, and before it could be known what the fate of that Bill would be, or what would be the nature of the reforms proposed; and I cannot help thinking that some of the unkind feeling which has sprung up between landlord and tenant in Ireland is owing to the language of warfare which has been used in this question. The hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), in addressing a meeting at Killorglin, explained to those present that there were men in Ireland who are well able to pay their rents, but who would not pay because he told them not to do so.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I did not say "well able." I said they were able to pay, but would not because I told them not to do so.

MR. GIBSON: They were able to pay, but would not, because the hon. Member told them not to do so. This certainly goes to show that there was a feeling of expectation on the part of several, at least, of the Irish Members, that social disorder and trouble might spring up in Ireland in the coming winter, and that this disorder and trouble would not be altogether unfavourable to Home Rule. I understood the hon. Member for East Mayo to say, on the previous night, that the Plan of Campaign was not pressed by him, or by other Members of the Party, on the tenants, but that the tenants first combined, and then came to him to obtain advice and assistance. This, however, does not agree with the speeches which the hon. Member and others of the Party have made in Ireland, for they had over and over again directly urged the tenants to adopt the Plan of Campaign. I was surprised to hear the late Chief Secretary give utterance to such a doubtful note in reference to the Plan of Campaign. One of the circumstances which has led to difficulty in Ireland at the present time is that hon. Members below the Gangway opposite are preaching a doctrine as to juries, which is absolutely subversive of all Constitutional law. Sir, the hon. Member opposite thinks, obviously, that the jurors lay down the law. On the other hand, it is an emphatic principle of our law that both what is legal and what is illegal must be decided not by debates in this House, or by the verdicts of juries, but by the Courts of the land; and if they do not ascertain and lay down the law, I am at a loss to know upon what the Constitution rests. The practice is for juries to accept the law from the Judge; but if it is to be laid down, as by hon. Members opposite, that juries are not to be guided in the law by the Judges, but are to find verdicts even against the law as interpreted by the Judge, the result will certainly be disastrous to the cause of law and order in the country. The right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary said to-night that much of the unpopularity attending the administration of the law by the Executive in Ireland is occasioned by the predominance of Law Officers. He said that one of the circumstances which made the high-souled people of Ireland recalcitrate and kick was that they were bullied, lectured, and dominated by lawyers. In order to avoid that difficulty the Government, of which the right hon. Gentleman was a Member, came into this House and endeavoured to govern Ireland without any Law Officers at all. Now, is it surprising that the delicate and tender susceptibilities of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway should be ruffled by the odious presence of men who may have to prosecute them on a subsequent occasion? [An hon. MEMBER: Emigrate them.] I have called attention to the active part taken by a select number of the Leaders of the Irish Party in recommending and pressing the Plan of Campaign, and I am not quite certain whether that Plan had not something to do with the unfortunate incidents which have occurred at Glenbeigh. ["No!"] I will tell hon. Members opposite why it is I say this. I have a very accurate memory, and I remember reading a statement in *The Freeman's Journal* that a flag was exhibited at Glenbeigh, and that on that flag were inscribed the words "The Plan of Campaign."

MR. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.): Perhaps the hon. and learned Gentleman will allow me to say——

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. and learned Gentleman is in possession of the House.

MR. GIBSON: The view taken by Judge Curran in the letter which he wrote to the Bishop of Killarney, and which has been published, is a view which many Members will adopt. He said—

> "I believe that the poor Glenbeigh tenants are sacrificed to keep alive the agitation in Kerry."

That was the view of Judge Curran, who did his best to protect the tenants from excited and suicidal counsels when he brought about an agreement which was favourable to them and merciful beyond example. But that agreement was broken through, and became useless. Now, as to the administration of justice and juries in Ireland, of which we have heard a good deal. I recollect, in the first place, that the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), in the Home Rule speech which he delivered in April last, distinctly put before the House that, from the unfortunate circumstances which existed in Ireland, it was hard to get juries to do their duty, though we all know that they are sworn to do it upon the evidence. We know that evil influences do exist, and even when juries are fair and are willing to do justice between man and man, without affection or partiality, in many cases, owing to commercial pressure, and owing to intimidation, they do not dare to do their duty. In these circumstances, it was the duty of everyone who conducted Crown prosecutions in Ireland—and it has been the duty of the Government of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian and of the late Chief Secretary—when a jury was impanelled, to see that men were selected who were independent and fearless, and not men who had made up their minds on one side or the other. But the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary appeared to me to-night to convey that there is something new, and something dangerous and unjustifiable in what has been done by Her Majesty's present Government in Ireland, since they have succeeded to Office. What has been done by them was done also by the Administration of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian. The right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary will recollect that in the powerful State paper issued by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), before the election in the summer of 1885, one of the weightiest charges which he brought against the late Prime Minister was the great jury-packing which had prevailed under his Administration. [Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: Hear, hear!] I see that the hon. Member cheers that statement, so that I am perfectly accurate in my recollection.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): It is always done.

MR. GIBSON: The difficulty is one which must be faced; there is no use in the Crown putting prisoners upon their trial before a jury who have determined, *per fas aut nefas*, to acquit, or who will not fearlessly resist external influences. But with respect to the alleged jury-packing at Sligo, I would call attention to some of the articles in the newspapers. I do not know whether hon. Members have heard of an article in *United Ireland* called "Jurors upon their Trial." Shortly before the Sligo Assizes it was boldly and distinctly laid down that the prisoners then in gaol were innocent men, who ought to be acquitted, and whose conviction would be regarded as an outrage upon the people. And actually in one of the articles there was an intimation that the names of jurors who acted in a particular way would be published and held up to public odium. That was too much apparently for a Home Ruler of the name of Rollestone, who wrote a letter on the subject to *United Ireland.* In reply to it, the editor wrote this note by way of comment—

> "In a self-governed Ireland it would, of course, be intolerable that men should not be allowed to differ in the jury box and everywhere else. But in the state of chaotic rule to which Ireland is reduced everyone that is not with us is against us, and must expect to be dealt with accordingly. That is not liberty, but it is the way of winning it—the only way in our power."

It is said that the Sligo verdicts were not just and righteous verdicts. Is there anyone who professes any knowledge of law, and who knows the facts that were proved in these cases, who will say that the verdicts were not just and righteous verdicts? The accused men had occupied a house by force, and they resisted the police by pouring hot water and lime upon them, and at length it was found necessary to bring up a siege train in order to enable the police to force their way in. No matter what the moral guilt of the accused was—I am not going to refer to that now—but can there be the slightest doubt of their legal criminality? The learned and eminent Judge who tried the case, and who has often received the encomiums of hon. Members opposite—Chief Baron Palles—fully approved of the verdict which the jury returned, and said that it was the only one that an upright and conscientious jury could give. To show what has been the result of a considerable "stand aside" in some cases, where the jury has consisted entirely of Protestants—to show the impartiality and fairness with which the juries have acted —I may say that all the accused have not been convicted. Tully was tried by a jury who were all Protestants, and he was not convicted; and in other cases there were disagreements. [*Ironical Home Rule cheers.*] Hon. Members opposite below the Gangway do not appear to understand the point of my observations. The suggestion, as I understand it, is that the Crown has selected the juries in order to obtain convictions. [*Home Rule cries of* "Hear, hear!"] Yes; but the juries which it is alleged have been selected did not convict—they acquitted many prisoners, and recommended others to mercy. I am not going to-night at length to justify what has been done in Sligo, because I believe that matter will be brought before the House on another occasion; but I will say a word or two as to the occurrence at Tyrone to which the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) referred. The hon. Member asserted that, in a case where the prisoner was charged with the murder of a policeman or of a soldier, the jury did not do their duty. I was not concerned in the case myself; I was at Cork at the time. But the hon. Member was wrong in saying that, in that case, there was no "stand aside," because there was a stand aside. The jury at the Tyrone Assizes, who have received the encomium of the Judge for having convicted fearlessly in all the cases up to this particular trial, did not in this case follow the charge of the learned Judge, who directed that the prisoner was guilty of a legal murder. The jury considered that the circumstances showed that the offence was committed in hot blood, and they were anxious to bring in a verdict of manslaughter. Neither did they acquit the prisoner, but they disagreed.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): The hon. and learned Gentleman is misrepresenting what I said. What I said was that in Sligo, whereas the Crown exercised its power of ordering jurors to stand aside, to the extent of setting aside about 20 or 30 Catholic jurors, and by that means securing a jury of Protestants in the North of Ireland, they did not exercise that power of ordering jurors to stand aside, as against the Protestants, but allowed an Orangeman to try an Orangeman.

MR. GIBSON: In all the cases in the North of Ireland to which I have referred, verdicts were found in accordance with the summing up of the learned Judge, except in the particular case of this murder. The hon. Member has complained of the change of venue in the case of "The Queen *v.* Dillon." I will make no observation on that case for obvious reasons. It is not for the House of Commons to discuss the wisdom of the action of the Crown in a pending prosecution; and I have no desire to turn the House of Commons into a Court of Appeal to re-try the case. But this I will say—that the Act of Parliament under which the change of venue was obtained is not an obsolete Act, but an Act which applies equally to England as to Ireland, and was passed for Ireland in order to assimilate the Irish to the English law. It was put in force at least six months ago in the Dublin

Commission Court, on which occasion the venue of a case which had been sent for trial in the City of Dublin was changed to the County of Dublin. [An hon. MEMBER: What case?] It was the York Street case. There was another charge made against the Government by the hon. Member for East Mayo—namely, that there was unnecessary delay on the part of the Crown in obtaining a declaration by a Court of Law that the Plan of Campaign was illegal; but that is a curious complaint to come from hon. Members below the Gangway, for the simple reason that, ever since the Plan of Campaign was declared to be illegal, they have persistently defied the Court. ["No!"] I say "Yes." The language which hon. Members below the Gangway opposite have been using throughout the country is that the jury must decide the question of law; and the hon. Member for East Mayo, after denouncing the judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench, went on to assert that, in apostolic succession to other Judges in error, Judge Fitzgerald was altogether in error in the judgment which he gave. The course pursued by hon. Members opposite has caused grave mischief and injury to public and social order in Ireland. I have no desire to refer in detail to matters which have accentuated the danger to social order; but I will merely point to the wretched case where, for some small offence against the law of the League, some ruffians broke into a house, cut off the hair of the girls in it, and poured tar upon their heads. Nor am I going to enter upon the case of Moroney, a tradesman on the O'Grady estate, who was committed to trial by the Judge of the Bankruptcy Court for contempt, and was serenaded on his way to prison. [*Cheers from the Home Rule Members.*] And he is getting, apparently, an afterclap of that serenade in this House tonight. Something has been said about the action which has been taken by my friend Judge Curran in Kerry. I do not know whether hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite are personally acquainted with Judge Curran, or whether the late Chief Secretary is acquainted with him; but I have been acquainted with him ever since he has been at the Bar, and I know no more honourable or more upright and resolute man, or one who unites such great faculties of the brain with large-heartedness and sympathetic feeling. In doing what he did in Kerry, Judge Curran acted upon his own responsibility as a Judge, having no one to account to but his own conscience. Whether he was right or wrong in his action, hon. Members opposite below the Gangway ought to be the last to complain of Judge Curran, for he has acted in the interests of the tenants of Kerry. Why is it those hon. Members attempt to throw ridicule and contempt upon Judge Curran and General Buller for what has been done by them in Kerry? What they have done was for the benefit of the tenants, who have received substantial advantage from their action. But I fear that one of the reasons why hon. Members denounce Judge Curran now, is in order to prevent him from being regarded by the people as that which he is—an upright, just, and merciful Judge. He has been described in terms of a very ambiguous character by the hon. Members opposite; but if there is any man who is a thorough Irishman, and speaks with Irish voice, it is Judge Curran. Yet he has been described as a Cadi coming from the East, and unable to speak the language of his native land. There is one point to which I wish to call the attention of the House, and it is that not one single authentic instance has been adduced by hon. Members opposite, in which full enforcement of the decrees of the Court has not been carried out. There may have been delay, for it was requisite, before carrying out a writ of ejectment, to make arrangements for the attendance of the necessary number of police. Nothing could be worse or more dangerous than failure in the enforcement of decrees, where it is known that they are likely to be resisted; and to carry out the decrees of the Court it is necessary to make arrangements beforehand, as there are only a limited number of police in any particular spot. The hon. Member for East Mayo last night said that one of the great evils from which Ireland suffers results from the congested districts, and that all of them are to be found on the poor lands, while the good lands are comparatively thinly populated; and he went on to say that the unequal distribution results from bad English law, and would be got rid of if Ireland were free. This state of affairs, I imagine, is not the result of any special laws, unless economic laws can be considered special legislation. I do not gather from the hon. Member's remarks that he proposes any remedy; the only clue he gave being that if Ireland were free, men in the congested districts would make their way down to the rich lands. By what process they would perform that operation, whether by Act of Parliament or otherwise, was not explained by the hon. Member. For my own part, I am at a loss to understand how this economic difficulty in Ireland is to be got rid of by merely making Ireland free. The right hon. Member for Mid Lothian, in introducing his Land Act in 1881, pointed out that one of the main circumstances to be kept in view, as indicating the condition and greater prosperity of the Irish tenants, was the diminution of the smaller holdings, and the increase of the larger holdings, and more especially of those of 15 acres to 30, and those of 30 acres to 50. They are both largely increasing, while the smaller holdings are decreasing. Everyone interested in the prosperity of Ireland would rejoice to see the tenants of Ireland obtain holdings of larger size. We do not want enormous holdings, but good-sized ones; but I fear that is a matter which must be dealt with by the play of economic interests, as it is very difficult, if not impossible, to prevent a farmer holding a farm of any number of acres by legislation dealing with the aggregation of property. No doubt it would be very desirable that the tenants in the congested districts should be moved to better places, by means of purchase or otherwise, to be provided for by emigration. The hon. Member for North Mayo told us that any scheme even of emigration would be regarded as extermination by the unfortunate tenants. I was sorry to hear that from the hon. Member; for if anything will be plain by the close of this debate it is that the Land Question in Ireland is the very kernel and heart of the Irish Question. The hon. Member is quite right when he says that it is the Land Question which must be dealt with and solved. The present Government, who made its first announcement in Office in August last, did not come into Office as a Government of repression which intended to grind down and oppress the Irish people. I think the House will recollect that we came in with a programme which promised so much and went so far that some hon. Members opposite were induced to suggest that it was an impossible programme, and that the promises which were made could not be realized. All I can say is, that the necessity for strengthening the existing law has been forced upon the Government, and forced upon them, I regret to say, by an agitation which was hardly justified under the circumstances. There is one thing the Unionist Party on both sides of the House must recognize, and that is that we are under a very great responsibility—that of securing the supremacy of Parliament, and seeing that the laws of this Parliament are enforced in all parts of the United Kingdom. In *The Freeman's Journal*, yesterday, I read a speech made by Mr. O'Brien, at Roscommon, which represents the exact antithesis of what I maintain must be the policy of the Government. He said—"From shore to shore of this island the law of the League must be the law of the land." That is what no Government, worthy of the name, can allow. No law except the Queen's law must be enforced or set up in Ireland; and we, the Unionist Party in the House of Commons, are bound to see that the supremacy of Parliament is not a nominal and illusory phantom, but a substantial fact, as the people of the United Kingdom intended it should be at the last General Election. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) not only contains an incorrect representation of fact, but recommends as a solution of the Irish difficulty a measure which has already been condemned. The time of the House is the property of the nation, and as long as this Parliament remains, and until it is dissolved, that time ought to be devoted to the interests of the subjects of the Queen. I am very sorry to have heard this evening from the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley) the dismal and hopeless view, that at the very threshold of the new Parliament we are to give up all hope, that we are in a leaden atmosphere, and that we cannot remove in this Parliament what for years has been the standing obstruction to Public Business. That is a hopeless and dismal proposition to make.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne): What I said was, that we should not be able to remove this obstacle now, unless we dealt with the great obstacle to legislative progress—not Obstruction, but the non-existence of free government in Ireland.

Mr. GIBSON: I accept the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman used the word "obstruction," which, no doubt, led to the misunderstanding. We must, however, keep this broad fact before us, that we are the Council of the country, and that the country is watching to see what the speeches and action of the different Members who compose it will be. I submit that the time of the House is very unprofitably expended in discussions raising over again the issue of Home Rule, which was decided at the last Election. If each night we are to have a fresh discussion as to whether Home Rule is the only panacea for all the wrongs of Ireland, the rest of the Kingdom will not consider it fair political warfare. The right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland has considered that one of the great recommendations of Home Rule was that it would make the Members of the British Parliament masters in their own House, and that that cannot be as long as hon. Gentlemen opposite occupy their present position. I do not adopt that view; but I hope that in the course of time, and seeing the fair play they get here, the Members from Ireland will become quite as willing and cheerful Members of the House of Commons as anyone in it. The most humorous remark made by the right hon. Gentleman in the course of his speech was the observation he made about the attitude assumed by the Unionist Party in lecturing and sermonizing the Irish Members. It appears to me that it is all the other way, and that it is the Irish Members who are constantly standing in the judgment seat and denouncing, not always with moderation, successive English Ministers, setting forth to the country that they should at once get upon the stool of repentance and admit their faults. The Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork is inaccurate in its statement of facts, is one it is quite impossible for us to admit, and recommends a policy which has already been decisively pronounced upon and condemned by the country.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I must congratulate the hon. and learned Gentleman upon being in better spirits than he was when I last saw him gliding away in a railway carriage from a station in the city a portion of which I have the honour to represent. I have no wish, however, to be ill-natured; and, therefore, I will proceed at once to congratulate the hon. and learned Gentleman on the speech he has made in defence of the Government. But, without wishing to be disrespectful towards him, I would say that the subject we are debating here to-night is of far too serious and too broad a character to be treated in the *Nisi Prius* manner in which the hon. and learned Gentleman has approached it. He has found fault with many of the statements of my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), and the way in which he has dealt with them is certainly calculated to produce an entirely false impression. Let me give an example. The hon. Gentleman has defended the change of venue in the case of the trial of my hon. Friend who sits beside me, which is, I believe, to come on on Monday next. He says that changes of venue similar to the one complained of have occurred frequently during the last six months; but he did not, until he was interrogated by my hon. Friend the Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton), give any information as to the cases in which it had taken place. My hon. Friend asked him to name a case in which a change of venue had taken place from the City of Dublin, where political feeling is mixed, to the County of Dublin, where the jurors are almost exclusively landlords. The hon. and learned Gentleman then named the York Street case. The hon. Gentleman evidently presumed on the ignorance of the English Members, for what was the York Street case? It was a change from a City jury to a County jury in the case of an Orangeman who was accused of firing a shot into a crowd in the City of Dublin out of the window of an Orange Club; and it is easy to understand why a Government, partly consisting of Orangemen, and largely supported by Orangemen, desired to transfer the trial of an Orangeman from a City to a County jury. [An hon. Member: He was acquitted!] Of course he was acquitted. I did not think it necessary to inform the House of that fact. Every hon. Gentleman in this House must have known perfectly well, when I stated the kind of action taken by the Government, the course they adopted, and the character of the prisoner, what the result must have been. The transfer of the case from the City jury to the County jury in the case of the Orangeman was to procure an acquittal; and the transfer of the case of my hon. Friend from the City jury to the County jury is to procure a conviction; and the action in both the one case and the other is tinged with equal criminality. Now, Sir, let me take one or two more of the observations of the hon. and learned Gentleman. He asks the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley) whether he personally acquainted himself with the estates in Ireland where the Plan of Campaign was adopted; and the hon. and learned Gentleman, whose elocution leaves nothing to be desired, laid particular stress on the word "personal." The moment he uttered these words there resounded through the House, from another master of elocution—namely, the hon. Member for Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin)—an emphatic "Hear, hear!" [An hon. MEMBER: He is right hon.!] I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. I see him sitting on the Bench below the Gangway opposite; were he on the Treasury Bench such a mistake as that into which I have fallen it would not have been so easy to make. I would take this opportunity of condoling with the right hon. Gentleman on his recent misfortunes. I am sure he is a good deal better fitted to be on the Treasury Bench than some who have seats there. I observe that the right hon. Gentleman has been taking copious notes during the debate, and what I want to ask him with his "Hear, hear!" still ringing in my ears, is this, whether he is prepared to pronounce an opinion upon every case to which he himself has not devoted an attentive personal examination? I am not sure whether my country has ever had the honour of a visit from the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I have been there often.

An hon. MEMBER: To Punchestown!

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: Yes, Punchestown! The hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland said that the rents were paid regularly in October, and the suggestion he made to the House was that they would have been paid with continued regularity had it not been for the continued intervention of the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) and the Plan of Campaign. It is true that rents were paid regularly in some cases in October, but surely the hon. and learned Gentleman, who has an intimate personal acquaintance with Ireland, knows very well that the number of rentals paid there in October are a very small portion of the entire rentals. October is not one of the special rent paying months. November is the great rent paying month, and the rents that were paid in October were a small portion of all the rents in Ireland, and were paid upon those large estates, on which, partly owing to the encouragement of the Government, good and reasonable landlords had already given very considerable reductions. Rents were well paid on estates like those of the Duke of Devonshire, the Earl of Devon and others, such landlords as were under the pressure of the Government giving tenants those reasonable abatements which in England are matters of right, but in Ireland are characterized as acts of generosity on the part of the landlord. Let me say one or two other words as to the hon. and learned Gentleman's speech. He said the Plan of Campaign had something to do with the evictions at Glenbeigh. I give a most emphatic contradiction to that. The case of Glenbeigh arose naturally and spontaneously. The hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) has pledged himself, and I am sure there is not a Member on either side of the House who doubts his statement, that he never heard of the Glenbeigh case until the cruel evictions and burnings were in progress. The hon. and learned Gentleman says there was a banner displayed at Glenbeigh bearing the words "Plan of Campaign." So there was. On the second or third day of the evictions a banner bearing those words was, I understand, raised over one of the houses, but the evictions had begun, and this small tittle of evidence of the banner is the only thing the hon. and learned Gentleman is able to give in proof of his statement that the Glenbeigh evictions were aggravated and accelerated by the action of the National League. No, Sir, the National League had nothing to do with it: the Plan of

Campaign had nothing to do with it either. These evictions stand isolated by themselves, entirely separated from the general movement in Ireland. Now, I come to the question of jury packing. I am glad the hon. and learned Gentleman and the right hon. and learned Gentleman his Colleague have taken a manlier attitude than was taken up by some of their Predecessors—Liberals though they were called. The hon. and learned Gentleman has avowed jury-packing; he has defended jury-packing, and now the question no longer remains for discussion in this House whether or not there is jury-packing in Ireland. That question has already passed beyond the region of dispute, and the question now is whether or not jury-packing is under any circumstances justifiable. The hon. and learned Gentleman made allusion to the attitude which hon. Gentlemen on these Benches, including myself, took up in regard to the action of the late Government in Ireland. Does the hon. and learned Gentleman think we have changed our opinion as to that? We condemned coercion when it was carried out by Lord Spencer and his Law Officers; we condemn it still. We have never said a single syllable to lead anyone to believe that our opinions in that respect have changed one iota or jot. If the fight with Lord Spencer had to begin again to-morrow, he occupying his old ground, and we standing in our old position, there would be no lack of vehemence and energy in our resistance and in the protest we should make. I would point out that in the first place I dislike to see any question of importance and gravity of the Irish Question degraded down to a miserable *tu quoque* between the two sides of this House. What I wish to say to the hon. and learned Gentleman is this: he is precluded from using the action of Lord Spencer and the late Irish Government as offering him a precedent in the present action of Her Majesty's Ministers. Lord Spencer tried coercion in Ireland, the Law Officers of the Crown under Lord Spencer packed juries—not quite so shamelessly as the present Government, but they did pack them. But has not Lord Spencer come before the country and the world, and with a frankness and manliness which have softened the memories of the struggle, acknowledged that the system, of which he was the most able exponent, was a mistaken system, and that Ireland could not be governed by coercion? To jury-packing and the other mean and miserable resorts the Conservative Government of a freely governed country like England, with all her traditions of freedom, is obliged to resort in the administration of the affairs of a country lying so close to her doors as Ireland. Such obsolete and rusty weapons as jury-packing are still to be availed of, although they have been given up by Liberal statesmanship and never more will form a portion of the armoury of a good Government. When the hon. and learned Gentleman appeals to Lord Spencer as a precedent he ought to add that such weapons as this Lord Spencer, having used and tested them, has been the first to most strongly and vehemently condemn. I remember one of the cases of jury-packing in Sligo to which reference has been made. It has been pointed out that a Catholic was allowed to be on the jury. Yes, but who was this Catholic? He was a landlord whose tenants were engaged in the consideration of, if they had not actually adopted, the Plan of Campaign. And, Sir, is it not an abuse of words and a contradiction of all accepted ideas of trial by jury when you put into the box to try a prisoner a man of a different class, of different politics, and a bitter enemy in the present bitter and social struggle? Why, Sir, it is gross unfairness. Now the Government had transferred the case of my hon. Friend from the City jury to the County jury in Dublin. Everyone knows what the character of the County jury in Dublin is. The jury is one in which the vast majority belong to the landlord class. It has upon it landlords, who at the present moment, in many cases are suffering from the Plan of Campaign, and who regard my hon. Friend as its author as little less iniquitous than the author of all evil. These landlords are suffering in their pockets; and to put my hon. Friend upon his trial before a jury composed of men like that, is, to use a very well-known simile, like trying a cow by a jury of butchers. Let me bring before the House this fact. There are 250 men on the panel altogether. Of these my hon. Friend will have the power of peremptorily challenging but six, which leaves 244 at the disposal of the Government prosecution, and I think I am within my right in saying that of these 244, something like 200 are friends of the Government, and may be relied upon to give a verdict. The property qualification to be a member of the jury of the County of Dublin is £40. The reason why this jury has been selected is told in the columns of *The Times* newspaper. On January 25, the well-known Dublin correspondent of that journal said—

> "The report that the Crown intended to apply for a change of *venue* for the trial of the defendants charged with conspiracy is not correct. No such intention is entertained. The trial will take place in the Commission Court, Green Street, but the bills will be sent to the grand jury of the County, instead of the City, of Dublin: a very necessary and proper arrangement in order to obtain a better panel."

Now, what Dr. Patton, the Orange editor of *The Dublin Express*, considers a "better panel" I leave it to the intelligence of any Member of this House to imagine. Sir, they will try next week to convict my hon. Friends by a packed jury of their bitterest political enemies. I put it to hon. Members on this side of the House: it has been complained that the law is not respected in Ireland, but the way in which the law is administered has a good deal to do with the feelings entertained towards it by those who are subject to it. You can make even a good law an object of dislike if you administer it impurely and unfairly. Is not the law which tries a patriotic man by juries of their political opponents, carefully packed, a law utterly dishonest, and to say that so long as law is administered in this manner in Ireland you can expect the Irish people to honour, or have any devotion to, the law, is as much as to say that you might fairly expect a man to admire the noble sport of horse-racing if introduced to it in a stable of blacklegs on the Derby course. I am astonished that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland is in such excellent spirits to-night. It seems to me there is not a Member of the Government who ought not to appear in the Parliamentary equivalent for sack-cloth and ashes, because never in recent history has there been a better illustration of the fallacy of the mode of governing Ireland, adopted by English Governments, than we have had of late. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, speaking from the Ministerial Bench some months ago, declared that rents could be paid in Ireland, and that reduction in the prices of agricultural produce was an invention of our wicked imaginations.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I never said that.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: Then why did the right hon. Gentleman oppose the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork? Our whole case was founded on reduction of prices, and the opposition of the Government to the Bill was based on the contention that prices had not been reduced.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I could not help interrupting the hon. Member, because he stated what was directly contrary to the fact. I never stated in this House that prices had not fallen.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: Then why did not the right hon. Gentleman support the Bill? The fall of prices, which, he now admits, means a reduction of the ability of the tenants to pay rent, and the Bill of my hon. Friend dealt with cases of clear inability to pay rent. Yet, the right hon. Gentleman, admitting that prices had fallen, and that the tenants were, consequently, less able to pay rent, rejected the Bill for their relief. I will leave the House to draw its own inference from that—I refrain from going through the whole ABC of political economy and logic to convince the right hon. Gentleman of inconsistency, for I should be all night on the point. I am unable to reconcile his admission that prices had fallen with his contention—as manifested in his rejection of my hon. Friend's Bill—that tenants were just as well able to pay rent as they were when prices had not fallen. Why does not the right hon. Gentleman get up and declare candidly that his policy and statement and arguments were all incorrect? Well, perhaps that is an unreasonable thing to expect. I must say, Sir, I have been very much pained to observe the high point which equivocation has reached in this House. Is there a man on either side of the House that has the least doubt in his mind that the Government have been bringing all the pressure they can command to bear upon the landlords of Ireland in order to induce them to give generous reductions of rent? The right hon. Gentleman says they used pressure "within the law." He will pardon me for saying that he is guilty of confusion and contradiction of phrases. There is no such thing as "pressure within the law" for preventing a man from doing that which he has a perfect legal right to do; and when the right hon. Gentleman confessed to the House the use of pressure, he thereby stood confessed to us of an illegal act. The right hon. Gentleman gets up and asks us to give proof of the pressure. He thinks we blame him. Well, I must say the right hon. Gentleman generally misrepresents our case against him. We do not blame him for having used pressure against the landlords. We admire him for having done it; we appraise him for it. In the difficult position in which his policy had placed him, no doubt he adopted the best course he could adopt by putting pressure upon the landlords. What we do find fault with the right hon. Gentleman for is, for having "done good by stealth and blushed to find it fame"—we find fault with him because his whole effort now is to try and blind the public to the fact of the pressure that he used in order to make the landlords give an abatement of rent. He asks us to prove the statement that he has brought pressure to bear upon the landlords. He says that the Government only used arguments and reasoning and representations for the purpose of securing agreement with his views; but are not arguments used by the Governor of a country with 30,000 soldiers at his back, with 13,000 police under his orders, very likely to be construed into commands, especially when used to a class that depends for its very existence on the Government of the day? The fact is, every man in his senses knows that the only difference between the Chief Secretary and the hon. Member for East Mayo is this—that one adopted the system of making private representations to the landlords; whilst the other adopted the system of public representations—both systems being adopted for precisely the same object. Now, a good many analogies have been used with regard to the Plan of Campaign, and I am rather afraid to venture on the ground of analogy; still I will say this, that it appears to me to be admitted by everyone that the Irish tenant is now part owner of the soil with the landlord. That is admitted not only on this side, but it is the basis of the complaints made on the other side, of the House. I think the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), or some other Member on the Conservative side, said a few nights ago that the landlords had been deprived of all their rights. I think it was the hon. and gallant Gentleman who said that, but I may be mistaken; it may have been said by an hon. Member of a less Liberal turn of mind than the hon. and gallant Gentleman. At any rate it is contended on the other side of the House—and the statement is cheered by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin)—that the Irish landlords had been deprived of all their rights by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). What does that mean? If hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite think that the landlords of Ireland have been deprived of their rights, and that what has been taken from them has been given to the tenants, they agree with us in thinking that the landlord is not the sole proprietor of the land, but has been rendered, through what they consider unjust legislation, only part proprietor. Well, I contend that the proper analogy to extend to the case of landlord and tenant in Ireland, so far as their connection with the soil is concerned, is an analogy drawn from partnership in a common business. I would ask any business man in the House—even any hon. Gentleman on the other side—whether, if he were in partnership with another person, he would think it fair that at the end of the year one partner should have all the profits, whilst the other should be asked to bear all the losses? I contend, in this analogy, that the action of the landlords who refuse abatements to their tenants is the action of fraudulent partners in a common firm who endeavour to take all the profits to themselves, and leave all the losses to those with whom they are associated in business. The Plan of Campaign was adopted for the purpose of making an equitable division of profits between the two parties. I do not deny that it was a very rough-and-ready method, but it was not quite as rough, not quite as ready, as that of Judge Curran or of Captain Plunkett, who actually made a division of profits on a farm he had never seen; whereas in the Plan of Campaign the division was made by men who had satisfied themselves of the justice of the case by making what the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland would call an intimate personal acquaintance with the land. But I am not concerned this moment in discussing the question of legality. That will come before a tribunal in the course of a few days. What I do contend is that, if there was illegality in the Plan of Campaign, so was there also illegality in the action of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary; and what I charge against him is that he has substituted an illegal remedy for the legal remedy offered to him last Session by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork. The Bill of the hon. Member proposed to remove the question of rent from the partizanship of landlord and tenant—it acknowledged that both these persons were too deeply interested to be fair judges, and referred the question to the impartial judgment of a legal tribunal. The Government rejected that Bill, and they have found themselves left to the rough-and-ready method I have described, of endeavouring to bring about the object that measure had in view. Let the responsibility rest with them for adopting an illegal method of doing that which we offered them legal means of effecting. I do not think I need deal further with the question of migration. Migration, of all the problems for relieving the congested districts in Ireland, is the most difficult and delicate to carry out. The objections to this remedy are many. It would afford abundant opportunity for jobbery and favouritism, and would require most careful attention and a most intimate acquaintance with the wants and wishes of the people, in those entrusted with the execution of such a project. Intimate attention would have to be paid to the feelings of the people about to be moved, and the feelings of the people who were not intending to emigrate; and I maintain that such a project is one which could only be carried out with even a moderate degree of success by a Native Government, acquainted with all the wants of the people. Then we have the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), and other Liberal Unionists, declaring that if you settle the Land Question you will get rid of the National Question. I regard it as a very statesmanlike suggestion which came from the hon. and gallant Gentleman, that the ultimate solution of the Irish Question rested with the Irish people. I interpret that as implying that the Irish Question will never be solved until the Irish people accept the form of Government which is offered to them.—["No, no."]—Well, if that is not so, I do not know what the ultimate solution of the Irish Question resting with the Irish people means. But the hon. and gallant Gentleman, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) think that directly the Land Question is settled the National Question will disappear. That is our antiquated notion. I remember the time when Nationalists used the argument that every concession, every relief, given to the Irish tenant injured the National cause. I remember—I think it was in 1869—hearing a speech by the late Isaac Butt, in which he argued at great length the question as to whether any step in the direction of reforming the Land Laws would, or would not, do more to retard the establishment of National self-government in Ireland than anything else. He argued the question this and that way to disprove the fact that if you gave the tenant fixity of tenure you would make him a bad Irishman and a bad patriot. But has not that matter been settled within the last few years? In 1871, and 1881, Land Acts were passed, but have the tenant farmers become worse patriots? Are they not more intense Irishmen and Nationalists than ever? Has not your improvement of the condition of the tenant farmer strengthened the National cause — strengthened the farmer in his devotion to that cause? Why, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) would not have 85 Members at his back to-day if it were not for the land legislation of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian and the Ballot. If you want to use the Land Question for the purpose of putting down the National movement, you will have to adopt a different system to that you are at present practising. You will have to repeal all the Acts of land reform which have been passed in recent years, and restore the Irish peasant to the condition in which I have seen him myself, of a poor, shivering serf, who did not dare address the landlord with his head covered; who, when he went into the polling booth, was confronted by the agents of his master, and knew very well that if he did not vote as required it meant a notice to quit from his master. Unless you can bring back the condition of things of years ago; unless you can make the Irish tenant a serf once more, abolish the Land Acts, and put a stop to voting by Ballot, you will never be able to destroy the National cause. Then we are told there should be some system of land purchase. If I were an English Liberal or Conservative Member, I should oppose every measure of land purchase unaccompanied by self-government, for I imagine that every penny you give to Ireland for land purchase will be at the risk of the British Treasury. I speak quite plainly on this subject. Supposing you have a large scheme of land purchase in Ireland; supposing you enabled all the tenants to buy their farms with the assistance of the Exchequer, I imagine you would desire to have the money returned, and would attempt to collect it. I should like to see you do it without the assistance of a Native Legislative Body sitting in Dublin. The one solid guarantee against repudiation is the making of the liberties of Ireland hostages for the payment of the money; and if you had a Parliament in Ireland this object would be attained. You would have then every farmer in Ireland compelled, by his own conscience and honour, to be a sponsor and bail for his country, because the liberties of the country would be dependent upon its solvency, and every insolvent tenant would be regarded as a traitor to those liberties. But adopt a system of land purchase only, and I can imagine a large system of repudiation being preached by the apostles of Irish liberty for the purpose of compelling an Irish Parliament to be given to the Irish people. Therefore, I say that hon. Members who propose land purchase in Ireland without the accompaniment of self-government, are risking the treasure of this country in such a manner as I should be sorry to see. But we have hon. Members getting up at this stage of the debate, and saying that they would give self-government to Ireland on certain conditions. That was the statement of the hon. Member for Bath (Mr. Wodehouse), who reminds me of a phrase of George Eliot—that the human bosom is capable of containing at different times opposite propositions. The hon. Member says he is in favour of self-government for Ireland in case the Parliament in Dublin is made subject to the Imperial Parliament. Well, Sir, if that means that this Parliament has supreme and ultimate authority, then the hon. Gentleman and I are in agreement; and he ought to have voted for the second reading of the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). But if it means that every Act of the Parliament in Dublin, before it passes into law, must be re-discussed and re-debated and re-passed in the Imperial Parliament, then the hon. Member and I are at issue. What would that imply? Imagine the position which the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) would take up under such an arrangement; and I am sure the hon. and gallant Gentleman will live to see the day when he will take a very honourable and active part in it; but imagine the hon. and gallant Gentleman in an Irish Parliament of which no measure could become law until it was first discussed here. Why, the hon. and gallant Gentleman would not be satisfied with the petty platform in College Green; he would come to this platform, in order that he might give you the benefit of his eloquence. The proposal would mean then that every Bill of the slightest importance would first be dragged through the Irish Parliament and then through this House. But a Parliament which had no power to make law until its measures had been discussed in this House would be a beggarly and a sham Parliament, without strength or authority. And, then, what would be the case with the English Parliament? This House, as long as I have had a seat here, has been the victim of a vampire in the shape of of Irish debate. We Irish Members have done all the talking; and what is the fact that has brought rational men to consider that an Irish Parliament is necessary? It is that this never-ending Irish debate has been an obstacle in the way of English affairs and English legislation. But the consequence of the carrying out of the views of the hon. Member for Bath would be that there would be more Irish debate than before; it would go on from Session to Session; and, while you had an Irish Parliament without strength, you would have the English Parliament without peace; instead of one Parliament, there would be two paralyzed Parliaments. The Government is hopeless in this struggle. The Chief Secretary for Ireland to-night almost went out of his way to repudiate the statement of the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon). If I could read the heart of the right hon. Gentleman I believe I should find there difficulty, doubt, hesitation, and dread, not physical or moral, but dread of the difficulty and impossibility of the task he has undertaken. I think that, before long, the right hon. Gentleman will be convinced that the Irish Question is insoluble, except in one way, and that is by leaving it to be solved by the Irish people. What is the proposal of the Government? Does anyone suppose that they are going to propose any remedial measure for Ireland? I have never seen the time of the House wasted with such cordial assent on both sides as now; indeed, I may say that the Treasury Bench is thoroughly delighted with the waste of time which has relieved the impossible task of proposing remedial legislation for Ireland. What do the Government propose in the programme laid before the House? You do not like the word "coercion;" but the proposals you make are coercion. There has been a faint indication that the proposal you make will be extended to all parts of the country. Well, Sir, I am rather seduced by the prospect of a law against boycotting, intimidation, and bribery in England. I have seen a good deal of England; I know something of the circumstances which surround the political struggles of the country; and I will say that there is more boycotting, more intimidation, and more bribery in one English county, and under half-a-dozen habitations of the Primrose League in England, than there is in all the 32 counties of Ireland. I have heard Englishmen say that their blood boils at the instances of tyranny that have come to light—of men driven from town to town and from village to village by the agents and friends of landlords, because they dared to have the courage of their convictions, and to vote and speak in accordance with them. I should be curious to see the clause against boycotting tried in Leicestershire, Buckinghamshire, Lincolnshire, or some of the other counties of England; but everyone knows that if coercion were applied in Scotland and England in the same manner as it is carried out in Ireland, it would produce a revolt. But if it is not to include the three countries, I say it is a sham; and if there is one thing more detestable than another, it is the masking of despotic measures under Constitutional forms. I would remind the right hon. Baronet that he is not unacquainted with Ireland and its administration, or with coercion there; and I ask him this, Does he think he is going to succeed where so many others have failed? You are going to recur to coercion in Ireland; but do you think you can get a draftsman to draw up a more potent Bill than the last? Do you think you can get a man more able to carry out a Coercion Act than Lord Spencer? And yet that noble Lord has come home to say that that most stringent measure, the Crimes Act, was a failure. What will be the end of coercion in Ireland? You will put some of my hon. Friends in gaol, and hundreds or thousands of others, and you will suppress the National League; but will you be any nearer to the solution of the problem? Be assured that the ultimate solution must come from the people themselves; and will you be any the nearer to that solution by putting 1,000 or 2,000 Irishmen in gaol? You will not terrorize the Irish people. I am sure that the right hon. Baronet has got rid of that vainest of all dreams—that a people, who have fought as Irishmen have for nationality, will be cowed by poor Brummagem imitations of Cromwellianism. You will not succeed by coercion; and when your coercion has come to an end, there will be a stronger National Party than before, and you will have hatred and bitterness towards this country as the result of the terrible and odious policy which is recommended to this House by men who call themselves friends of the Union. We have approached a period which makes men's minds naturally take a retrospect over the memorable reign of the present Queen. I would ask the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland), if the loyalty and unity of those Colonies have not been purchased by the gift of self-government? Why, then, cannot you trust to the affections and the willing obedience of the Irish people, when self-government has been found to be a panacea for disloyalty and discontent elsewhere? Why not give Ireland a chance as well as Canada and Australia? Let the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland throw his Coercion Acts into the waste-paper basket of the Irish Office, and come forward with something worthy of the name of a scheme of self-government for Ireland, and I will promise that, at the end of the present year Her Majesty will reign over a united and a contented Empire.

Motion, made and Question proposed, 'That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Coleridge.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *Tomorrow.*

MOTIONS.

COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

The Select Committee on Public Accounts was *nominated* of—Mr. Baden-Powell, Mr. Barran, Sir Walter Barttelot, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Lane, Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Mason, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Salter, and Sir Richard Temple.—(*Mr. Jackson.*)

GLEBE LANDS BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Baggallay, Bill to amend the Law relating to the occupation of Glebe Lands by Incumbents in England, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Baggallay, Mr. Childers, Mr. John Talbot, and Mr. Tomlinson.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 162.]

House adjourned at twenty minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 9th February, 1887.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILL—*Ordered—First Reading*—Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment (No. 2) * [162].

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [TENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [7th February], proposed to the Question—[See page 84.]

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the 8th paragraph, to insert the words, "But humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the relations between the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland have not been seriously disturbed in the cases of those owners who have granted to their tenants such abatements of rents as are called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce, and that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is not to be found in increased stringency of criminal procedure, or in the pursuit of such novel, doubtful, and unconstitutional measures as have recently been taken by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland, but in such a reform of the Law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people."—(*Mr. Parnell*).

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Debate *resumed.*

AGRARIAN AFFAIRS (IRELAND).

MR. TUITE (Westmeath, N.) said he represented a county in which the Plan of Campaign was adopted in only two cases; but that was no evidence that the people over the rest of the county had been able either during the past season or preceding seasons to make the rent out of the land. To his own certain knowledge a large number of tenants in the County Westmeath had been obliged to draw upon their capital for the purpose of paying their rent. That capital was being reduced every year, and next year the people who had paid freely hitherto would not be able to pay one shilling, and would be obliged to seek salvation in the Plan offered to them. He claimed to belong to a county in which the first victory for the

Plan of Campaign was won—on the estate of Captain Dawson, in Westmeath. It had been stated in the House that the Plan was not willingly adopted by the tenants, but was forced upon them by Members of the Irish Party. Well, in the case to which he alluded, the adoption of the Plan was entirely due to the people themselves. The people went to the priest, represented to him the state of things on the estate, and asked him to accept the rents in trust to the landlord. He did so, and with what result? The landlord, who had previously refused any abatement, wrote to say that he would give the 20 per cent demanded by the tenants, and in some cases he gave as much as 30 and even 50 per cent. The other case in the County Westmeath in which the Plan of Campaign was adopted was on the estate of Lady Nugent. That lady had no voice at all on the estate, it being mortgaged up to the chin, and it was the mortgagees who had to be consulted—mortgagees whose desire, of course, was to extract the heaviest interest. The tenants now paid their rents hoping for better times and better legislation, but he feared very little better legislation was to be looked for from the present Ministry. They talked of the Commission which had been appointed. But the Irish people had had enough of Commissions. They had had the Devon Commission, which sat 40 years ago, and though they reported that the state of things in Ireland was a disgrace to civilization, no legislation on the subject followed for 30 years. It was now said that the Irish people were to be treated to further coercive legislation. In Westmeath they had had special gifts of that kind from that House. A particularly stringent Act was passed, but had it made the people more law-abiding or fond of English institutions, or had it brought about better feeling between landlord and tenant? Quite the contrary. During the sitting of the Select Committee on the State of Westmeath it was sworn that the landlords leagued themselves with the Riband Society—an excrescence which had grown out of the exterminations—in order to carry out those great clearances for which that county had been so celebrated. The people had gained sense since then, and that murderous conspiracy had disappeared, not on account of any coercive legislation, but on account of the teaching of the Nationalist Party, and of the spread of the National sentiment, which had led them to trust in Constitutional Reform. The first victim of the last coercive measure was the hon. Member for the Harbour Division of Dublin (Mr. T. Harrington), who was charged with inciting farmers against labourers. The Tory Party claimed credit to themselves for having reduced the number of outrages; but if evictions were permitted to take place in considerable numbers under their rule, they would soon find that their claim had no foundation in fact. The published statistics showed that in 1879, when the number of evictions was 4,515, the number of outrages was 870; in 1880, when the number of evictions was 10,657, the number of outrages was 2,590; and in 1881, when the Government had more than 1,000 of the most respectable men in Ireland, including Members of Parliament, town councillors, and clergymen in gaol, what was the result? The evictions swelled to 17,341, and the outrages to 4,439. Therefore, if the Tory Party thought that they would stop outrages by means of coercion they would soon find out their mistake. The statistics of outrages before and after the adoption of the Plan of Campaign were most instructive. The number of outrages in the quarter ending September 30 last, before the adoption of the Plan of Campaign, was 306, of which 107 assumed the mild form of threatening letters; while in the quarter ending December 31 last, after the adoption of the Plan of Campaign, that number dwindled down to 166; abundantly showing that the people of Ireland preferred to rely upon Constitutional agitation for a redress of their grievances, rather than upon the wild justice of revenge or other rough-and-ready measure. Why had not the same amount of outrage followed the rejection last year of the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork which had followed the rejection of the Compensation for Disturbance Bill? Simply because the Irish people were convinced that the policy of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian would yet be carried successfully through that House. The Irish people knew that behind the Irish Party in that House was a strong Liberal Party ready and willing to follow them into the Lobby when any measures of justice to Ireland were to be carried. That was the reason that there was so little crime in Ireland at the present moment. Therefore, the Tory Party need not congratulate themselves upon having restored law and order in Ireland. Do not let the Tory Party imagine that the Irish Members dreaded coercion. It would fail for the 87th time. Irish Members had gone to prison before and they were ready to go there again, with the result that they would be more than ever endeared to the people of Ireland, while the present rulers of the country would be hurled from power, and they would have restored to them the only Prime Minister who had given a gleam of hope to the Irish people.

VISCOUNT EBRINGTON (Devon, Tavistock) said, the defenders of the Plan of Campaign had argued that the end justified the means; but he failed to see how poverty could be held to justify dishonesty, and he could not see in what point of principle the Plan differed from the No Rent manifesto, which had been so greatly condemned by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) and suppressed by his Government. In a question of this kind, the end could not justify the means which such an eminent authority as the late Lord Chancellor (Lord Herschell) had pronounced to be manifestly illegal. Indeed, both that noble Lord and the right hon. and learned Member for Bury (Sir Henry James), who had been the law advisers of the Government which prosecuted the authors of the No Rent Manifesto, were of opinion that the principles of the two movements were identical. He (Viscount Ebrington) fully admitted that there were some bad landlords in Ireland; but only five years ago the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian had declared that the result of a full and careful inquiry into the question was to show that the general body of Irish landlords were not guilty of the offences that had been imputed to them. It had been shown before the Commission that was then held, that in many of the cases where it had been alleged that the landlords had turned the tenants out of their homes, while the tenants had built the houses, the landlords had supplied the materials. There was no question that the tenants had reclaimed a considerable quantity of land; but, whatever the reason might be, the land was not cultivated well or scientifically, and the falling off in the crops must be largely attributed to the deterioration of the soil. Indeed, many landlords would be glad to have their virgin soil back again. If the rents charged in past years had been so large and outrageous as they had been represented, it would necessarily follow that the arrears would have been considerable in the greater number of cases; but it was admitted by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) that it was only in exceptional cases that the arrears had been considerable. He (Viscount Ebrington) believed that there was no country in the world in which the fact that an occupier built a house gave him an interest in the house superior to that of the owner of the land. He never heard of any contract to that effect in this or any other country. If the law in that respect were wrong, let it be altered; but while it was what it was, irresponsible individuals should not be allowed to put themselves above it. Nobody could have failed to be struck, by the speech of the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), pointing out that the real difficulty of the Irish Question lay in the fact of some districts being over-populated and some under-populated. Yet the hon. Member went on to say that emigration, or migration, if conducted under the British Government, would be regarded by the Irish people as extermination. But, if the difficulty could not be solved by that means, how on earth could it be met? The hon. Member said the people, if they were left to themselves, would soon re-settle themselves on the richer lands; but was it to be done in the way that had been suggested in some speeches? The suggestion was that the land should be appropriated at three, five, or 10 years' purchase. If emigration and migration were to be resisted as a policy of extermination, there was little hope for improvement. There seemed to him to be a split among the Home Rulers. One section appeared to seek Home Rule in order to obtain a settlement of the Land Question; the other wished the Land Question to be kept alive in order to promote the cause of Home Rule. While these two sections worked together, and while Home Rule bore the interpretation put on it by hon. Members both in this House and elsewhere, he despaired of much going done.

There were very few Members of the House who would not be glad of the co-operation of the Home Rule Members in settling the Land Question, and in giving such a re-arrangement of the system of local government as would enable the people to have a fair voice in their own affairs. Indeed, they would heartily promote a settlement such as would enable them to remedy the undoubted grievances under which they suffered. But their desire to do that was checked and hampered by the knowledge that if hon. Members meant half of what they said, they would use any improvement that might be made in the government of Ireland for the sole purpose of promoting the attainment of an object to which the Unionists could not give their consent. Mr. Davitt, on returning to Dublin from America, expressed his pleasure at being back again to co-operate with the hon. Member for Cork in the struggle for a free land and national independence. ["Hear, hear!"] The idea was promptly cheered; but unless the hon. Members who cheered would give up the idea of national independence it was difficult for others to co-operate with them. Could the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian justify giving them greater freedom in their own country to work for the realization of that idea? But if they abandoned it the constituencies which elected them would have reason to complain. As long as Irish Members talked as they did they put difficulty in the way, not only of Members of that House who desired reforms in Ireland, but also of voters outside of it, who, though sick and ashamed of the state of things in that country, hesitated to support men who had been described by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian as marching through rapine to 'the disintegration of the Empire. ["Oh, oh!"] Well, that was the description given of the hon. Member for Cork and his Colleagues by their best Friend in this House. The description was accepted and applauded at the time; and had anything been done since then to falsify it? If anything had been so done the case would be different; but, as matters stood, he had no hesitation in voting against the Amendment.

CAPTAIN COLOMB (Tower Hamlets, Bow, &c.) said, that though he represented a Metropolitan constituency, he had been closely connected with Ireland; and for the last 17 years—since he left the public service—he had chiefly resided in Kerry, and yielded nothing to hon. Members from Ireland in his deep interest in, and in his desire for, the happiness and prosperity of the Irish people. They had heard, once more, the threadbare argument that Ireland was governed by 30,000 bayonets; but the presence of troops there was rather to the advantage of Ireland and to the disadvantage of Great Britain. At all events, the distribution of our troops was simply in accordance with the principles on which our system of national defence was based. He believed that, on a numerical calculation, about 90,000 troops ought always to be available for service in the United Kingdom, not for purposes of law and order, but for external defence. If the programme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) were carried out—if the 30,000 troops whose presence in Ireland was complained of were withdrawn, the only result would be the establishment of another Irish grievance. Directly troops were removed from a district there was an outcry against it. The Nationalist Corporation of Limerick, on the withdrawal of a regiment, had petitioned for its return, and their request was acceded to. The presence of troops increased the trade and business of the districts where they were quartered. The late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley) last night had passed strictures on the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), and denied that emigration was the panacea for the woes of Ireland; but the noble Marquess had only said it was one of the remedies, and that had been admitted even by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) himself, who had expressed his willingness to accept Government assistance in the way of providing, not only passage money, but money to start the emigrants with in their new homes. His (Captain Colomb's) experience entirely confirmed the noble Marquess's recommendation of Government assistance in co-operation with local authorities. The district in which he (Captain Colomb) resided was congested; and when the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Morley) cavilled at the idea of emigration, he must say that he knew little of the recent history of Ireland. Towards the end of 1882 he (Captain Colomb) was a member of a Board of Guardians at Kenmare, and upon that Board were Nationalists whom he respected, and who, he hoped, respected him—for he always managed to get on very comfortably with his Nationalist colleagues —and they provided a plan by which they enabled 1,050 poor people, in two years, to emigrate, and, so far as they knew, those persons were pleased and thankful for having gone to that country. The results had been very satisfactory, and not more than 2 per cent of the emigrants returned. One man, who, he thought, ought never to have gone out, was sent back by the American Government; but he was a man of 40, who could never be happy because he was an orphan. In another case, a family returned because the wife did not like to be confined in Canada. The Canadian Government had kindly afforded every facility for the emigrants, and encouraged the priests to go with their people. Letters had been received from emigrants thanking the guardians for the new start which they had given them, and exhorting their friends at home not to listen to political agitators. He (Captain Colomb) did not think that the priests and some local gentlemen liked the people being sent away. Well, who did? But there was no difficulty in getting families to go; but there was in providing the means of sending them out. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Morley) should not take one passage from Mr. Tuke's report, and then say that the system would not work. Mr. Tuke worked his own system, and it may have failed; but what the guardians had —through the kindness of the Canadian Government and the Steam Shipping Company—done had not. One of the priests went out afterwards to visit those persons, and he had no complaint to make when he came home. If assistance could be afforded by the State to the local authorities, it would be one of the most judicious remedies for the improvement of the people of Ireland. Hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway objected to emigration to the Colonies; but he (Captain Colomb) could not approve the plan of the late Liberal Government, which encouraged emigration to the United States. He objected to the aid of this country being given to men to cease to be British subjects and take the oath of allegiance to a Government which had established a hostile tariff against this country, and with which we might, some day, be on unfriendly terms. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. John Morley) had said that the Colonies would reject the Irish people; but he had evidently, forgotten the despatch from the Government of Canada to the Imperial Government, March, 1881; and, further, there was a letter in *The Times* of to-day of Sir George Stephen, who knew more about Canada than any man, which flatly contradicted the statement which had often been made that the Canadians were not disposed to welcome Irish emigrants. But schemes of emigration ought not to be confined to Ireland. The congested districts of England and Scotland ought also to be relieved of their surplus population by a large-hearted system of State-aided colonization, and he trusted that those in the United Kingdom who approached this question would not limit any system to Ireland, so that those who wished to better their position might be able to do so. He believed that some Members of the Nationalist Party were doing their best to stir up strife between the Colonies and this country. But the attempts in this direction of Mr. William O'Brien and others—who had threatened that the present Governor General should be boycotted and hunted out of Canada—would not be countenanced in Canada, where one-fourth of the people were of Irish origin, and of whom Lord Dufferin some time ago stated that none were more loyal subjects of the British Crown than the Irish of Canada; and if Mr. O'Brien went there and acted upon his programme he would be conducted out of the colony to a country where agitators were treated in a short and summary way. But Canada would be more likely to welcome a system which should not be applied to Ireland alone but should extend also to England and Scotland. The main difficulty in Ireland, as had so often been pointed out, was the economic difficulty. She had suffered in common with the rest of the United Kingdom and other countries from the depreciation in prices of agricultural produce. Providence had denied coal and iron to Ireland, and the people could not compete in manufactures with England and Scotland. The Irish people, who were clever and quick-witted, were not suited to agricultural pursuits, which demanded a steady-going and plodding temperament. The people there necessarily must be agricultural, and to be successful and prosperous they must face the difficulties of competition of produce from other countries, and adopt the best methods of cultivation. It was exceedingly difficult for a purely agricultural population to thrive when it could buy more cheaply than produce. The difficulty was deep-seated, and could not be solved by one Parliament or in a single Session, or in one, two, or three years; it would be a long process. What Ireland wanted more than anything else was an improved system of practical education, in which the children should be taught practically the pursuits by which they would have to gain their livelihood. National School Teachers should not be left, as now, at the mercy of private hands, but should be thoroughly organized by, and be entirely under the control of, the State. The result of improved methods of education would be that in 25 years, when the present coming generation should have grown up, national aspiration would be, not in the direction of separation, but in that of a closer union with Great Britain.

MR. T. P. GILL (Louth, S.) said, he would not follow the hon. and gallant Member in his schemes for the regeneration of Ireland, especially as, on the hon. and gallant Member's own showing, those schemes would take so long to produce any effect. The matter to which he wished to draw the attention of the House was, he might say, of momentous and startling importance. His hon. Friend the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) referred to the action of the Queen's Bench in the case of his hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon); and the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes), replying to his observations on that head, made the statement to which he (Mr. Gill) wished to direct the attention of the House. The Attorney General for Ireland defended the action of the Court of Queen's Bench, or rather endeavoured to account for it by saying that the Crown had invoked the inherent jurisdiction of that Court; and what he (Mr. Gill) wished to say, and he hoped to prove, was that the action of the Queen's Bench in invoking that jurisdiction amounted to an usurpation which had no precedent in English history since the Star Chamber was abolished, and for which, if it had occurred in England, everyone concerned in the transaction would have been impeached. What Judge O'Brien and Judge Johnson had done in the Court of Queen's Bench in Ireland was simply to revive the Court of Star Chamber. That was not a figure of speech. He said deliberately that these Judges had actually revived the self-same infamous Court, the records of which were amongst the darkest pages of English history, for the use of which a King lost his head, and which this House, 200 years ago, solemnly abolished amidst the execrations of the English people. The Judges of the Queen's Bench described the power which they used, and the source from which they derived it; and that power was nothing more nor less than the power which Henry VII. claimed to be inherent in the King and Council, and under which he abrogated trial by jury. The Judges of the Queen's Bench in Dublin, by their action, had suspended the Habeas Corpus Act, and in so doing smashed a breach through the most cherished portion of the English Constitution. In the case of the hon. Member for Mayo, who had been cited to show cause why he should not give bail to be of good behaviour, or be imprisoned for having uttered certain speeches, the Judge went out of his way to denounce the Plan of Campaign as part of an illegal conspiracy. The Judge, he held, had no right to make that declaration, which was simply an *obiter dictum*, or, to use the definition of an old writer, a mere "judicial impertinence." Acting upon it, however, the Government immediately issued a Proclamation declaring the Plan of Campaign to be illegal, and then and there caused the arrest of several gentlemen who were engaged in the execution of the Plan. The connection between the Judge's declaration in the Court of Queen's Bench, the Proclamation, and the prosecution for conspiracy was very significant. If there was any conspiracy in the matter it was a conspiracy between Her Majesty's Judges and Her Majesty's Privy Council, which were tantamount to the same thing in Ireland. It was generally believed in Ireland that the Court of Queen's Bench in condemning the hon. Member for East Mayo to find bail were acting in virtue of powers conferred by a statute of Charles I. This statute was unearthed by Law Adviser Naish, recently Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and now one of the Lords Justices of Appeal; and it was announced publicly that this was the statute under which the Crown were acting in the cases of Miss Reynolds, of the Ladies' Land League, and Father Feehan, and also in the cases of Messrs. Davitt, Healy, and Quinn, who, like the hon. Member for East Mayo, had been cited before the Queen's Bench. But it appears the public had been under a misapprehension; and this was the point. In the case of the hon. Member for East Mayo, the Judges of the Queen's Bench expressly waived that statute of Charles, and put every statute out of the question altogether. They waived, in fact, every statute passed by Parliament — they waived Parliament itself out of the way; and going behind Parliament went back to the old Royal Prerogative—the right Divine of absolute monarchy, to that right as delegated to — according to Judge Johnson's phrase—and inherent in, the Court of the King's or Queen's Presence, otherwise the Court of King's or Queen's Bench. Judge Johnson expressly declared that the defendant was under a misapprehension with regard to the jurisdiction of the Court; that it was not derived from any law, but from the old right which the Court possessed when it used to follow the King or Queen about the Realm for the purpose of aiding in the preservation of the peace. He said—

> "The King's or Queen's Majesty is the conservator of the peace in this country. The Court was held originally *coram rege* and, by law, whether the King was present or not, it took place in his presence. The authority was delegated to the Judges of Queen's Bench."

In this view Judge O'Brien concurred, adding that they did not proceed

> "By the lines of forgotten statutes, but by the inherent authority of the Court as the Court of Chief Magistracy of the Kingdom charged with maintaining social and public peace."

It was clear, therefore, that the power claimed by the Judges of Queen's Bench was the identical power which was abolished by Parliament when King Charles I. was executed, and which, until now, had never been claimed by any Court in the Realm. The hon. Member for Mayo had asked to be tried by a jury of his countrymen, but he was refused, as John Hampden was refused, and for the very same reason—because the Crown knew that no honestly chosen jury of his countrymen would find him guilty of evil conduct. That the jurisdiction now claimed by the Irish Court of Queen's Bench was nothing less than that exercised by the Star Chamber, could easily be proved from the writings of such authorities on constitutional questions as Coke, Hallam, Clarendon, Blackstone, and Green. Coke described its constitution as a court held *coram rege;* and Hallam claimed that its authority was simply that of the ancient *concilium regis*, whose encroachments so many statutes had endeavoured to repress; and this was exactly the authority invoked by Judge O'Brien and Judge Johnson. The part played by the Privy Council in the constitution of the Star Chamber was most significant, for in the Court of Queen's Bench in Ireland they had not only the suppositious presence of the Queen, but they had also the virtual presence of the Privy Council. Most of the Judges were Privy Councillors, and what generally happened in an Irish State prosecution was this—that a couple of Judges would attend the Council in Dublin Castle—where they had it their own way most of the time—and command as Privy Councillors the prosecution of certain individuals, and would then walk down to the Four Courts and as Judges try the individuals, they themselves had caused to be prosecuted. This had happened over and over again in Ireland. Indeed, it had happened in this very case of the hon. Member for East Mayo. Another thing they would do: as Privy Councillors they would frame a proclamation, and then subsequently as Judges they would try the people charged with disregarding the proclamation. If that was not Star Chamber procedure to a "T" he did not know what to call it. In Dublin they had out-Star-Chambered the Star Chamber, for in Clarendon's day those who issued proclamations from the Council table were usually different persons from those who sat in judgment on offenders against the proclamations in another room; whereas in Ireland it was mostly managed that those who proclaimed, those who prosecuted, and those who tried, were one and the same individuals. And against what class of men were these powers being used? Against the same class as were struck at by the Star Chamber, when the Kings and their corrupt Governments could not get juries to convict them—against the noblest and best of their citizens. He thought he might say, even in that House, for his hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo, that however opinions might differ as to the wisdom of his policy, all parties agreed in testifying to the transparent purity, to the devotedness and chivalry of his character. Even the Judges who tried him were forced to acknowledge that. They stopped at requiring his hon. Friend to enter into sureties for his good behaviour, or in default to go to gaol. Let us grant that this was very mild. But what was to prevent them, should the situation develop, and the occasion arise, exercising a far greater degree of severity? The limits of their power were not defined. There was nothing defined about it at all. Judge Johnson said their inherent right was derived from, and consequently limited by no law. It was aboriginal and absolute. It was the old right Divine "delegated" from the King to the Court, which was held in the presence of the King, *coram rege.* What was to prevent this Court emulating its predecessor, and summarily sentencing men to fine and imprisonment? What was to prevent it Inquisitionizing the accused? What was to prevent it, in virtue of this inherent right, from even sentencing men to be hanged? Nothing whatever. All these encroachments began very innocently. Henry VII.'s Court was first intended merely for those stiff-necked barons who insisted on keeping up their armies of liveried retainers. The Dublin Castle lawyers under Mr. Trevelyan began by thinking it necessary to hold up a Statute as their authority, but now the Castle lawyers had grown so bold that they dispensed with statutes altogether. It was important to consider this statute of Charles which was said to invoke the inherent power of the Queen's Bench, because if the Judges now go back of their words and say that their power was not the Royal Prerogative, but was derivable from a statute, as they certainly did when Law Adviser Naish dug up the statute of Charles for the prosecution of Miss Reynolds and Father Feehan, it was well to know what that statute was. And as to this habit of Crown lawyers going back to dark ages for obsolete statutes, surely nothing could be more subversive of English ideas of Constitutional Government. There was an Attorney General in the reign to which this statute belonged, and he did exactly the same kind of thing that Attorney General Holmes and Law Adviser Naish had done in those days. Hallam said of Attorney General Noy—

> "The name of Noy has acquired an unhappy celebrity. Shaking off the dust of ages from parchments in the town, this man of venal diligence and prostituted learning discovered that the seaports had in early times been sometimes called upon to furnish ships for the public service."

This was the origin of the infamous ship-money, for that tax sprung from Noy's discovery, as Hallam says—

> "According to the invariable course of encroachments which those who have once bent the laws to their will ever pursue."

He (Mr. Gill) thought that to invoke an obsolete statute—a statute that grew so absurdly offensive that it was not worth while to repeal it—was often worse and more dangerous than to invent new powers. The author of this old statute was Strafford; the object of it was to extend the arbitrary powers of that form of the Star Chamber, which was known as the Council of the North, over which Strafford presided; and it was for his use of this statute that Strafford was impeached and sent to the scaffold. Yet an Irish Attorney General comes down to this House and tells them it was this statute they were invoking to-day in Ireland. It was well for his devoted head he was not living in the days of Cromwell and Pym. He (Mr. Gill) asked where would we be if every statute that was invoked in the days of Charles were to be invoked to-day? This was what they were permitting to be done in the nineteenth century under the sanction of English law by Dublin Castle and its myrmidons—the re-erection of the Star Chamber; the restoration of the insolent Royal Prerogative that it cost them a revolution to destroy, the abrogation of the most sacred privilege conferred by Magna Charta; the right of every British subject to be tried by a jury of his peers. This was the havoc they were allowing to be played by the hands of Irish Crown lawyers upon the Constitution built up by the genius of their ancestors and cemented with their blood. He really thought it must be a retribution for the long and woeful misgovernment of Ireland. It would be poetic justice indeed. What an anti-climax to the efforts of Hampden, to the patriotism of the juries that acquitted the seven Bishops, and the cause to which the most glorious efforts of this House had for centuries been consecrated—a brace of Dublin Castle judges, a brace of peasants from the County Cork, coming down from Cork Hill to the Four Courts and restoring the Prerogative of the Stuarts! What would the English democracy, who were neither the Tory Government nor the Liberal Government, but the rude commonalty out of doors who were the real upholders of the Constitution, who overturned a throne when their privileges were infringed too far — what would they have to say to this? He answered the Government that if they did not look out, their Irish Judges would lead them into a pass they little bargained for. What were they going to do about it? Would they impeach Judge O'Brien and Judge Johnson, Prince Edward of Saxe-Weimar, the Chief Secretary, and the Lord Lieutenant? That was what they would certainly do had this thing been perpetrated in England.

The SECRETARY to the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Long) (Wilts, Devizes) said, it was not his intention to follow the speech to which the House had just listened—a speech which had been delivered with considerable eloquence—and which showed that the hon. Member had bestowed considerable time and trouble to the study of English history, and of the laws of this country. A subject so abstruse as that should, he (Mr. Long) thought, be left to those who were better versed in it than he was. He would address himself to the consideration of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), from the point of view of an Englishman. And he could not help regretting that even on a Wednesday afternoon, when attendance in the House was no doubt irksome, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley), who occupied so prominent a position in the late Administration, had not found it convenient or in his power to be in his place, because that right hon. Gentleman—speaking as the ex-Chief Secretary for Ireland, on the previous evening—delivered a very important and serious speech. The right hon. Gentleman, in that speech, started by asserting that the condition of Ireland was one of unredressed wrongs; and that it was to the existence of that feeling in the minds of the Irish people that there had grown up a a feeling of bitterness and resentment in Ireland, which had led to the commission of many of those unfortunate acts which had taken place in the sister country, and which they all united in lamenting. Now, if that was the case—and coming from so high an authority, he was not prepared to deny that there was something in it—if Ireland was suffering from unredressed wrongs, of which bitterness and resentment were the outcome, he asked on whose shoulders rested the greater part of the responsibility—on whose head descended the greater part of the blame for that deplorable state of things? Who, during the last 50 years, had held the greatest share of power and authority in regard to the legislation and administration of this country? Was it not the right hon. Gentleman the late Prime Minister (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) who, during that period, had a more prominent and influential position in the Imperial Legislature than any other man on either side of that House, and who had at his disposal all the powers of the Government? He should have preferred to make his remarks on the speech of the right hon. Member for Newcastle in his presence, because he remembered once hearing an hon. Member of that House being accused of "striking another hon. Member in his absence." That, he confessed, seemed to him an almost impossible feat, although in these days of progress there was no saying what they might not yet be able to achieve. Before dealing further, however, with the right hon. Member for Newcastle, he wished to say that he had listened with great attention to the speech of the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hanbury) delivered a few nights ago, and which would have made a greater impression on his mind but for the statement with which it was prefaced—namely, that the hon. Gentleman's experiences and knowledge of Ireland were chiefly drawn from the harvest men, who came over to do harvesting work for him. That was an argument which would carry little or no weight at all. If the hon. Member for Preston's speech had been one condemning the action of hon. Members opposite, and supporting the Government, his extraordinary confession as to the sources of his knowledge and experience of Ireland would have been received with ridicule by hon. Members below the Gangway opposite, who were never tired of charging hon. Members on the Ministerial side of speaking in utter ignorance of Ireland and the Irish people. But, returning to the right hon. Member for Newcastle, that right hon. Gentleman was extremely angry and indignant with Members of the Government for asking him and his Party to condemn the Plan of Campaign. He said it was ridiculous to ask such a question, and to ask them because the Liberal Party, as represented by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), were in favour of Home Rule, to express an opinion on anything that the Irish Members did. That might be a very useful doctrine; but it was not one which would commend itself to the judgment or the common sense of most men. It reminded him of an incident in the criminal annals of this country. Not very long ago, there was a gentleman who distinguished himself by the commission of more or greater crimes than any man that had been heard of for a considerable time past—he meant the late Mr. Peace, who was a very remarkable man; for he not only contrived to commit burglaries of an extraordinary nature at night, but, it was said, whether truly or not, that he attended evening parties, where he delighted ladies by playing on the violin, and, in addition to that, acted as churchwarden, and carried the bag on Sundays. According to the argument of the right hon. Member for Newcastle, those people who attended the evening parties at which Mr. Peace played the violin, or who acted with him when, as churchwarden, he carried the bag, would be justified in saying that it was absurd to call on them to pronounce any opinion whatever upon that gentleman's burglaries. The right hon. Gentleman, however, complained that he and his Friends should be asked to express a decided opinion on the Plan of Campaign. The right hon. Gentleman said if the Government was not wrong in not condemning the action of hon. Members from the North of Ireland, they were not wrong in not condemning the action of the hon. Member for Cork and his Friends. Two wrongs, however, did not make a right. It had been pronounced from the Irish Bench to be an illegal combination. It had, to the best of his belief, been so pronounced by the highest legal authority. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] He would leave those who expressed dissent to fight out the point with the Irish Executive. The Plan of Campaign, as he understood it, as a layman, and not a lawyer, meant a deliberate attempt to interfere between landlord and tenant, and to take money which belonged unquestionably to the landlord; and to take it, as he believed, contrary to the wishes of the Irish people. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] Hon. Members below the opposite Gangway claimed to represent the Irish people, and no doubt they represented them as they themselves had schooled and educated them; but if the people were allowed to be guided by their own feelings and inclinations, they would not be represented faithfully by hon. Members below the Gangway. Referring to the Land Act of 1881, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle stated that the tenants did not jump at that Act and take advantage of its provisions. No, the tenants did not; but why did they not do so? Was it because those provisions were not favourable enough to the tenants? No; it was because it would not suit hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway that they should do so; a settlement of that sort would deprive them of their political daily bread. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle was also very indignant with his right hon. Friend the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) in connection with the jury panels, and said that "a man of independent mind" meant a man on whom the Government could rely to convict. That was a very grave imputation. That statement was made by a Privy Councillor, and who, up to a short time ago, was a Minister of the Crown. That statement could only have two meanings. One was, that the Crown deliberately challenged those jurymen, and placed in their stead men who could be trusted to give a conviction when they knew the prisoner was not guilty. If this was the construction, no action of the Executive in Ireland could justify any man, and especially a man occupying the position of Privy Councillor, in making a statement of that kind in the House of Commons. There was only one other meaning, and that was, that the sympathies of certain jurors would prevent their convicting. [*Cheers.*] He could not believe, notwithstanding the cheers of Gentlemen below the Gangway, that that was the interpretation that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle intended should be placed upon his words. It was the duty of the Government to see that crime in Ireland did not go unpunished, and to see that by all fair means the law was vindicated. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, who he sincerely regretted was not in his place, said that there was no prospect from the Government of legislation for Ireland, and that the atmosphere was leaden. To say that the Government were not sincere in their proposals, and their desire to legislate—was a remark which was not justified by anything, except the leaden atmosphere of which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken, which he showed a marvellous power of appreciating, and which had filled him on that occasion with gas of a very disagreeable and unworthy odour. It rested very much with hon. Gentlemen opposite as to what the course of legislation would be; and if the expressions of opinion with which the right hon. Gentleman had favoured them were well founded, the Government might expect great difficulties ahead in carrying their legislation. As to coercion, the House had been told, what many Members had forgotten, that the powers referred to already existed in Scotland, and were not resisted by the Scotch people. Speaking for himself, as an English Member of the Government, and as one connected by family ties with Ireland, while especially regretting that any necessity should arise on the part of the Government for restricting the liberty of the subject, or altering the administration of the law, he would support coercion if it meant protecting women and children, the weak against the strong, and allowing men to do their business in their own way and at their own time, free and undisturbed. If it meant putting an end to the crimes that had stained the country, and to the detestable crime of boycotting—if that was coercion, what upright and courageous man could refuse to support it? and he did not think the House would decline to support a proposal to that effect. He was perfectly certain no one wished to apply harsh laws to Ireland. The hon. Members opposite claimed a monopoly of the milk of human kindness; but hon. Members on his side of the House had as much sympathy as those opposite had for those suffering from oppression. They sympathized with those who were oppressed by boycotting; but not with those who defied the law. He (Mr. Long) denied that the Irish landlords did not show indulgence to their tenants; and while having no sympathy whatever with bad landlords, he was far from saying that because they did not do their duty therefore they were to be denied the protection of the law. With regard to the depreciation of prices, he admitted that there had been a considerable fall in the 10 years; but the reduction was far more marked in England than in Ireland. He should oppose the Amendment, because it was directed to the legislative independence of Ireland; and because behind this demand for Home Rule there were looming further demands which would lead to complete independence. It was because the Government felt this and believed it that they resisted this Amendment, and it was because the House felt this, and believed it, that he believed it would reject the Amendment. The present condition of things among Parties in the country, consequent upon the Bill for Home Rule introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, brought forcibly to his mind the speech of the right hon. Gentleman—a speech familiar to hon. Members—and which could not be read without feelings of pleasure and admiration, when he described his position on leaving the Conservative and joining the Liberal Party, in the words of Dido describing her reception of Æneas—

> "Ejectum littore, egentem
> Excepi;"

and then added that he hoped the time would never come when they would give utterance to the following line—

> "Et regni demens in parte locavi."

He was afraid the time had come when many good Liberals, with much bitterness of heart, must have felt the application of those last words. Because the Amendment, if carried, would mean Home Rule, because it would be a heavy blow at the Union, for which they fought and won so lately a great battle, the Government would resist, and the House would, he was confident, by a substantial majority, reject the proposal of the hon. Member for Cork.

MR. B. COLERIDGE (Sheffield, Attercliffe) said, the House had listened with great attention to the speech of the hon. Member for Devizes (Mr. Long), and they who sat below the Opposition Gangway noticed with pleasure the absence from the speech of the unworthy attacks that were so often made from the Ministerial side of the House upon the motives and conduct of the Irish Members. It seemed to him that the arguments which had been addressed to the House by the hon. Member opposite against the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) ranked themselves under two heads. Hon. Members said, first of all, that the Amendment should be rejected, because the House was fully capable of dealing with all questions which concerned the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; and they said, secondly, that because it was the duty of the Government, therefore they were determined to enforce the law. So far as the political aspect of the case was concerned, the speech which they had listened to last night from the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) sufficiently answered the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland. There was, however, some opening for a few words on the legal aspect of the case, as it was presented by the speech of that hon. and learned Gentleman; and with regard to the first argument—namely, that the House of Commons was fully capable of dealing with all the manifold interests of the United Kingdom, hon. Gentlemen opposite, by their conduct last Session, had completely answered the arguments advanced by the Opposition. It would be in the recollection of all that, in last Session, there was a demand made for passing certain legislation dealing with Irish matters. The hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland appeared to complain that it should be supposed that the foresight of hon. Gentlemen representing Ireland who sat below the Gangway was superior to that of the Government. It was not the first time, and he (Mr. Coleridge) did not think it would be the last time, while Ireland was not allowed to govern itself in its own way, that a great deal of foresight would be the possession of the Irish, and not the possession of the Government of the day. The existence of the superior prescience on the Opposition side of the House was an argument that, somehow or other, the Government of the day was not in touch with the people over whom they were set to rule. There was a demand made by the all but unanimous vote of the Irish nation, and what was demanded was put forward in a Bill presented to the House in a moderate, statesmanlike, and conciliatory speech by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). The facts upon which that speech had been founded and upon which that Bill had been introduced, he (Mr. Coleridge) ventured to say were never seriously contested by hon. Gentlemen opposite. They had had, then, a demand made by the all but united voice of Ireland for a change by way of remedial legislation—a demand based upon intimate knowledge of the country acquired by the Irish Members. There was thus afforded an opportunity, not likely to occur again, of exhibiting to the Sister Country how possible it was for the House of Commons to pass laws presented in a moderate and statesmanlike manner by her own Representatives. How did the House treat the proposal of the hon. Member for Cork? It rejected it with contumely, and almost without discussion. He (Mr. Coleridge) imagined that hon. Gentlemen went away, after the decision upon the Tenants' Relief Bill, under the impression that they had struck a very formidable blow for the preservation of the Union; but it seemed to him that, if the arguments advanced on that occasion by the Liberal Members failed in showing that the House could not deal with Irish affairs according to Irish views, and in accordance with the feelings of justice, hon Gentlemen opposite had supplied that defect. He recollected being immensely struck with the speech of the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), delivered in the debate upon the Tenants' Relief Bill. It was a speech marked by every feeling of earnestness, and with the single-minded view of benefiting the people whom he represented. He told the House in tones of warning what would be the result of the rejection of that Bill. He told the House, with candour and with truth, that the result of the rejection of that Bill by the House would be to send him back to the Irish people to try to follow his duty, and to try to effect, by means which were beside the law, that which the law had denied him the power of doing by legal powers. He gave the House a short description of what he would feel it his duty to do. Now, the result of the rejection of the Tenants' Relief Bill was, that the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Mayo, and others, found themselves face to face with the fact that there were many poor people in Ireland who, owing to the fall in prices, could not pay their rents, and in order to meet the difficulty the Plan of Campaign was introduced, a plan which, in the cases in which it had been applied, he (Mr. Coleridge) thought had commended itself to the moral sense of the best majority of the English people. For his own part, he emphatically endorsed and approved of the Plan of Campaign. He approved of it, with the one qualification which its authors had laid down—namely, that it should not be adopted except where, in the words of Mr. O'Brien, "the tenants have a just, and moderate, and unimpeachable case." He thought it would be well if hon. Gentlemen opposite, instead of condemning the Irish Leaders and all their works — it would be well if the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), instead of saying that the Irish Members preferred politics to humanity—it would be well if the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), instead of declaring that the Plan of Campaign was the most immoral and dishonest conspiracy which had ever been devised in a civilized country, and instead of stigmatizing the Irish Members who sat below the Gangway as self-constituted Leaders, as "well-paid patriots dividing in secret the proceeds of American subscriptions"—it would be well if these hon. Gentlemen would come forward to disprove the facts which had been published, and proved by evidence in Courts of Law, and tacitly admitted by the conduct of the Executive in Ireland. They would then know whether or not the Plan of Campaign had, in any particular instance, been put in force where the tenants had not "a just, moderate, and unimpeachable case." He, and others who held similar views, were told that they were sentimentalists, and they were not upholding the law; that they were not showing that tenacity which was exhibited in the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite. It would be as well if all those who maintained that they must, in all cases, and under all circumstances, put the law, as it existed, into legal effect and operation, were to read the history of their country, and to study the history of the times in which they lived. It was not very long ago that it was the law that men should be hanged for the smallest crimes, for petty thefts and larceny. What happened? The law was felt to be harsh and unjust, and it offended the moral sense of the people. Did the Leaders at that time, in every case and under all circumstances, carry into effect that which was part of the Common Law of the land? No; when prisoners came to be tried for these miserable crimes, Judges, counsel, witnesses, jurors—all combined together in what was, in effect, a conspiracy to defeat the operation of that which was felt to be a harsh and unjust law. Then, why should not the same principle be applied to the action of the Irish people? Was it to be said that the jurors were false to their oaths, or that the Judges were engaging in a conspiracy against the common weal? No; the principle was in operation in England at the present time with regard to laws which were condemned by the moral sense of the community, and those laws, by general consent, were left inoperative. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said, a short time since, that, even if Church rates were legal, he would not pay them—not, of course, because he was unable to do so, but because he regarded them as unjust, and he would not obey an unjust law. He (Mr. Coleridge) admired the position the right hon. Gentleman took on that point; but he left him to apply, in common fairness, the same principle to the Irish tenant. The law declared that people must be vaccinated, and that if they were not, they should be subjected to certain pains and penalties. Hon. Members who sat on the Treasury Bench were charged with carrying the compulsory Vaccination Law into effect, but, at the present day, there were thousands of people in Leicester who refused to be vaccinated. He expressed no opinion as to whether the people were justified or not in resisting compulsory vaccination; but he maintained that if they were not right, and if they were not justified in the course they were pursuing, all the more was it the duty of hon. Gentlemen opposite to see that the law was carried into effect. Furthermore, it was a common thing to hear of School Board summonses being held in abeyance. The law declared that every child should be sent to school, and that all parents who did not send their children to school should be subjected to certain pains and penalties. It was, however, a matter of common notoriety throughout the country that where the sending of children would work hardship and injustice upon the parents, the law remained inoperative. The Statute Law of this country declared that every tenant who "holds over" was liable to be charged by the landlord double rent, or double value. That law a landlord had a right to demand that the Executive should put into execution. What was the fact? When a landlord came into Court making such a demand, the Judge smiled, and said to the man—"You really cannot be serious in demanding this double rent or double value;" and, if the matter were pressed, the Judge held over the landlord *in terrorem* the question of costs, and thus practically defeated the law. Again, they read constantly of cases where money-lenders came into County Courts demanding exorbitant interest. The law said the principal and interest should be paid; but very often County Court Judges made orders for the payment of a shilling a month, so that the debt should not be repaid for years; and that was a practical setting aside of the law, because the enforcement of the law would be contrary to the moral sense of the community. On this question, he thought that they ought to get rid of what he would call legal cant—that if there were tenants in Ireland who could not pay their rents, and there were landlords who were ready to evict them, whether they could pay or not, it was their duty to look at the substantial justice of the case. The hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the House (Mr. Long) said that, although he disapproved of the Plan of Campaign in the abstract, he had no great reason to complain of it in the concrete. The hon. Member added that he was connected with Irish land and Irish landlords; but the Earl of Cork, with whom the hon. Gentleman was connected, had not had, and probably never would have, the Plan of Campaign put into operation against him, because he had been generous, and wise, and moderate in his demands from his tenants. What was the moral to be drawn from the present state of affairs? It was that the House of Commons really did not understand, and were not in a position to understand, Irish grievances and their remedies. How could he, or any other English Member, obtain a personal knowledge with regard to each case in which the Plan of Campaign was put in force? He repeated that to be operative and respected, either in England or Ireland, the law must be approved by the moral sense of the community at large. That was not the case, however, with the law in Ireland; and it was opposed and rendered inoperative there, because it was harshly and roughly applied against the sense of justice of the Irish people. He had heard throughout the debate numerous threats as to what might be in store for Ireland. It seemed to him there was one weapon, and one only, the Government had in their hands, and that was to return to coercive legislation. There might be something to be said about coercive legislation, if hon. Gentlemen were prepared, in the words of Lord Salisbury, to pursue it resolutely for 20 years. But he thought hon. Gentlemen opposite had not the tenacity which they displayed in their speeches when they came to put in practice coercive legislation. But, even if they had resolute government for 20 years, what would be the result? In his opinion, they would create a nation of slaves, a nation of slaves which they would rightly and properly despise for being what they had created them. Coercion ought to be rejected as unworthy of a great nation like England. There was only one other sound alternative, and that was to grant to Ireland, freely and generously, that which she demanded by the voice of her Representatives—an Irish Parliament with an Irish Executive. That must be the end of all these debates. Everything pointed to it. The attitude of hon. Gentlemen opposite pointed to it. The stern logic of events, which hon. Gentlemen could not control, pointed to it, and he, for one, welcomed these debates, because he believed that the longer the Irish Question was debated before the public gaze, the more necessary would it appear to grant to Ireland that which would meet with the national aspirations of her people. He intended most heartily to give his vote for the Amendment.

Mr. MURDOCH (Reading) said, he knew Kerry at a time when the relations between landlord and tenant were most satisfactory. The House heard now only of the interests of one class—the tenants; those of the landlords, the peasants, or the commercial classes they heard little or nothing about. They heard a great deal also of denunciations of landlords in Ireland. He regarded the Plan of Campaign as one more step towards separation between England and Ireland. [*Home Rule laughter.*] Though at present Irish Members treated that opinion with scorn there could be no doubt that separation was the real object they had in view, and some of them had the honesty to acknowledge it. In a considerable portion of Ireland the people were destitute; the tenants were too many and the holdings too small. At the same time, many of these tenants should not be tenants at all, but should be mere agricultural labourers; and if farming in Ireland was conducted with the enlightenment of the present day and with the necessary capital, the position of the labourer would be far better than that of the small tenant. One effect of the Plan of Campaign undoubtedly was that it increased the fear which existed in Great Britain that capital could not be safely invested in Ireland, and therefore cultivation in that country must go from bad to worse. It seemed to be acknowledged that the population of Ireland had outgrown the means of subsistence; and though he understood the feeling of those who were unwilling to leave their country, yet he thought some well-defined scheme of emigration which would be thorough and complete—and such a scheme had never yet been tried—might be successful. Another reason why the population had outgrown the means of subsistence was that there were no manufactories in the greater part of Ireland. He would call on those who were Leaders of the Irish Party to pause before continuing on a course which must lead ultimately to the ruin of their country. Many Gentleman opposite, men of brilliant ability, and whose eloquent words rang through the House, could devote their talents to far better purpose than trying to persuade tenants to adopt the Plan of Campaign. That Plan did not meet with the support of the whole of the Irish Party. There were indications, especially from the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), that it did not meet with his approval in its entirety. It might be that the want of unanimity was only the beginning of a rift in the Irish Party itself; and if the Government carried on with set purpose the administration of Ireland in a true and just manner it might be found that the rift would extend, and in a short time the Irish Party would be broken up. With respect to the 20 years of firm government of which the Marquess of Salisbury had spoken, it might be read in this light—that 20 years of proper administration of the law might be necessary to restore Ireland to prosperity and to enable confidence to return.

Mr. M'LAREN (Cheshire, Crewe) said, they had heard from the hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. Murdoch) that he discerned signs of a rift in the National Party, because he fancied they did not all approve of the Plan of Campaign. But if the hon. Member carefully considered the matter, he would find there were more signs of a rift in the Unionist Party, and that it was more likely to come to pieces than the National Party. The hon. Member and the hon. and gallant Member for the Tower Hamlets (Captain Colomb)—both of whom knew Kerry well—had pointed out the advantages of emigration; but they had overlooked the fact that, in spite of Kerry being considerably depopulated, it was the most disturbed county in Ireland. If the Conservative Members agreed that colonization or emigration was the best remedy for the Irish difficulty, why did they not persuade the Government to carry it out? They had no promise from the Government of any great scheme of emigration. On the contrary, the Marquess of Salisbury distinctly threw cold water on the scheme the other day, when he said they should have to emigrate about 1,000,000 of persons, and that he would be a bold man who would ask the House of Commons to vote £100,000,000 for the purpose. If the House last year was unwilling to vote £50,000,000 for the purchase of Irish land, with, at least, a moderate security, still more would they be unwilling to vote £100,000,000 for a scheme which offered very little. He should certainly like to see the House able to address itself to English questions; but when they were asked to thank Her Majesty for informing them that the condition of Ireland still required their anxious attention, he felt it was true; but he did not see any prospect of a different state of things so long as the present Government remained in Office. When the Queen put her name to such a statement She must have felt like the old woman at Chester, who exhorted the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), on setting out on one of his journeys, "not to forget Old Ireland." He should like that House to be able to forget Ireland in the sense that they forgot Australia and their other large Colonies—that was to say, that she would not be ever present to their minds, and that would never come to pass until they allowed the Irish people to govern themselves. The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Long) had said that the object of a new Coercion Bill for Ireland would be to protect the weak from oppression by the strong, and if the Home Rule Liberals could be brought to believe that, they might become coercionists themselves. But they knew perfectly well that whatever might be the wishes and interests of the Secretary to the Local Government Board, he was not the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and had nothing to do with the Government of Ireland; and he was afraid that if the measure of coercion foreshadowed by the Government was passed by the House, it would be administered in the way that had been pointed out by the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. T. P. Gill). It would be administered with all the rigours of the old Star Chamber. Statutes perfectly obsolete would be raked up—statutes passed by Strafford, and for the putting in operation of which he was arraigned and executed. It had been said that the Plan of Campaign was being carried out by irresponsible persons; but he denied that the members of the National League were irresponsible persons; on the contrary, they had incurred great responsibilities, to the extent of which they were fully alive, seeing that they constituted the *de facto* Government of Ireland. As regarded the Amendment, he thought Members who heard the speeches of the hon. Members for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) and East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) must have been convinced that the Government had acted in Ireland in an unusual and irregular, if not actually illegal, manner. Chief Baron Palles called it illegal, and suggested that the Members of the Government ought to be brought before his Court for punishment. Not being a lawyer, he (Mr. M'Laren) did not condemn them. Referring to the Glenbeigh evictions, the hon. Gentleman cited a leading article which appeared in *The Standard* in the end of January. That newspaper, which was the organ of the Conservative Party, had no hesitation in advising the Government to use what was called a dispensing power. That invitation the Government had very properly accepted, and they had very readily endeavoured to put an end to the horror of these evictions. He supposed the barbarous eviction spectacles were all perfectly legal; the action of the undeserving landlords, which *The Standard* denounced, was perfectly legal; and that it was perfectly legal for a man to burn down cottages on his estate if he chose to do so. There was a similar case of this kind in Scotland. An agent carried out an eviction by burning down a cottage; but what did the landlord do? He instituted a prosecution against his agent for having destroyed his property. Clearly the Irish Government and *The Standard* newspaper held that law was not to be the test of right and wrong; and if the Government might adopt a slight deviation from the regular course of strict law in a case of emergency, why might not the National League do the same? It was very doubtful how far the Plan of Campaign was illegal; it was very doubtful whether anyone could lay his finger on the particular statute which made it illegal. Though it was called robbery, it was at its worst only a temporary collection of the rents of the landlord. It was only a technical violation, at most, of a doubtful conspiracy law, and he wanted to know whether it was really to be held that we were bound to obey the law at all hazards? This was not the first occasion on which the law had been openly violated with the approval of the people. The law had been constantly violated in regard to vaccination. The Government tried to put it into operation in the town of Keighley, with which he was connected in business; and they put the Board of Guardians in prison, and the result was that far fewer persons were vaccinated in Keighley than before. That would always be the case where the Government tried to put a law in operation to which the public opinion of the place was opposed. The religious community with which he was connected (the Society of Friends) was at once the most peace-loving and the most law-breaking that had ever existed in this country. In their form of marriage ceremony they had persistently for about 100 years broken the law, even at the sacrifice of their children being illegitimate, until at length the law was altered so as to legalize marriages celebrated in accordance with the customs of that Society. The same thing had happened with regard to their objections to taking an oath, and taking off hats; and at one time, 11,000 Quakers were in prison for various offences. Those who prosecuted them were now admitted to have been wrong. The Quakers had been impelled by conscience. The Government had not said to them—"Cease breaking the law, and we shall then alter it." No; the law had been altered because it had been persistently broken. For his part he thought, with regard to the Plan of Campaign, that it was a matter of conscience with the poor tenant farmers of Ireland whether they should not persist in violating the law in order that they might carry out their marriage vows and their parental duties by protecting their wives and children. He rejoiced very much that the Plan of Campaign had been put into operation, because he was convinced that it had saved many families from ruin, and probably some persons of delicate health or great age from death. He thought it not impossible that it might have saved some landlords from death as well; and even if that were not the case, still it was enough to know that owing to that Plan, and owing to the pressure that the Government had put upon landlords, Ireland had been in a much more peaceable condition during the whole of this winter than they had had any reason to expect. The plan of Campaign had been a valuable aid to the Government, and they ought to have connived at it as they connived at breaches of the Vaccination Laws. But they intended to suppress it, and they asked for powers to enable them to do so. The shape in which they asked for those powers was called a reform of Criminal Procedure. The ordinary way of strengthening the administration of the Criminal Law was by a suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, or a Coercion Bill, like the late Mr. Forster's. He supposed they would not bring in such strong measures as those, but it was clear that the new Bill should be called—"A Bill to facilitate the imprisonment of certain Members of Parliament and others who have conspired, independently of the Government, to obtain a reduction of rents in Ireland." He hoped, if they had the Closure, that strong repressive measures, such as that proposed, would be excluded from its operation. He thought that coercive or repressive legislation was not the way to put down agitation. When the Reform Act of 1832 was passed the Government did not say—"We will put down the riots first, and then we will amend the law." The proper way to check agitation, as history showed, was to remove the grievance which was the cause of that agitation. *The Standard* had said that the Government were exercising a sound discretion in applying the intended coercion to all parts of the Kingdom; but he did not think that English or Scotch Members would be any more ready to support a Coercion Bill which they might think was necessary in Ireland because it applied to England and Scotland, where it was not wanted. A promise was made last Session by the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill) that a measure of Local Government would be brought forward which, as regarded the three countries of the United Kingdom, was to have similarity and simultaneity. As to the former, the only similarity they were promised was coercion, and as to simultaneity, it was gone altogether. That was not the only pledge given by the noble Lord which had been broken by Her Majesty's Government. Speaking on September 15, he had said that the functions of the Board of Works and the Local Government Board in Ireland would be developed as far as possible in accordance with the views of the Irish Representatives, and that it was the intention of the Government to put proposals before Parliament with the view of putting those matters in the hands of the Irish people; and if the Government failed to satisfy the Irish Members they would be justified in carrying on what was, in short, obstruction. Those pledges had gone to the wind; those Bills were not promised in the Queen's Speech. The Government would, therefore, have themselves to blame if the Irish Representatives remembered the second part of the noble Lord's speech, and continued to bring forward their grievances "with incessant repetition and in immense detail." It was far more important to have an Irish Local Government Bill pressed on than English and Scotch Bills; and although such a Bill would not satisfy the aspirations of the Irish Nationalists or the English Radicals, he would welcome it as a contribution towards the self-government of Ireland. He represented a constituency that had few Unionist Liberals in it, and had very few Irish voters. It was a purely English constituency in the heart of what used to be that most Conservative county, Cheshire, and there the Liberals were as strongly in favour of local self-government for Ireland as the Irish Members themselves. The electors were well trained under the late Mr. George William Latham to know the benefits of self-government. If they could conciliate the Unionists by giving up subordinate details, they would do well to try to conciliate them; but rather than sacrifice the main principle that was embodied in this Amendment he would go on struggling for it in Opposition for an indefinite number of years. They should do nothing to let it be thought for a moment that they were wavering from the principle of satisfying the needs and aspirations of the Irish people.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CLARKE) (Plymouth): I think it most desirable that a protest should at once be made against the most dangerous doctrines which were contained in the early part of the speech of the hon. Member who has just sat down. In making that protest, I believe I shall make it, not only on behalf of those who sit upon this Bench, or who are supporting Her Majesty's Government, but I shall make it also on behalf of a large majority of hon. Members on that side of the House, who must be amazed at hearing the doctrines which have been laid down by the hon. Member for Cheshire (Mr. M'Laren). There is some excuse, perhaps, to be made for some of those doctrines, for we heard earlier in the afternoon a speech in which my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Coleridge), dismissing what he, as a lawyer, called legal cant, gave his sanction—and he is the first lawyer who has done so—to the illegal conspiracy known as the Plan of Campaign. The hon. Member for Cheshire may have been misled by a too ready acquiescence in the fanciful history of law which has been given by the hon. Member for South Louth (Mr. T. P. Gill). But, however misled or excused, I do not believe that the hon. Member himself will, on reflection, regard what he has said this afternoon with any satisfaction. The hon. Member has distinctly stated that obedience to the law is a matter of personal judgment, and that any person. responsible or irresponsible, has a right to disobey any law which he thinks has been improperly enacted or laid down. That is a doctrine far graver than any question raised in the discussions with regard to the immediate Amendment before the House. It is a doctrine so disastrous in its application to a law-abiding people, that I think the hon. Member will really, on reflection, feel that he has said much in that speech to weaken the authority which any other suggestion of his might have had with the House. The hon. Member quoted certain instances in support of his proposition. He told us that for three generations the Quakers disobeyed the law by not being married in a church, and that 11,000 of them were in prison at one time for disobedience to the law of the country. I take leave to doubt the absolute historical correctness of the statement. The hon. Member alleges that it is one of the chief glories of the Society of Friends that all their grandfathers and grandmothers were illegitimate. [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!" *from the Opposition.*] Well, I am quoting the hon. Member's own words. I think the Society of Friends have little to thank their advocate for. They have a greater glory than any which has been attributed to them by the hon. Member. While, for conscience sake, they did disregard and refuse to obey certain laws which they believed to be inconsistent with the Divine Law—[*Cheers from the Home Rulers*]—and I am glad to hear a recognition of Divine Law which I did not expect—while they obeyed the Divine Law which they felt to be deeper and stronger in its hold and its authority over them than any law made by any human society, they never asserted disobedience to the law with objects of a personal kind. They never for the sake of money, or from enmity to a particular class, associated themselves together in conscious disobedience to the law. That is the distinction between the case which the hon. Member has put and the Plan of Campaign, which I venture to say is an illegal conspiracy, and which has been acknowledged to be an illegal conspiracy by every lawyer of repute and authority who has ever spoken upon the subject; and I cannot believe that even my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Coleridge)—and I deeply regret that one bearing his name should in this House have made such a speech as he delivered this afternoon—I cannot believe that he could have understood what the Plan of Campaign is when he gave his hearty acquiescence to it, and when he quoted the instances which he gave in support of his approval. The Plan of Campaign is a conspiracy between tenants who can pay and tenants who cannot pay to coerce the landlord into abandoning his legal rights to some extent against all of them, whether they can pay or whether they cannot pay. It is a conspiracy by which they agree to sell the stock, so that there shall be nothing for the landlord to seize, and they make a rule with regard to there being no eviction from any farm on the estate as a condition of allowing the landlord to get any of the rent to which he is entitled. That is a mere illegal conspiracy. The hon. and learned Member for Sheffield has doubted and, indeed, denied this; but I prefer the authority of Lord Herschell and Lord Selborne.

Mr. COLERIDGE (Sheffield, Attercliffe): I never denied that it was an illegal conspiracy.

Sir EDWARD CLARKE: I am extremely glad to have elicited that statement, but I am quite sure from the enthusiastic way in which those who were sitting near him rewarded the expression of opinion by the hon. and learned Member by their cheers that they quite understood it was of great moment that at last an English lawyer, bearing an honoured name and representing a great English constituency, had given his acquiescence and authority and sanction to their Plan of Campaign. I am exceedingly happy to say now that there is no lawyer, not even my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Sheffield——

Mr. COLERIDGE: I am sure the hon. and learned Gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. I did not express any opinion as to whether the Plan of Campaign was illegal or not, but I said in certain cases it had my moral sanction.

Sir EDWARD CLARKE: I am bound to say that my hon. and learned Friend goes beyond me there. He was arguing a question of law, and was illustrating it by questions of law. Did he say it was illegal? Let me put it both ways. My hon. and learned Friend said he did not pronounce an opinion as to whether the Plan of Campaign was legal or illegal, but that, whether it was legal or illegal, it has his moral sanction. I do not think that is a position which is quite worthy of my hon. and learned Friend, or that it is one which, being a lawyer, he is entitled to take when speaking in this House on a matter of very serious importance. My hon. and learned Friend has stated that many years ago death used to be inflicted for small offences, and he said that so strongly was the moral sense of the people hostile to the cruel law that, when a case was brought into Court that involved the punishment of death, Judges, jurors, counsel, and witnesses joined in an illegal conspiracy to defeat the law which was then in existence. Now, I beg to give that statement a most unqualified denial. There is no foundation for it at all. The Judges at that time, though not in sympathy with the law, administered it as it was, and not as they thought it ought to be, exercising indulgence only in cases of doubt. A Judge at the present time, in a capital case, exercises the most careful scrutiny of the evidence, in order that the sentence of death may not be carried out on a person who may be innocent. To describe such action as conspiracy is to represent a state of things which has never existed in this country. The hon. and learned Member also cited disobedience to the Vaccination Law as an example; but that is not analogous to the Plan of Campaign, and involves no violation of a contract between two persons or the enforcement of legal rights. Again, as to School Board summonses, I contend that this example which has been cited by the hon. and learned Member is, also, not parallel. I have not heard of any magistrate who, when a case was clearly proved before him, refused to convict, however small the fine might be which the justice of the case required. And now, Sir, I must refer again to the speech of the hon. Member for South Louth (Mr. T. P. Gill). The hon. Member has, with praiseworthy diligence, endeavoured to acquaint himself with the history of the law. But his studies have not been carried far enough, otherwise he would have known that the Statute of Charles I., to which reference has been made by the hon. Member, and which is said to be so odious, was really passed in the 10th year of Charles for the protection of the subject, and it was simply an application to Ireland of a Statute passed for England in the Reign of James I. He has stated that in Ireland the Judges who, as Privy Councillors, order a prosecution, walk down to the Courts to try the men whom they have ordered to be prosecuted. There is no foundation for that statement at all; and I venture to say that the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley), if he were in his place, would confirm me in that denial. It has been further stated by the hon. Member for Cheshire (Mr. M'Laren) that it is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill which properly ought to be called a "Bill for imprisoning certain Irish Members." Whence did he get his power of prophecy? He is not a Member of the Cabinet, or a Gentleman whom the Government would be likely to consult. I happen, from my position, to know something more with regard to the proposals of the Government, and I can assure him that there is no foundation whatever for his description of the measure. The description is certainly not one which can be applied to the Bill which Her Majesty's Government may introduce for the amendment of the Criminal Law. It has been said that this debate has wasted a good deal of valuable time. I do not entirely agree with that, for the reason that I think it was very desirable, in view of what has taken place in Ireland, that there should be, at the very earliest moment, a full and formal impeachment of the conduct of the Government. It was eminently desirable that some accredited spokesman of the Irish Nationalist Party should formally attack the policy of the Government; and I believe that it has been a source of great satisfaction to Members on both sides of the House to hear the speech in which the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) made a really serious attack upon the Government. The attack made by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) was very cautious, and he did not desire to go into much detail. But when the hon. Member for East Mayo, the trusted and accredited spokesman of the Irish Members, speaks on such a subject as the present Amendment, the House knows that it has heard the whole of the case. The hon. Member for East Mayo is the trusted and accredited spokesman of hon. Members below the Gangway opposite, and they are always content when he has stated their case to the House. Now, what does his case amount to on this occasion? Where is the imputation of cruelty on the part of the landlords? It is in connection with the Glenbeigh evictions alone that the hon. Member has made any serious accusation of cruelty against the landlord. We were told that these atrocities were to be exposed at public meetings, that the whole nation was to be roused by the recital of the wrongs of the tenants at Glenbeigh. Why is it that this cry has died down? Why is it that this threatened agitation is collapsing? [An hon. MEMBER: It is only beginning.] How is it that it has rapidly declined during the last three days? It is perfectly clear that the cause of the visible dying down of this excitement and agitation is that it has become quite plain to the House and the country that the Glenbeigh tenantry have been made the instruments of the agitators, who would not allow them even to accept the benefits of the indulgent terms held out to them by the landlords. They refused to allow them to entertain those terms, because they knew that it would destroy the last vestige of the suggestion that the tenants had been unfairly and cruelly dealt with. It is a good thing that we have heard this case stated fully, because the conscience of the country is now set at ease, and the people see that, however much those accusations may form the staple of violent and inflammatory speech elsewhere, when they are brought before this House and examined they practically disappear. There is another, and, perhaps, still more important, question to be considered. What is to be the attitude of the Liberal Party, headed by the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone)—what is to be the attitude of the Representatives of the late Government towards this Amendment? An Amendment to the Address is a rather serious matter. It used to be the custom of this House that an Amendment should not be formally moved unless it was intended to raise definitely some serious question of policy. This Amendment meets that requirement and is perfectly legitimate. It contains two elements—a censure and a demand. If right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Bench opposite are going to vote for this Amendment, they mean to censure the Government for the "novel, doubtful, and unconstitutional measures" which have recently been taken by the Government in Ireland. Now what are those measures? The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), who has alone ventured to define them, mentioned two besides the question as to juries, to which I will advert later on. It is interesting to observe that the right hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley), in addressing the House on Tuesday, was careful to avoid casting any blame on the Government; but, on the contrary, in various passages expressed his approval of the course they had taken. The two measures which the hon. Member for Cork mentioned were the action against the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), calling upon him to find bail, and the proclamation of the Sligo meeting. Now, Sir, the right hon. Member for Newcastle was not very long a Member of the late Liberal Government; but I see in his place the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir William Harcourt), who was in the Cabinet during the administration of Irish affairs by Mr. Forster and Sir George Trevelyan. What is that right hon. Gentleman going to say as to the "novel" and "doubtful" and "unconstitutional" courses denounced by the hon. Member for Cork? The action against the hon. Member for East Mayo, calling upon him to find bail to be of good behaviour, was exactly the same as was brought by the late Government against Mr. Davitt and an hon. Member who has just been returned to this House. The two actions were brought in the same way; the same jurisdiction was appealed to, and the grounds were in each case substantially the same. That measure, therefore, was certainly not novel. If it be doubtful, the right hon. Gentleman opposite will, of course, be ready to defend it. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman, as one of a Cabinet who authorized precisely similar action, will not for a moment listen to the proposition that it was unconstitutional. Now, as to the proclamation of the Sligo meeting. The proclamation was issued because the meeting was called for the avowed purpose of influencing and intimidating jurors; and, whether it was right or wrong, it certainly was neither novel nor unconstitutional, for it was drawn up in the terms of a Proclamation issued by Lord Cowper when he was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer being at the time a Member of the Cabinet. Surely right hon. Gentlemen who were

Members of the late Cabinet will not denounce as novel and unconstitutional measures which were exactly copied from those which they took themselves? I come next to the subject of juries, which I will not now discuss in detail, as it is to be raised hereafter. No one can be more anxious than I am about questions affecting the institution of trial by jury, in which I have the strongest possible belief. Where you have a fair and impartial jury, dealing with matters which do not concern them personally, I am satisfied it is the best tribunal for the decision of disputed matters of fact. There have been but very few cases in my own experience in which, six days after a trial, I have thought that the verdict of the jury was wrong. Now, who are those who complain of jury-packing, and what do they want? Do they want to secure the trial of cases by fair and impartial juries? Then, why do they use all the influence and power in their possession to prevent that result? From the day when Mr. Field was stabbed almost to death in the streets of Dublin, the position of jurors in cases such as those to which we are referring to-day has been one, not only of great responsibility, but of serious danger. In speeches, in placards issued in the country, in the articles in the paper from which my hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) quoted last evening, there have appeared incitements to the people to "watch jurymen." Every juror now is under the apprehension—an apprehension deliberately and intentionally caused by hon. Members below the Gangway opposite—that if a verdict is given against what is called the "public cause," he will become a mark for the indignation of the people, and be subjected to the punishment which they may be able to inflict upon him. The right hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley), in his speech yesterday, said nothing which could justify the censure of the Government. In fact, he went a little the other way. Referring to my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), he said—

> "The course taken by the right hon. Gentleman is such as will commend itself to everyone as a good and sound policy of administration."

But, if that is his view, to support a Motion of Censure upon the Government to which the Chief Secretary belongs is the oddest way of showing his appreciation of the conduct of that right hon. Gentleman. But the right hon. Member for Newcastle not only points out that there has been this sound and excellent conduct on the part of the Chief Secretary; he shows, also, how satisfactory have been the results of that conduct. If the Government needed any justification in this House for the way in which they have conducted Irish affairs during the past six months, they would readily find it in the right hon. Gentleman's recognition of the beneficial results of their action. Describing the present state of Ireland, he says—

> "Over the greater portion of Ireland rents have been very fairly paid, and legal obligations very fairly and honourably acknowledged and met."

The right hon. Gentleman also more than once described the disturbances in Ireland as of a slight character. But if the right hon. Baronet has behaved so well as the right hon. Gentleman has indicated—if the result is that rents have been paid and legal liabilities met, and if we find a diminution of crime and disturbance, one begins to wonder how much further the eulogy will go. The right hon. Gentleman went a step further—he went on to deal with the question of land in Ireland, and spoke of it as inextricably associated with the great problem of the government of Ireland; but, at the same time, he spoke of it as the most important question with regard to Ireland. He said—

> "I cannot, for my part, imagine any terms being invented more favourable to the Irish tenant if he is inclined to purchase than those of Lord Ashbourne's Act."

And he adds—

> "With a temptation so enormous as that, apparently so irresistible, the Irish tenant has not shown any very great anxiety to become the purchaser of his holding."

That takes the eulogy of the Ministry a great deal further. It is acknowledged by the right hon. Gentleman that the present Lord Chancellor of Ireland (Lord Ashbourne) has been the author of a scheme for the purchase of land by the Irish tenants as favourable in its terms as any which the right hon. Gentleman himself could imagine. Surely, Sir, the question must occur to Members of this House, after these acknowledgments have been made, and this eulogy has been spoken, with what object is this Vote of Censure brought against the Government, and how is it that the right hon. Gentleman is going to lend himself to an attack upon Her Majesty's Government? I am afraid it is with the object of intercepting and defeating the efforts which Her Majesty's Government are making on behalf of the people of Ireland. That intention was admitted and avowed some time ago. The statement came from a man on whose lips it appeared to be strangely out of place. It came from the lips of Lord Spencer. On the 25th of November last he made a speech at Leicester, at a meeting to which he was accompanied by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler), and in that speech Lord Spencer used some very remarkable words. He said that there were two modes of government, and he then proceeded to an exposition of the mode of government of the Tory Party, which I, as a Member of that Party, at once accept. He said—

> "There is the mode of the Tory Government and their supporters, then there is the mode of Mr. Gladstone and his Party. Now, what is the mode of our Conservative friends? They say they wish to redress grievances and improve the country by carrying out great public works. They wish to maintain law and order if possible by the ordinary law, but, if not, by exceptional legislation; and, if they persevere long enough, they will defeat and rout the Nationalists and bring contentment to Ireland."

I do not understand that to be the prophecy of Lord Spencer. But I understand it to be Lord Spencer's quotation of the views of the Tory Party. Sir, that statement is literally accurate; but, in addition to that, we do mean, as long as we have the responsibility of dealing with Irish affairs, to maintain law and order by some law or other. If it can be maintained by the ordinary law it will be, and no pains will be spared to carry out that plan. But if the ordinary law fails to secure to Ireland the existence of law and order, which are essential to the welfare and prosperity of her people, Parliament will be asked to improve that law, and if it refuses, it must leave to other hands the administration of Ireland. Lord Spencer described the measure brought in by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, and went on to recite on what conditions alone he would grant to the Irish people that measure of Home Rule and legislative independence which they were asking. He said—

> "We have to secure the unity of the Empire, the supremacy of Parliament. We have to satisfy the financial relations between the two countries—we have to see that law and order is maintained, and we cannot tolerate anarchy in that country—we are too much bound up with them and we have too many interests in that country. We ought also to see that minorities are properly represented. All these matters were carried out in the policy and in the measures proposed by Mr. Gladstone. We do not adhere to the details of these measures, but we maintain rigidly and uprightly the main principles. One thing further I consider necessary, and that is whatever change is made to meet the reasonable aspirations of the Irish people must prevent them making use of any concession made for fresh agitation against the English people."

Sir, it is rather a striking commentary on this requirement that the hon. Member for Wexford (Mr. J. E. Redmond) in America denounced the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian as "cramped and deformed by humiliating safeguards and unnecessary limitations."

MR. W. REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.) said that, as his hon. Relative was not in his place, he wished to correct the hon. and learned Gentleman's statement. The speech alluded to referred in the highest terms to the Government of Ireland Bill, and to the attempt made in it to solve the Irish Question. That speech had been quoted several times by hon. Members, who had always avoided mentioning the fact that at that meeting of the extreme Nationalist Party in America the Bill was referred to, amid cordial cheers, as a settlement of the Irish Question.

SIR EDWARD CLARKE: The hon. Member has had a full opportunity of justifying his relative; but the House will observe that he has not contradicted, and cannot contradict, my statement. But, Sir, to turn back to Lord Spencer's speech. He says—

> "The Government have offered to them the policy of four-fifths of the Irish people, and the remainder is all that they have behind them to support their policy. The alternative policy—the policy of Mr. Gladstone—must not be allowed to remain in a pigeon-hole until the present Government have a majority of the Irish people at their back to support their policy."

There is the sum of the whole matter—

the Government is being a great deal too successful. Lord Spencer was afraid that if the Government were allowed to continue their administration they would rout the Nationalists and win the confidence of the Irish people. Why, that is the meaning of the Amendment to the Address; that is the meaning of the action of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, who praised the action of the Administration and recognized the advantage that it had given to Ireland; that is the meaning of his pledging himself to support the Amendment, which is a Vote of Censure on Her Majesty's Government. There is no foundation whatever for the suggestion that Her Majesty's Government have no intention to carry out any real or serious legislation. Such a taunt as that carries no weight whatever with Her Majesty's Government. I do not believe there is one Department of the State in which a Member of the Government is not ready and anxious to bring forward some proposal of real and substantial good for the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle closed his speech by talking of the leaden atmosphere amid which they approached Irish questions. He, no doubt, correctly represented the manner in which his side of the House did so, or, at all events, he is the best judge about that; but, speaking for the Government side, I maintain that that is not by any means the feeling with which we approach those subjects. We know perfectly well that if, when this debate is over, the House of Commons can persuade itself to make an effort, it can be free and make itself fit to do the work which is given it to do; if it will arrange its Procedure so as to afford fair opportunity to individual contribution to the debates, and at the same time to secure to the House as a whole the power to do Public Business—if it will do this I am quite sure the Conservative Government will go forward with projects of legislation which cannot be assailed as matters of mere Party interest, but deal with questions which concern all Parties and interests, and seek to remove grievances which have long been complained of. While this debate has had the advantage to the House of making public every accusation against the Government, while it has had the incidental and unexpected advantage of extorting from the keenest opponents and most watchful critics of that Government an acknowledgment that they have done well and have been successful, I hope that when this debate has come to an end, and the House has succeeded in thus freeing itself from the trammels which its own Procedure now imposes on its powers, it will then go forward diligently and with success with those measures which will make its proceedings memorable, and conduce greatly to the welfare of the people.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said, it was not necessary to go into the legality or otherwise of the Plan of Campaign, for that would be speedily settled; but what the House had a right to know was what Her Majesty's Government were going to do to remedy the evils which had made the Plan of Campaign necessary in the minds of its authors? For his own part, he had every belief in the efficacy of a comprehensive system of emigration from the congested districts. Some years ago he was associated with Mr. Tuke in his emigration scheme, and he could bear testimony that that scheme had been carried out in such a way that it was an advantage to the people who left the country as well as to those who remained behind. He took exception to a remark which fell from his right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) the previous evening as to "pauper emigration," and "persuading the people to emigrate." The description of pauper emigrants certainly did not apply to those persons and families sent out by Mr. Tuke. Out of the 9,000 or 10,000 persons emigrated by Mr. Tuke only about 150 individuals had come back to Ireland, and of this number many came back from motives personal to themselves; while, as far as they could judge, the others were doing well in the places to which they had been sent. But, however well-intentioned might have been the objects of those who undertook that emigration work, unfortunately the proceedings of the Emigration Committee were not found to be in sympathy with the wishes and the desires of the people of Ireland who were specially interested in the matter. Having had considerable opportunities of coming into contact with Irishmen of all classes and all degrees while engaged in this work, he had been converted to the belief that Home Rule was the only solution of the Irish Question a year or two before it became so popular as it was now. But what ought to be done in this matter of emigration? He believed, everyone admitted, that there were certain congested districts in Ireland in which at the present time, in consequence of the poorness of the soil, the population dependent on the land was too large, and where economic rent did not exist. The case of those districts was hopeless unless something were done by means of migration or emigration to reduce the population in those districts. Two plans had been suggested — the plan of the noble Lord the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), and the plan of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley). As he understood the noble Lord's plan, he proposed that emigration should be carried out through a grant from Parliament, and with the co-operation and sympathy of the local bodies in Ireland. But while it was difficult two or three years ago to obtain support and co-operation, would it not be absolutely impossible now to obtain that sympathy or support in any scheme of State-aided emigration carried through by the English Parliament? He believed that any scheme carried through by the English Parliament must be done without local support. Any proposal of the English Government in the present state of opinion asking for large sums of money for emigration or migration would meet with the strenuous opposition of hon. Gentlemen from Ireland, and he believed that in the present state of public opinion it would be infinitely better to leave those congested districts in the state in which they were now than to ride roughshod over public opinion in Ireland, as such a proposal would do. The other alternative was that the Irish themselves should be allowed to carry out a scheme of migration or emigration such as they believed would be successful in its object. He thought such a scheme as that could only be carried out by means of an Irish Parliament. An Irish Parliament, acting in sympathy with the people, in the interests of the people, would be able to arrange this most delicate matter of removing persons from their holdings to other parts of the country, or to other countries, in a way quite impossible for any individual or Government to do so long as the Irish people were opposed to that policy. He was afraid, therefore, they were brought to this position—that, while admitting that the state of certain parts of Ireland was serious and dangerous, the only way in which a solution of that difficulty could be found was by allowing the Irish to carry out that policy themselves by a central body in Dublin. They heard a good deal from Unionist Members that if the Land Question were settled on a satisfactory basis, then Home Rule would be dropped. He thought that those who had any acquaintance with the feelings of the Irish people themselves must admit that there was a most intense feeling in favour of nationality entirely apart from the Land Question. He believed, in the first place, that it was not possible for the English Parliament to settle the Irish Land Question on a satisfactory basis, and that the only way in which it could be satisfactorily settled was by allowing the Irish to settle it for themselves. But, even if the Land Question could be and were settled, he did not believe that that fact would at all weaken the craving for Home Rule which now existed. In his opinion, everything which Parliament had done in recent years to place the Irish tenants in a better position than they were before had not weakened, but on the contrary, had done much to strengthen, the desire for Home Rule.

Captain M'CALMONT (Antrim, E.) said, he would, at the outset, ask hon. Members not to allow themselves to be led astray by the sensational statements which were being continually made by hon. Members opposite who sat below the Gangway. It was necessary that the House should be very careful in ascertaining the facts upon which they were asked to decide, as they were face to face with an unscrupulous and dangerous conspiracy, half Irish and half American, aided and abetted by the following of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) and by a plentiful supply of American dollars, and which was at open war with the Government of the Queen. The promoters of that conspiracy considered it necessary that something should be done to carry out the Chicago programme. Parliament having adjourned, and Ireland being very quiet last autumn, the heads of the conspiracy thought they had better try to make things a bit lively, and so they hit upon the Plan of Campaign. There was no doubt that, in some cases, reproach and opprobrium had been brought upon landlords, and that a great cry had been got up against Irish landlordism, calculated to destroy, in the eyes of the English people, all respect for Irish landlords as a body; but he ventured to say that, when the facts were examined into, it would be found that the Irish landlords who acted in a reprehensible manner were not those who sat on that side of the House, nor those whom they represented, but that they were supporters of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). Allusions had been made to evictions having taken place, and harrowing pictures drawn of the turning out of poor families on the roadside, and the burning or overturning of their houses; but he could cite them an instance of an hon. and gallant Member, who was a supporter of the hon. Member for Cork, and who, being anxious to sell a certain property of his—some townland—had an offer from a shopkeeper, who insisted as one condition of purchase that all the existing tenants and squatters should be cleared off the land before he paid his money. Well, the hon. and gallant Member for North Galway (Colonel Nolan)—for that was the Member to whom he referred—closed with the bargain and turned all the tenants and squatters out upon the roadside, or into the workhouse, for no other reason than that he wanted to sell the property.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I rise to Order. I think it is very curious conduct to attack my hon. and gallant Friend in his absence, and not to state that all the tenants were re-instated by my hon. and gallant Friend.

CAPTAIN M'CALMONT said, the hon. Member interrupted him too soon, because there was more to tell of the story. The result of the hon. and gallant Member's conduct was, that he was brought before a private Court, which consisted of the late Sir John Gray, Cardinal Cullen, and the late Mr. A. M. Sullivan, who examined into the whole matter, and the hon. and gallant Gentleman was cast by that Court in the sum of £6,000. Whether that money ever found its way into the pockets of those unfortunate people who were driven out into the roadside he was unable to say, but he defied the hon Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) to contradict any item of the statement that he had just made to the House. He merely made it with the view of showing what kind of landlordism there was amongst the supporters of the hon. Member for Cork. There was in his own constituency, he was thankful to say, but one landlord who professed Nationalist principles. Some years ago that gentleman became possessed of a property in East Antrim, and in 1878, he raised the rents over 35 per cent, and forced the tenants to take fee farm grants under very severe conditions as to notice to quit, and the only reduction which the tenants had received was 10 per cent on one half-year. No matter how bad their circumstances, they got no compassion from this gentleman, who was undoubtedly a supporter of the hon. Member for Cork, because he proposed a candidate named Williamson as the opponent of his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Saunderson) in North Armagh. Since then the candidate in question had become more qualified to be a supporter of the hon. Member for Cork, inasmuch as he had been a week in gaol; and, doubtless, when he in turn arrived at the House of Commons, the Parnellites would give a hearty welcome to another gaol-bird. But he would not pursue that line of argument further. If it were necessary, he could support his contention by other proofs that it was supporters of the hon. Member for Cork who brought Irish landlordism into disrepute. Passing on to another point, he would remind the House that, when speaking the other night, the hon. Member for East Mayo alleged that the Plan of Campaign had only been put into operation upon estates whose landlords had refused to deal fairly with their tenants. [MR. DILLON: Hear, hear!] Passing by the question of who was to be the judge of fair dealing between landlord and tenant, he denied altogether the correctness of the hon. Member's allegations. Was it fair dealing between man and man, when a landlord's agent went to meet the tenants and collect the rents, that he should be waited on by a deputation consisting of several Members of Parliament whom he had never seen before, and by two or three priests, and that they should tell the agent that, unless he gave 40 per cent reduction, no rent would be paid? That happened on the property of Mr. Brooke, in the County of Wexford. Could it be said that the hon. Member for East Mayo or Mr. W. O'Brien were professional valuers of rent, and competent to decide, at five minutes' notice, that 200 tenants had a right to demand a reduction of 40 per cent? Now, the evidence as to Mr. Brooke was all on one side. Mr. Brooke, in all his dealings with his tenants, had been careful that they should be conducted with the greatest kindness and generosity. He was an exceptionally good and indulgent landlord. The parish priest wrote a letter, which was published in *The Freeman's Journal* two years ago, which was headed "A Good Landlord," and thanked Mr. Brooke, in very eulogistic words, for the valuable services which he rendered to education and his generous treatment of his tenants, and concluded by saying that it was no wonder Mr. Brooke should be held, as he was, in honour and esteem. Now, since that time, Mr. Brooke had expended 30 per cent of the rent of the estate upon the property, and had done everything possible for the welfare and comfort of the tenants. Yet that was the man who received an intimation that unless he reduced his rent 40 per cent all round he should receive no rent at all. The hon. Member for East Mayo, in addressing a meeting of the tenants on a Sunday afternoon, said, "They ought to remember this man against whom they were struggling as the representative of ascendancy and bad landlordism." He (Captain M'Calmont) contended that a stop should be put to this vilification. Mr. Brooke was a good representative of the landlords of Ireland who had been reviled before the English public, and that was the treatment which such men got, because it was said they were representatives of the English garrison in Ireland. Unfortunately, it was not the agitators who interfered and caused ill-feeling between landlord and tenant who suffered, but the poor tenants who were the dupes of the agitators; and in the case which he had cited, he was afraid the tenants would be very great sufferers, because Mr. Brooke would fight the matter out to the bitter end, and when the law asserted his rights the agitators would be able to go scot-free. They had heard a great deal about the unfortunate people of Glenbeigh who had been turned out on the roadside; but did those people who supported the policy of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian ever consider the misery which was brought upon the people of Ireland by the machinations of the National League? He also denied that the Plan was only used to protect tenants who were unable to pay; indeed, a tenant who had come under its operation had frankly admitted to him that last year was the most profitable year he ever had, and he was almost ashamed to accept a 20 per cent reduction. He knew of many ladies, holding property in Ireland, who had been reduced to the most deplorable state of misery. One lady—he would call her Mrs. A. [*Cries of* "Name!"] Knowing the state of Ireland, he would decline to give any names; he was too familiar with the working of the National League to fall into that trap; but he knew that this lady, having been reduced to a position of want through the non-payment of her just rent, had been compelled to support herself in Cork by needlework. Another lady, Mrs. B., from the same cause, was driven to pawn her watch and chain, and, he might add, that the gates upon her estate and the very doors of her house, had been carried away. He wished that some of those hon. Members who went over to Ireland for a fortnight, in order to get up horrors for retail in this country, would give a little time to making inquiries as to the terrible evils which the machinations of the Land League legislators were bringing on the country. He regretted to say that it was the custom of many hon. Members opposite to go into the country and hold meetings for the purpose of condemning the law, and doing all they could to bring it into ridicule. The hon. Member for West Cavan (Mr. Biggar) was one of those Gentlemen. The hon. Member, some time ago, spoke at one of those meetings something in the "Don't-put-him-under-the-pump" style in reference to a land agent who had made himself obnoxious. "Look here, boys," said the hon. Member, "whatever you do don't shoot him; for if you do, a partizan Judge and a packed jury will be sure to convict you." That was the sort of language which led these poor people to consider that, even if they saw murder committed before their eyes, they must not convict. The hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hanbury) last night declared that England had deprived Ireland of her industries. He (Captain M'Calmont) denied the statement altogether. The reason manufactures did not flourish in Ireland was owing to the policy of hon. Members opposite. They who lived in the North of Ireland knew the value of the connection of Ireland with this great country. That connection gave them confidence, and hence their industries flourished. In the division he represented there were 25 manufacturers in one branch of manufacture alone; and, though they were not now so flourishing as they should like, still they went on increasing and multiplying. He might also say that some Lancashire men, who were putting up a paper factory in the town of Larne a short time ago, said things would go on all right if the Bill of the hon. Member for Mid Lothian did not become law; and that was the secret of the whole matter. If hon. Members opposite would only devote some of their energies to the endeavour to promote industries in the other parts of Ireland as the Loyalists did in the North, it would be very much better for the country than spending their time in political agitation. In conclusion, he wished to say that the Loyalist Party had every confidence in Her Majesty's Government, and fully appreciated the difficulties with which they were beset. He hoped that, in any remedial legislation which they might undertake, they would take means to put down the frightful and barbarous practice of Boycotting, which was a disgrace to any civilized community. There was nobody who would rejoice more in seeing industries flourish throughout Ireland than he should; and he hoped sincerely that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who had made so many sacrifices for Ireland, would be rewarded soon by seeing Ireland prosperous, contented, and happy.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. William Redmond.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTION.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT (1880) AMENDMENT (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Burt, Bill to amend "The Employers' Liability Act, 1880," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Joicey, Mr. Haldane, and Mr. Lockwood.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 163.]

House adjourned at fourteen minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 10th February, 1887.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Solicitors (Ireland) (12).
Committee—Appellate Jurisdiction (15).

NEW PEER.

Percy, Lord Shute—Was introduced by virtue of a special limitation in the Patent dated 17th April 1880, and sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother George William, Lord Shute, and took the Oath.

SOLICITORS (IRELAND) BILL.

(*The Lord Fitzgerald.*)

(NO. 12.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD FITZGERALD, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, the object of the measure was to consolidate and amend the law so as to place the profession of Solicitor in Ireland on a similar footing to that enjoyed by it in England. He brought in the Bill on behalf of the Incorporated Society of Solicitors in Ireland, whose desire was to raise the standard of professional education in Ireland. The measure contained 59 clauses, which, amongst other things, declared that no person should act as solicitor unless admitted and enrolled. It laid down the terms of apprenticeship, made provision for examinations prior to admission to the profession, and for the proper keeping of the roll. It also provided for the registration of solicitors, made arrangements as to certificates and penalties, and contained miscellaneous provisions for the authentication of regulations and other documents, the construction of enactments referring to attorneys' examinations, and the amendment of 33 & 34 *Vict.* 97. 62. There was also a clause making temporary provision as to examination, and another of appeal. He would further say, that if the Bill were read a second time that night, he should defer the Committee stage for a fortnight.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}"—(*The Lord Fitzgerald.*)

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (Earl CADOGAN) said, he had received an intimation from his noble and learned Friend the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, to the effect that there would be no objection to the second reading of the Bill. There were, however, several formal Amendments the noble and learned Lord would desire to see made, of which he would furnish the noble Lord opposite with a list. As the Committee stage was to be postponed for a fortnight, there would be ample time to consider the proposed Amendments.

LORD FITZGERALD said, he should be very grateful to the noble and learned Lord for any suggestion which would improve the Bill.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* the 25*th instant.*

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL.

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

(NO. 15.) COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

LORD DENMAN said that in 1826 Lord Gifford was created a peer, and in two years cleared all the arrears of appeals in the House of Lords. Besides that of 1856, a Bill for an Imperial Court of Appeal passed their Lordships' House in 1874, but was dropped by the Government in the House of Commons.

House in Committee accordingly.

Clause 1 (Lord of Appeal may take his seat during prorogation).

LORD DENMAN, in moving an Amendment on the clauses, said that in the Statute of Edward III., the Archbishop of Canterbury was one of five Lords of Appeal, but they always reported to the House.

Amendment *moved*,

At end of clause, add ("and any Spiritual or Lay Lords shall also be empowered to take the oaths during the sittings of the House of Lords on appeals during the prorogation of Parliament; and if a quorum of three Law Lords cannot be found it shall be lawful for the Lord Chancellor, with the consent of both parties, to nominate one or two Spiritual or Lay Lords who may be willing to sit during the whole of any one case or cases.")—(*The Lord Denman.*)

Amendment *negatived.*

On Question, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill?"

LORD ESHER said, he should certainly have opposed the clause if he had thought that, by its means, under this Bill, there would be a creation of Life Peers. That, however, was, in his opinion, not so, because, as he understood it, the noble and learned Lords who were mentioned were already Peers by virtue of the Act under which they were appointed. If not Peers, they had been enabled to speak and vote, and decide cases while they held the office of a Lord of Appeal only without being Peers at all. The Act said that they were to rank as Barons; and, unless the words made them Peers, they were not Peers at all, and the adjudication of cases in which they had taken part had not been decided by the House of Lords at all, but by persons not Peers. He construed the Act of 1876 as meaning that they were Peers for life for all purposes, but with this fetter—that on their ceasing to be Lords of Appeal they were not to have afterwards a Writ of Attendance; and all that this Bill did was to take off a fetter which that Act imposed not to create Life Peers, but to continue the attendance of those noble and learned Peers in that House after they had ceased to be Lords of Appeal. He, therefore, did not think that the political sarcasm which came from the noble and learned Lord opposite on that subject was well founded. He differed from that noble and learned Lord on the construction of the Act of Parliament, and further supported the clause in the Act because it did not contradict what that House did in the case of Lord Wensleydale. What the House objected to then was an assumed power on behalf of the Crown to make, without authority given by Act of Parliament, any number of Life Peers. Under the Acts now in question the power is limited, and is a power to act under Statute.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he could not agree with the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Esher). Lord Blackburn was a Lord of Parliament exactly as the right reverend Prelates were, and was not a Peer for life. By the present Bill, Lord Blackburn would become a Peer for life, and he was glad that that would be so. If it were not that he desired that the Bill should be passed without delay, he should have asked that the measure might have been postponed, in order that they might have further time to consider its full scope and effect; and he would suggest to his noble and learned Friend the Lord Chancellor that he should consider whether the Bill could not be enlarged.

Lord THRING said, that, in his opinion, from the surroundings of the question, that it was the clear intention of Lord Cairns and the framers of the Act of 1876 that the Lords of Appeal should only sit and vote in the House as such during the time they held Office, and should not be Peers of Parliament. This was clearly stated in the Act, and their dignity was described in the Act as that of a "Lord of Parliament," an expression inconsistent with their being Peers of Parliament.

Lord HERSCHELL said, that he had only put forward the view that was maintained by the very eminent Lord Chancellor who introduced the Act and carried it through their Lordships' House, and by the very able Attorney General of the then Government. If he had erred, he had erred in their company; and, with all respect to his noble and learned Friend opposite (Lord Esher), he thought that, according to the view of those who introduced the Act, this Bill did make a difference. He did not say that the proposal would have been on all fours with what would have been done, if that House had permitted what was proposed in the case of Lord Wensleydale to be done. But he said that in order to meet the views of that House, it was insisted that those Lords of Appeal would be Lords of Parliament only while they held their office, and that they would not sit in that House as Peers, but as Lords of Parliament in right of being Lords of Appeal in Ordinary. The present Bill, however, did make, looking at the views of those who introduced the Bill of 1876, a great change. The Lords of Appeal were *ex-officio* Members, and were in the same position as the Bishops. This Bill would give them the position of Peers for life. It made that difference in their position, and he would not say that it was wrong.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Halsbury) said, they were all agreed that the Bill should be passed, and a question arose as to what was intended by the Act under which Lords of Appeal were appointed to their office. He thought that no person was less able to say what was the construction of an Act than the man who drew it; but he would not enter into an academic discussion of the point. The whole question seemed to be, whether a person appointed under the Act was a Peer, or was only a Lord of Appeal; and, whether the House was now asked to do anything inconsistent with what was done in 1876? The discussion with regard to the creation of Lord Wensleydale as a Life Peer was an important but a different question. It was claimed to be in the power of the Crown to create Peers for life; but that the House objected to. This Bill did not appear to him to establish a precedent as to Life Peerages.

The Earl of MILLTOWN said he wished to point out that the Bishops could not sit in that House after they had resigned their sees. By resigning, they ceased to be Members of their Lordships' House; the Lords of Appeal were in the same position, but this Bill would enable them to sit as Lords of Parliament for life. But could any one pretend that that would create Peers who were not Peers before?

Lord FITZGERALD said he would suggest to his noble and learned Friend the Lord Chancellor that the third reading of the Bill should not be proposed until some time next week, in order that they might have that matter discussed more fully with a view to see whether its provisions could not be enlarged. But he now protested against the principle that they were to be guided on the question by what were the intentions of the framers and draughtsmen of the Act of 1876, however eminent they might be. They were to be guided solely by the intention of Parliament as expressed in the Act which it had passed, and that intention must be gathered from the terms of the Act itself.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Retired Lord of Appeal in Ordinary may sit in House of Lords).

Lord DENMAN, in moving an Amendment on the clause, said, he proposed the power of sitting in the House of Commons, which was the right of every Irish Peer, because Mr. Macaulay had voted for a Master of the Rolls being, as before, eligible to sit in the House of Commons and opposed their exclusion, both as a Liberal, and as a Conservative. His (Lord Denman's) attention had also been called to the lamented death of Lord Deas—a retired Lord of Session. His Lordship was well known when at the Bar, engaged in cases in their Lordships' House, but never was eligible for the House of Commons after he became a Lord of Session, or had retired. With regard to the creation of Lord Blackburn, the Prerogative of the Crown decided, and the consent of his Lordship was also requisite.

Amendment *moved,*

At end of clause, add ("and if a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary, after he has resigned his seat in this House, should be elected to sit for any county or borough in England, or Scotland, or Wales, it shall be lawful for such Lord to sit and vote in the House of Commons, so long as he may remain a Member of Parliament, and if, ceasing to be a Member, it shall be lawful for him to return to his seat in the House of Lords for the remainder of his life."—(*The Lord Denman.*)

Amendment *negatived.*

Amendment *moved,*

In page 1, line 24, at the end of the clause, to add ("and the expression 'high judicial office,' as defined in the twenty-fifth section of the said Act, shall be deemed to include the office of Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.")—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

The Earl of SELBORNE said, he thought there were some Members of their Lordships' House qualified to sit and assist in the transaction of Judicial Business, who ought to be brought within the quorum clause of the Appellant Jurisdiction Act, quite as much as those whom the noble and learned Lord (the Lord Chancellor) proposed to bring within it. There was Lord Hobhouse, for example, who had acted for many years to the public advantage in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and who, at present, did not happen to come within the definition of the Act of Parliament as one of the persons having held high judicial office. He thought the definition should be enlarged, so as to include all those persons nominated to be members of the Judicial Committee by Her Majesty under the Sign Manual, and who, for a reasonable period of time, had acted as Judges of Appeal in Council.

Lord BRAMWELL said, he fully concurred in the suggestion of the noble and learned Earl (the Earl of Selborne). The words in the Act of Parliament referred to would not have included Lord Kingsdown, one of the ablest Judges who had ever assisted their Lordships. He would have been able to sit, but not to be one of the quorum described.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

The Report of the Amendment to be received on *Thursday* next.

ARMY (SIDE ARMS)—DEFECTIVE SWORD-BAYONETS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Lord BALFOUR, in rising to ask Her Majesty's Government, What steps the authorities are about to take in order to ascertain who are responsible for having passed the defective sword-bayonets, and having taken them off the contractor's hands; and, what was the contract price paid for them, said: My Lords, I am not animated in any way by a feeling of hostility to the War Office; but it seems to me that the Question which stands in my name arises directly out of the answers given in this House and the other House of Parliament on Monday last. It seems to me that there are two manifest defects in the reply which was given by the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris). In the first place, it seems to me that he did not give any expression to what I think is the feeling of the majority of your Lordships, as to the great gravity of the state of things revealed in regard to the defective condition of certain weapons which have been supplied to the different branches of Her Majesty's Service. Secondly, there did not appear to be any expression of an intention to find out who is really responsible for the admission of these defective weapons into the hands of officers and men. There can be no two opinions but that this is a very serious question, both for its own sake, and on account of the moral effect which it might produce, if the Army were to become afraid that the weapons served out to them were in a large measure defective. Therefore, I do not think it necessary for me to make any apology for bringing the matter before your Lordships. It is of the utmost importance, if possible, that we should find out who is responsible for what I think is a neglect of duty in allowing defective weapons of this nature to pass into use. If my noble Friend says that there is a more rigorous test demanded now than before, that may relieve individuals from blame; but if he lays blame on the system, I shall be glad to hear that, in the future, that system is to be changed; if the Department does not admit that the system is defective, then I think that the Department is bound to say who is responsible for not having put the weapons to the proper test. The contract price paid for these weapons is also a matter of great importance. I may be wrong with respect to the information that has reached me, to the effect that the prices of these sword bayonets were so low that it was practically impossible for proper weapons to be supplied at the price paid for them. If that is a misapprehension, it will be for the noble Lord to state what was the price paid for the articles, and then any practical man will be able to say whether there would be a reasonable expectation that a good article could be supplied at that price. The noble Lord concluded by asking the Question of which he had given notice.

THE EARL OF MORLEY: Before the noble Lord answers the Question, I am anxious to say a few words. I do not know anything about the particular batch of bayonets, or cutlasses referred to; but I should like to tell your Lordships what I saw yesterday, because it shows, at any rate, that however severe a test may be to which these weapons are submitted, they will not, and cannot, resist treatment that any irresponsible people may subject them to. I happened to be at Enfield, yesterday, on business, with several Members connected with the Committee which is now sitting, who are well acquainted with metals and their working. I was not directly inquiring into this, or any other technical subject, but into administration. While at Enfield, we looked very carefully into the tests which all sorts of swords, cutlasses, and sword-bayonets are now subjected to. I think it was their unanimous opinion that those tests were extremely severe and satisfactory. The present tests are very much more severe than those formerly used. Two cutlasses were taken and put through all those tests, which were of three kinds—first, the striking test; secondly, the bending test, which was of a severe character; and, thirdly, the weight test—that was to say, how many pounds a weapon would bear without bending, and how many inches it would bend to every additional pound. These cutlasses passed through all those tests. Then we put one into a vice, and it was perfectly easy, when applying sufficient manual force, to bend it in any way you liked, and not merely to bend, but to break it. It is impossible that any steel will remain unbroken, if sufficient force is applied in a vice, or, even, if you bend it over your knee; and it is quite possible for a sword or cutlass to pass all the tests which are admitted to be satisfactory and stringent, and yet be unable to stand this severe treatment. It does not follow, however, that the article is bad, because it will not stand the particular treatment to which it is subjected, and I venture to state that no steel which could possibly be made could stand such tests as that of the vice.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, with reference to the answer of my noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for War on Monday, I would suggest that he would do better to give a candid answer and say that flexible swords which bend are better than brittle swords which break, rather than to endeavour to screen the Department. There was no precedent for flexible swords unless you went back to ancient history. Julius Cæsār relates that some of the Gauls had swords which bent at every blow, and that they had to straighten them under their feet. What was involved was not the credit of this or previous Governments, but the safe equipment of the Naval and Military Forces of the Crown.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Lord HARRIS): I can assure my noble Friend (Lord Stanley of Alderley) that, so long as I represent one, that it will not be my object to screen any Government Department. The reply which I made the other day was perfectly honest, and without any attempt to screen anyone. With regard to the Question of the noble Lord (Lord Balfour) I must point out to my noble Friend that, following upon my answer the other day, there is something more than a Question. There is an assumption which I cannot admit in using the word "defective." I am not at present prepared to admit that these sword-bayonets are defective. If it cannot be shown that they will not stand the test to which they were submitted in 1871, and which was considered at the time to be perfectly sufficient, then I say the sword-bayonets are not defective. If it can be shown that they will not stand the test, I will admit that they are defective. At present, my information is that they will stand that test, but that a certain percentage will not stand the increased test demanded of swords and sword-bayonets at the present day. There is, undoubtedly, a great deal of interest taken in this subject. The noble Lord has further asked who is responsible for the issue of these sword-bayonets. In answer to that, I can only repeat what I stated the other day—that the Superintendent of the Royal Small Arms Factory issued the cutlasses and the sword-bayonets on his own responsibility, and there is no reason to suppose that they were not up to the test when they were passed. The last contract price was 14*s*. each, including the scabbard.

NAVY—H.M.S. "INDUS"—DEFECTIVE SWORD-BAYONETS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of ERNE: My Lords, I have a Question, which is supplementary to that which I put the other night; but, after what we have heard from the noble Lord, I suppose I ought to strike out the words "admittedly defective," as the War Department do not appear to admit that they were defective. The Question I desire to ask Her Majesty's Government is with reference to the answer lately given by the Under Secretary of State for War, showing the admittedly defective state of the sword-bayonets supplied to H.M.S. *Indus*. Whether any complaints have been received at the Admiralty from commanding officers of other ships, and, if so, of what nature; what steps are the Admiralty about to take to ascertain whether any of Her Majesty's ships on foreign stations have been supplied with defective sword-bayonets; what was the test applied to the sword-bayonets found defective in H.M.S. *Indus*; and to what extent are the Naval Authorities answerable for the admission of these defective sword-bayonets into the Naval Service?

Lord ELPHINSTONE (A Lord in Waiting): My Lords, in answer to the first part of the Question, complaints have been received from the commanding officers of four ships, the *Active*, *Volage*, *Rover*, and *Devastation*. Some cutlasses and sword-bayonets on the *Active* having been found defective in actual use, orders were given for about half of those on the ship to be tested as follows:—The point of the sword was placed in the deck, and pressure applied at the handle until the point was turned about 50 degrees from the straight line. On being released, the whole of those marked "defective" remained permanently out of the original line. Of the 50 cutlasses tested on the ship, 34 were found defective; and of the 55 sword-bayonets tested, 40 were found defective. The same course was followed on the *Rover*, when 45 out of 50 cutlasses were found defective, and 54 out of 55 sword-bayonets. On the *Volage*, with the same test, 12 out of 50 cutlasses were reported defective, and 17 out of 55 sword-bayonets. The following is the report from the *Devastation*, at Queensferry—

> "On examining sword-bayonets, it was found that many would bend like hoop-iron. Some could be bent easily by hand, and remain bent."

With regard to the second part of the Question, the War Office has been communicated with to know what steps they wish to be taken, sword-bayonets being a War Office store and not a naval. What was the test applied to the sword-bayonets found defective on Her Majesty's Ship *Indus?* The point of the sword was placed on the deck, and a fair pressure applied on the hilt; when this was released, a permanent deflection of the blade existed. The point was then fixed in a vice, and the blade bent evenly round until it assumed the appearance of a screw. As to the last part of the Question, I have to say that the Naval Authorities are in no way responsible for the admission of these defective sword-bayonets into the Naval Service. When a new weapon is designed for the Naval Service, a pattern is sent to the Admiralty. If approved of, notification is made to the War Office, and there all responsibility ceases. The Naval Authorities are not consulted further. They are not consulted as to the wording of the specifications, as to the selection of the contractor, as to the details of the metal to be used, or as to the nature of the test to which the weapons are to be submitted before being accepted as serviceable weapons. Your Lordships will readily understand that the approval of a pattern weapon is a very different thing from the approval of the weapons themselves. A pattern weapon would not be likely to exhibit inferiority, either of workmanship or metal. The Admiralty can, therefore, accept no responsibility of the admission of these defective weapons into the Naval Service.

LORD HARRIS: My Lords, I must be allowed a word in reply to what has been said by the noble Lord (Lord Balfour) with regard to these sword-bayonets. With respect to the tests, your Lordships have heard that the sword point was placed on the deck, and pressure was applied upon it until it had obtained an angle of 50 degrees. I am not sure that your Lordships will be able to understand what an angle of 50 degrees is. Certainly, we found very great difficulty about it at the War Office, and, having the advantage of his presence, I asked a distinguished naval officer to explain what was meant, and he was entirely unable to do so. But your Lordships will perceive that this was a purely arbitrary test, and it was not at all fair, inasmuch as it may have been a far greater test than the sword-bayonets were submitted to in 1871, and even a far more severe one than that to which they are submitted now. What fell from the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Morley) will show that the subsequent test of placing in a vice was positively unfair. I would ask any of your Lordships to go to any eminent sword manufacturer in this country, and ask him whether he considered it fair to put any sword to a stronger test than that which it was made to stand. I have seen a manufacturer bend a sword until the blade was shortened six inches, and when I asked him to bend it another inch he declined, because, he said, it would be unfair. The test on these ships, therefore, may or may not have been a fair one. If it was a fair test, the War Office is perfectly ready to assume the responsibility; but I would remind your Lordships that a Royal Commission of Inquiry is now sitting to inquire into the system by which ordnance stores were issued. There is also a Committee inquiring into the manufacture of ordnance stores, and the terms of Reference will permit of the question of sword-bayonets being included. The Secretary of State has determined, further, to investigate this matter by instituting an impartial inquiry on the spot.

LORD DE ROS: I think that there exists an immense amount of red-tapeism connected with this subject, and it appears to me very hard upon our soldiers and sailors that they may be called upon to go into action armed with weapons which they cannot rely upon. I hope that the Committee and the Royal Commission which the noble Lord has just mentioned will be able to throw some light upon the matter, and that the result will be that more satisfactory weapons will be supplied to the Services in the future.

LORD BALFOUR: I think that the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) has misapprehended what I have said. I did not mean to charge him with indifference; I only desired to state that, in the answer I gave, he did not seem to sufficiently appreciate the importance of the state of matters.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY: My Lords, it is obvious that one of the statements made on behalf of the Government—that made by my noble Friend (Lord Elphinstone)—contains some very startling revelations. I wish to know whether any previous discoveries of this nature have been made, or whether these are the only defective weapons found?

LORD ELPHINSTONE: I think that this is somewhat a wide Question, and I must request that Notice may be given of it.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH: I wish to ask, whether there is not reason to suppose that these weapons had become defective by reason of the alterations which had been made in them from cutlasses?

Lord HARRIS: That is not the opinion of the authorities at the Small Arms Factory; but it is possible: and the question will be tested by chemical process.

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 10*th February*, 1887.

MINUTES.]—New Members Sworn—The Right honble. George Joachim Goschen, *for* the Borough of St. George's, Hanover Square; Timothy Michael Healy, esquire, *for* the North Longford Division of the County of Longford; John Gordon Swift MacNeill, esquire, *for* the South Donegal Division of the County of Donegal; Edward Joseph Kennedy, esquire, *for* the South Sligo Division of the County of Sligo.

Select Committees — Public Petitions, Mr. James Campbell *disch.;* Mr. Dalrymple *added;* Public Accounts, Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth *added.*

Private Bills (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—Brixton Market, *put off;* Metropolitan Board of Works (Various Powers).*

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Marriages (Attendance of Registrars) * [164]; City of London Fire Inquests * [165].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

BRIXTON MARKET BILL (*by Order*).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

Mr. BROADHURST (Nottingham, W.): I beg to move, as an Amendment, that the Bill be read a second time upon this day six months, and in doing so I shall have to ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I state my reasons for objecting to the Bill. In the first place, this is not a Market Bill at all. It makes no provision whatever in the shape of market requirements. Secondly, there is no necessity for a market in this locality. As far as I have been able to gather, the Bill is in reality a Land Appropriation Bill. There was an Act of Parliament passed about 80 years ago, called the Rush Common Act, which gave a certain frontage to the Brixton Road, and made provision that no building should be erected upon it thereafter. A clause in this Market Bill gives to the Company who are promoting it power to cover the frontage with market buildings. Since the opposition to the Bill has become known, the promoters of the measure have offered to surrender their claim to this open space, but it is only a surrender in name, and in reality is no surrender at all. They would still retain if not complete, almost complete, authority to do what they like with the land in question. The latest proposal of the promoters is that they should enclose this space themselves, in garden patches, but that, at the same time, they should have the right of cutting two very wide roads through this narrow strip of land, which would not be half the size it is now; while in regard to the small plots they propose to enclose, the House would surrender to the Company complete authority and control over them. I sincerely hope that no hon. Member, by reciting the concessions, or so-called concessions, which the promoters propose to make, will succeed in leading the House astray, or induce them to believe that the inhabitants of Brixton would still enjoy their ancient rights over this property. Looking at the question in its proper light, I wish to make it clearly understood by the House that if it was only this narrow strip of land that was involved, the question would not be so important as it really is. But, as a matter of fact, there are many acres of land farther south which are under the same Act of Parliament, passed in 1806, and if the House of Commons concedes to the Brixton Market Company the provisions now asked for, it would be unable to deny to other Companies who might propose to take possession and cover with buildings other lands farther south upon the Brixton Road. And now, Sir, with regard to the scheme for establishing a market, apart from the question of the land. As a matter of fact, there is no market at all wanted in the district. I have lived for 12 years only a few minutes' walk from the site which the Bill proposes to appropriate, and therefore I know personally what the necessities of the case are, if there are any. The only necessity that actually exists is to provide some place where the costermongers may expose their goods for sale. But there is no provision whatever in this Bill for that class of market people. So far as I can gather, the Bill simply provides for the erection of a series of colonnades for fancy shops, with which I am able to say that the district is more than well supplied already. Not one inch of space is set apart for costermongers and street hawkers, who are the only people who, at the present moment, need protection in that part of London. I do not propose to occupy the time of the House at any greater length than I can help; but, in order to show the House how little the scheme is required in the neighbourhood, I must mention the fact that no one interested in the locality is engaged in the promotion of the Bill. There are only three names mentioned in the measure of those who are to be Directors of the proposed Company, and I am told that one of them comes from India, another from Ceylon, and the third, I was given to understand, at first came from Portugal, but I have since been informed that he is resident somewhere in London; but few, if any, of the residents in the neighbourhood have asked for or desired the proposed scheme, and that fact should, I think, of itself be sufficient to condemn the Bill. But there is one other appeal I wish to make to the House, and it is this. A portion of land in the vicinity of the Brixton Road was dedicated to the inhabitants by the Act of 1806, and provision was made that a wide open space should be maintained on one side of the main road. But, at the present moment, we have no single authority in London to stand up in defence of that Act, and we are at the absolute mercy of any Company-mongers who have selfish objects of their own to carry out. I should have thought that the Metropolitan Board of Works would have afforded us their protection. I do not see the hon. Baronet the Chairman of the Board (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg) in his place, but the Metropolitan Board of Works appear to be either incapable or careless so far as the proposals contained in this Bill are concerned. Then, again, the Lambeth Vestry, which is the immediate Local Body that ought to protect us, is itself pervaded by land-grabbers, and is not likely to take any active steps to frustrate such an encroachment as this. I may tell the House that so extensive is the system of land-grabbing in that part of London, that if a resident were to leave his house unprotected for a day, it is scarcely too much to say that on returning home at night he would find a cottage built in his front garden. That is scarcely an exaggeration of things that are now taking place, and in regard to which we have in vain appealed for protection from the Metropolitan Board of Works. We hope, however, that even yet we may be protected by some Metropolitan authority against these encroachments. I have no doubt that much mischief would be done if it were not for the exceptional efficiency af the police in that part of London. Then, Sir, I appeal very earnestly to the House of Commons to protect the people of South London from so gross a proposal to encroach upon their rights as is contained in this Bill; and, in doing so, I would call the attention of hon. Members to the fact that this is not in the least degree a Party question. The hon. and learned Member opposite who sits for the Brixton Division of Lambeth (Mr. Baggallay), adjoining which Division I myself reside, has undertaken to second my Amendment. I have been informed that urgent appeals have been made to the hon. and learned Gentleman to put his name on the back of the Bill, but that he refused to do so because the inhabitants were opposed to it. I understand that the promoters also applied to the hon. Gentleman who—I do not like to say represents me in this House (Mr. Bristowe), but who, at least, sits for the Division in which I am a voter—but that hon. Gentleman also very wisely refused to put his name on the back of the Bill. The promoters did not invite me to do so, because they probably knew that I should oppose the measure. They obtained the signature and sanction of two of my hon. Friends, who have allowed their names to appear on the Bill; but I venture to say that, if those hon. Gentlemen had known the real nature of the proposal, and the opposition there is to it by the people who live in the neighbourhood, they would at once have refused their sanction to this attempt to rob the inhabitants of their common rights. I must apologize for trespassing so long upon the time of the House upon a Private

Bill; but I earnestly hope that all Parties in the House will join hands in protecting the great mass of the inhabitants of London, who at present have no protection, except that which is afforded to them by the House of Commons, from such encroachments upon their rights and privileges as are involved in this Bill. I beg, Sir, to move that the Bill be read a second time upon this day six months.

MR. BAGGALLAY (Lambeth, Brixton): I rise to second the Motion which my hon. Friend the Member for Nottingham has made. I believe that, in doing so, I am acting in behalf of my entire constituency. I have taken some trouble to ascertain the feeling of the people residing in the neighbourhood, and of the tradesmen there, and I am fully able to endorse what my hon. Friend has said—that this is not a question of party or class, but that all parties and all classes in Brixton are unanimously against this proposal—in the first place, because they say that a market of this character is not wanted; and, in the next, that the measure is an infringement of their rights. They have affirmed their opinion by presenting, through me, two Petitions against the Bill, signed by nearly 6,000 persons living in the immediate neighbourhood. The Vestry of the parish of Lambeth are unanimously against it, and have resolved to present a Petition to this House in opposition. The question of whether or not a market is required is, of course, one which might be considered by a Committee upstairs, and might be a very fit and proper question to send before a Committee, provided there were no other grounds of opposition; but there are other and very important objections. One of the most important is the proposal which is contained in it to take possession of a long strip of ground which is now covered with trees, shrubs, grass, and flowers, and to devote that land to building and other purposes. It is right to say that an undertaking has been given by the promoters that, if they are allowed to take this piece of land, they do not propose to build upon it. Perhaps, at first sight, that undertaking might appear to meet the objections of the opponents of the Bill; but I wish to point out that the promoters only propose not to build upon it. They do not undertake that they will not cut any number of roads through it; they do not undertake that they will not cut down every tree upon it; that they will not take up every shrub, remove all the grass, and so cover the space as to be able to carry on the business of a market upon it, although they place no building or fixed erection upon it. It would be quite possible for them to put shanties and costermongers' barrows, and do other things which would be equally, and perhaps more, objectionable to the inhabitants of Brixton than the building of good houses and shops upon that strip of land. The Circular issued by the promoters this morning in support of the Bill points out the concessions which the promoters are willing to make; but my objection is that, even with the Amendments which they propose to introduce, it would still take away from the inhabitants a piece of land dedicated to them by an Act of Parliament 80 years ago. To cut down the trees and shrubs which now exist upon this spot, and to destroy the garden ground, would give to the land the most unsightly appearance; but, in addition to that, it would be in the power of the Company to cut roads through it, and cover the rest with temporary sheds and stalls, as a market for the sale of goods. My hon. Friend the Member for Nottingham has alluded to the fact that the promoters of the scheme have no interest in the district, and that no inhabitant of Brixton is taking an active part in it. I have made every inquiry as to the promotion of the Bill, and I have thoroughly satisfied myself that the desire for the Bill is not local. The measure comes from certain people—whether from India, Ceylon, or elsewhere, I know not; but this I do know, that it is not supported by any person who has a genuine interest in the locality. It emanates from gentlemen who may be able to satisfy a Committee upstairs of their *bona fides;* but we have no assurance that, as soon as they secured the passing of the Bill, they would not put up temporary shops and shanties, and then seek to cover over other open spaces for the purposes of their own private profit. Believing that the Bill is not required; that it is promoted by people who have no connection with the neighbourhood; that there has been no public meeting in the locality in support of it, and that any Petition in favour of it has only received the signatures of a few costermongers, I feel it my duty to second the Motion for the rejection of the Bill.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS (Sir JAMES M'GAREL HOGG) (Middlesex, Hornsey): I had not intended to take any part whatever in this debate, because I had not considered the merits of the Bill, either in one way or the other. I have myself, generally speaking, supported the diffusion of markets throughout the Metropolis and elsewhere, believing their extension to be for the benefit of the inhabitants. I lay that down as a general principle. But in regard to this particular scheme, if the hon. Gentleman had not referred to me, and suggested that I and my colleagues upon the Metropolitan Board of Works were either incapable or careless, so far as the discharge of our duties is concerned, I should not have risen now. I wish the hon. Member to know that the Metropolitan Board, and I, as its Chairman, have no wish to act in any way against the law. We never attempt, in any shape or form, to interfere with interests with which we have nothing to do. A Question was asked the other night about lines of frontage; but, as regards that Question, it is impossible for the Metropolitan Board to go against existing Acts of Parliament. In this case an Act of Parliament has been passed which deals with this land; and so long as the law is clearly laid down and defined, I am of opinion that the Metropolitan Board pursue a wise course in attempting no interference with the law as laid down by Parliament.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton): I would ask the House to reject this Bill on a much wider ground than that which has been taken by the Mover and Seconder of the Amendment. It will be within the knowledge of some hon. Members that I obtained a somewhat voluminous Return in regard to market rights and tolls in the last Parliament. I propose to bring the subject before the House, in the shape of a Resolution, in two or three weeks' time; and I would ask the House in the meantime not to confer upon any private body the right of collecting tolls or of creating new privileges in connection with markets. It is upon that ground that I ask the House not to assent to the second reading of this Bill.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Second Reading *put off* for six months.

QUESTIONS.

—o—

INDIA—THE PUNJAB—FORCED LABOUR, &c.

MR. DE LISLE (Leicestershire, Mid) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether Begar or forced labour is still compulsory in Kulu (Punjab), although ordered to be discontinued since last August; whether the Assistant Commissioner has issued an order compelling the Zemindars of Kulu to carry the road overseer's baggage without any remuneration whatsoever, and whether other subordinate officials enjoy the same privilege; what is the number of deaths that have occurred among the Zemindars living at high elevations ordered down into the valleys during the heats of summer; and, whether the upper valley is still unprovided with dispensaries, schools, and post offices?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): In Kulu, which is in a very backward state of civilization, it is thought that the administration of the country would break down without some form of forced labour. The practice has, therefore, been regulated, not abolished, as stated in the Question. All forced labour, except that necessary for maintaining existing roads, is to be paid for at its fair market value. The Secretary of State has no information as to the specific orders referred to. But the task of carrying the road overseer's baggage on a tour of inspection would be part of the labour necessary for maintaining existing roads. No deaths have been reported to the Secretary of State as having occurred from the causes referred to. The district of Kulu has a post office, two dispensaries, and six schools. The latter are ill-provided with scholars, although attending school is regarded as forced labour and exempts the parents of the children from any further demand.

HARBOUR OF REFUGE—LUNDY ISLAND.

Mr. LLEWELLYN (Somerset, N.) asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether the attention of the Board of Trade has been called to the serious and lamentable loss of life by shipwreck, especially during the last six months, in and near the Bristol Channel; and, whether any scheme or proposal is under consideration for the construction of a Harbour of Refuge at Lundy Island, or some other suitable place, as a means of minimizing the risks to shipping on that part of our coast?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Yes. The attention of the Board of Trade has been called to the serious and lamentable loss of life in the Bristol Channel. For a Harbour of Refuge, as distinguished from a commercial harbour, there are considerations which seem to point out to the suitability of Lundy; but of recent years the general policy of creating such harbours at the public expense has been discountenanced; and, in view of the difficulties which surround this subject, the Board of Trade do not see their way to make or to entertain at present any proposal such as that suggested in the hon. Member's Question.

EGYPT—ABOLITION OF THE "CORVEE."

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK (London University) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is correct that the French Government have refused their assent to the financial arrangements necessary for the abolition of the *corvée* in Egypt?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): It is not correct to say that the French Government refused their assent to the financial arrangements necessary for the abolition of the *corvée* in Egypt; and the Under Secretary of State for India contradicted the statement in the debate upon the Amendment of the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer). The French Government were not satisfied with some of the Articles of the proposed Decree for the abolition of the *corvée*; and it was apprehended that the consequent delay would necessitate the calling out of the peasantry to clear the canals. Since that debate, a telegram has been received stating that the French Government have now signified their adhesion to the Decree on certain conditions; that an arrangement is probable, and that if arrived at within a few days it would still be in time to prevent *corvée* work being actually begun.

PUBLIC HEALTH—INSANITARY CONDITION OF BATTERSEA PARK.

Mr. BONSOR (Surrey, Wimbledon) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether his attention has been called to the insanitary condition of the Ornamental Water in Battersea Park; and, if so, whether he can see his way to have it remedied before the summer months?

The FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. Plunket) (Dublin University): My attention has been called to the state of the Ornamental Water in Battersea Park. I am informed that the shallow portion of the Lake was cleaned out last spring; that the water of the remainder is comparatively deep; and that there is a considerable change in it twice each day, owing to the action of the tide; and I am assured by my officers, who have reported upon the matter, that it is not in an insanitary state, and that no smell can be perceived from it. It would cost, at least, £2,000 to clean out the deep part of the Lake; and I regret to say I have not got the money.

SEA FISHINGS (SCOTLAND) ACT—DEFECTIVE OPERATIONS.

Mr. FRASER-MACKINTOSH (Inverness-shire) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether he is aware that, in consequence of the non-issue of an Order in Council, and of books and instructions to the Collectors of Customs in Scotland, the Sea Fishings (Scotland) Act, passed eight months ago, is inoperative; and, whether these Collectors refuse to register mortgages prepared under the Act when presented to them?

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): I am quite aware that, in consequence of the unavoidable delay in issuing the Order in Council, the Act referred to is unworkable, and that no mortgages under the Act can yet be registered. The Order in Council is now in the printer's hands. I may remind the hon. Member of the answer I gave the other day to the hon. Member for West Perthshire (Sir Donald Currie), in which I expressed my great disappointment at the delay which has occurred, and pointed out the reasons of it.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT) — CONTRACT FOR CARTRIDGES FOR QUEENSLAND.

COLONEL BRIDGEMAN (Bolton) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been drawn to a statement which appeared in *The Standard* of the 7th instant, alleging that a tender for 500,000 cartridges for Queensland having been sent in to the War Office an hour or two too late, the order was given to a German; and, whether there is any foundation for the statement?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF THE ORDNANCE (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter) (who replied) said: There is an absolute rule in the War Office that if a time is fixed for the reception of tenders, those received later are not considered. The contract in question was given to a well-known firm, whose tender was the lowest, and, I may add, considerably lower than that of the firm to which reference is made in the statement in *The Standard* newspaper. The patent is, I understand, a German one; but the firm whose tender was accepted have positively assured the Director of Contracts that the metal for the cartridges will be rolled at Birmingham, and the cartridges made on their own premises.

MR. HANBURY (Preston): May I ask what is the name of the firm?

MR. NORTHCOTE: Messrs. Latimer, Clark, Muirhead, and Co., of West Street, Millwall.

MR. HANBURY: May I ask whether Messrs. Latimer, Clark, Muirhead, and Co., are not merely a commission house, acting as agents for a firm at Carlsruhe, and themselves employing only 16 hands, and no mechanics among them?

MR. NORTHCOTE: I cannot say what number of men they have in their employment; but if the hon. Gentleman will put the Question on the Paper, I will endeavour to answer it. I am assured that they manufacture their own goods, though the patent is German.

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—THE RIVER BARROW.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is yet in a position to state the intentions of the Government with regard to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Drainage of the River Barrow?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The hon. Member must be under some mistake. The Royal Commission has made no recommendation on the subject.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: I am speaking of the Royal Commission which reported last year.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Oh! That was not a Royal Commission at all. I thought the hon. Member referred to the Commission now sitting, to which, last Session, I stated that this question would be referred. The previous Commission reported and made recommendations, to which the Government did not feel able to give effect.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Are we to understand that the Report of the Commission, which was appointed by the Lord Lieutenant last year, which sat for several months, took evidence and made recommendations, has now been referred to another Commission?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: That is so, Sir, for the simple reason that we have not been able to carry out their recommendations.

COMMISSIONERS OF IRISH LIGHTS—CLOTHING CONTRACTS.

MR. P. O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Commissioners of Irish Lights have recently issued a printed tender form to traders for the supply of clothing for the officers and officials generally under the Board, which contained the following provision—

> "That all clothing supplied shall be made from cloths approved of and manufactured by Messrs. William Lupton and Co., Leeds, and numbered 500, 501, 502, and 503 respectively, samples of which are to be seen at this office;"

whether this provision has his sanction;

and, whether he will cause that tender to be withdrawn and a fresh one issued open to all trades who may wish to tender for the contract?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Commissioners of Irish Lights inform me that they advertised for samples of blue pilot and other cloths used in their service, the result being that nine firms sent in patterns of various kinds of tweeds, serges, &c. The samples were duly submitted to the officers of the Board and an experienced expert, a cloth buyer for one of the large mercantile houses in Dublin, and they unanimously selected the samples of Messrs. Lupton and Co. as the only ones suitable to the requirements of the Commissioners. Under these circumstances the Board of Trade do not propose to interfere.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND)—STATE-AIDED AND NON-STATE-AIDED SCHOOLS.

MR. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox) asked the Secretary for Scotland, The number of children attending State-aided and non-State-aided schools in Scotland, when School Boards came into operation in 1873, and the number of children attending State-aided and non-State-aided schools in Scotland in 1885?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): Certain statistics in regard to the first point upon which information is desired were given by the Board of Education in their first Report. As the Department have only statistics relating to inspected schools, I fear that I cannot give the information desired as to the comparative statistics.

CROFTERS' ACT—SHEEP FARMS AND DEER FORESTS (SCOTLAND).

DR. R. MACDONALD (Ross and Cromarty) asked the Secretary for Scotland, If his attention has been called to the proposal to turn the extensive sheep-farm of Garbat, Ben Wyvis, into a deer forest; and, whether it is the intention of the Government, having regard to the pressing demand of the native population for the restoration of the land for productive purposes, to take any steps to prevent the afforesting of any additional lands, or the disafforesting of such arable and pastoral portions of the present forests as might be beneficially occupied by people from the congested districts of the Highlands?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): I have no information on the first point. On the second, I may remind the hon. Member that, under the provisions of the Crofters' Act, so far as the people in the locality are concerned, land under deer is more available for the purpose of increasing the size of holdings than land under sheep. As regards the use of land under deer to relieve the congestion of distant parts of the Highlands, I presume the wish of the hon. Member—though the wording of his Question fails to express it—is that the Government should introduce a measure for enabling the population of overcrowded districts to migrate on to land now occupied by deer. I cannot enter fully into the arguments in favour of or against such a scheme, nor is it necessary, as I am not aware that there exists any large population in the congested districts anxious to leave their native place, and provided with the capital, without which any such scheme would prove a disastrous failure.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE MILITIA (SCOTLAND).

DR. R. MACDONALD (Ross and Cromarty) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, considering that there are about 1,700 Lewismen connected with the Militia, who are annually sent for training to Dingwall and Fort George for a period of six weeks or two months, and whose travelling expenses and loss of time in going and returning means a considerable sum of money, it would not be better that these men should be trained at Stornoway, and thus save the time and money uselessly wasted?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): The question of training on the mainland of Militiamen from the Islands is one of great difficulty, and I believe a great deal may be said on both sides of the question. I can only at present say that I will inquire further into it.

NAVY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE NAVAL RESERVE (SCOTLAND).

Dr. R. MACDONALD (Ross and Cromarty) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether, considering that there are thousands of boys and young men in Lewis willing and anxious to enter the Naval Reserve, he will entertain the idea of having a training ship stationed in Stornoway, or cruising about the Highland ports, as recommended by the Crofters' Commission?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): There is a battery at present stationed at Stornoway for the purpose of receiving and training volunteers for the Royal Naval Reserve, and that has proved hitherto quite sufficient for all purposes. Therefore, it is not proposed to provide a training ship, as suggested in the Question. As many men as are wanted for the Second Class Reserve can now be obtained.

CROFTERS' COMMISSION—LEWIS AND SKYE CROFTERS.

Dr. R. MACDONALD (Ross and Cromarty) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether he is aware, or, if not aware, whether he will make inquiry as to the allegation that a great many of the Crofters in Lewis and Skye are unable to make their applications to the Crofters' Commission, through inability to pay the preliminary fees; and, in the event of this allegation being found true, whether he can see his way in such cases to dispense with the ordinary fees?

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): I was not aware that any such allegation had been made; I will inquire into the matter, and, if necessary, communicate with the Treasury, by whom, under the Crofters' Act, the scale of fees fixed by the Crofters' Commission has been approved.

INDIA (MADRAS)—THE CONFLAGRATION.

Sir ROBERT FOWLER (London) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the attention of the Secretary of State has been directed to the alleged conduct of the Coroner of Madras, who, after the recent fires at Madras, in which 300 bodies were left on the night of the 31st December, deferred the inquest till mid-day of the 1st of January, thus causing danger of mischief from putrefaction in that hot climate; and, whether he will call the attention of the Governor of Madras to the matter?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir John Gorst) (Chatham): The Secretary of State's attention has not been specially directed to the delay in holding the inquest at the late fire in Madras till the hon. Baronet gave Notice of this Question. The circumstances of that lamentable accident have received the most careful attention from the Government of Madras, and the Secretary of State has no reason to think that the time at which the inquest was held has escaped their observation; but the attention of the Governor of Madras shall be specially directed to the matter.

ADMIRALTY—"OLD AND UNSERVICEABLE STORES."

Mr. J. ROWLANDS (Finsbury, E.) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, What is the meaning of "Old and Unserviceable" in the following advertisement of a sale from *The Times*; whether the clothes, &c., proposed to be sold are all damaged, and the provisions are no longer fit for human beings—

> "Royal Victoria Victualling Yard,
> "Deptford. Tuesday, March 1st.
>
> "Old and Unserviceable Stores, including 8,300 lb. salt pork and beef, 2,040 lb. suet and cook's fat, 823 lb. candles and candle grease, 7,100 lb. biscuit and biscuit dust, 6,000 lb. flour, 2,500 lb. sugar and sugar sweepings, 2,200 gallons ale and stout, 452 bottles ditto, 162 bottles wine, 1,582 lb. raisins and currants, 1,800 lb. preserved soups, vegetables, &c., 1,271 lb. pickles, 1,672 great coats, 1,183 frocks and tunics, 565 pairs trousers, 1,532 haversacks, 1,098 pairs leggings, 929 yards cloth, duck flannel, serge, &c., 21 yards gold lace, 28 flushing jackets, 571 pairs boots and shoes, 224 pairs stockings, 518 shirts, 123 beds, 89 blankets, 120 tons iron and iron hooping, 66 iron, &c. tanks, a large quantity of seamen's and marine clothing, transport bedding, horse gear, hospital stores, cooperage articles, and numerous other effects."

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): The expression "Old and Unserviceable" is that generally used when advertising the sale of obsolete Government stores. There is an annual sale of victualling stores at Deptford, consisting mainly of the damaged stocks of this class of stores which have been returned to that yard from Her Majesty's ships serving in all parts of the world during the past year. No provisions which are "unfit for human food" are ever advertised for sale. Those advertised consist of provisions that have fallen below the standard established for Her Majesty's Service, and which it is not considered desirable to re-issue.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.): With regard to these 162 bottles of wine, I wish to ask whether their being old would not render them rather more serviceable?

No reply.

BURMAH—THE RUBY MINES EXPEDITION—MESSRS. STREETER.

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the application, in consequence of which one of the representatives of Messieurs Streeter was authorized to accompany the Ruby Mines Expedition, was in writing, and to whom it was addressed; and, whether any written communication as to the leasing, or renting, or working the Ruby Mines has been received by the Government, or communicated to the Government, from Messieurs Streeter, or any person on their behalf; and, if so, what reply, if any, has been made by or with the knowledge of the Government?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir John Gorst) (Chatham): The application of Mr. Streeter, junior, to accompany the Ruby Mines Expedition was made and assented to in Burmah. The Secretary of State is not aware in what form it was made. Communications between Mr. Streeter and other applicants, and the Government of India, as to leasing or working the Ruby Mines, took place in the spring of last year. Such negotiations were subsequently suspended, pending inquiries on the spot. It is, therefore, impossible, at the present time, to make any communication to the House as to the nature of any offers made, or of the replies of the Government of India.

ARMY—DEFECTIVE WEAPONS.

Mr. HANBURY (Preston) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is the fact that very recently, on the return of a battery of Artillery from India, the swords were tested, and every one failed to stand the test?

The SURVEYOR GENERAL of the ORDNANCE (Mr. Northcote) (Exeter) (who replied) said: The event referred to in the hon. Member's Question has not been reported to either the War Office or the India Office. If he can give me any information on the subject, the matter shall have immediate attention.

ARMY—PRACTICE IN USE OF THE REVOLVER.

Colonel HUGHES-HALLETT (Rochester) (for Mr. Brookfield) (Sussex, Rye) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he is aware that Warrant Officers, Staff Sergeants, and other soldiers armed with the revolver, are put through an annual course of practice with that weapon, while Commissioned Officers are not given any training of the same kind; and, whether, if such is the case, he will consider the desirability of prescribing an annual course of revolver practice for all Regimental Officers?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. E. Stanhope) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): All soldiers of whose equipment a revolver forms a part, go through an annual course of instruction in the use of that weapon. No course is prescribed for commissioned officers; but instruction in the use of the revolver is now given to officers who attend the School of Musketry at Hythe. My hon. Friend's suggestion as to prescribing an annual course for officers is well worthy of consideration; and I will refer it to the Military Authorities.

POOR LAW (METROPOLIS)—HOLBORN WORKHOUSE.

Mr. NEWNES (Cambridge, E., Newmarket) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he is aware that, on the bitterly cold night of 12-13th January, a woman and her two infant children, in a half-starved condition, were refused admittance to the Holborn Workhouse, and that, had they not been taken to the police station, and there fed and warmed, they might have died of cold and hunger; and whether he will take steps to so alter the administration of the Poor Law, so that such an incident may be made impossible?

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Ritchie) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): The facts with regard to the case alluded to have been inquired into by the Guardians. It appears that the woman referred to, who was accompanied by her sister, applied for admission to the workhouse after midnight, and that she was then told that, as she had no order of a relieving officer, she should go to the casual ward, which was within a distance of less than one-third of a mile. In about a quarter of an hour she returned without her sister, and on being again told that she should go to the casual ward, she in strong language refused to do so. She was found by a policeman about half an hour afterwards lying on the pavement, and as she was again refused admission, she was taken to the station, where she was charged with being without any visible means of subsistence. It is admitted by the woman that she had been in the neighbourhood all the day, and there would appear to have been no sufficient reason why, if she was destitute, she should have deferred applying until after midnight for relief for herself and her children, or why she did not go to the casual ward, where she would have been at once admitted. There is a conflict of evidence as to whether the policeman told the porter, when he found the woman on the pavement, that she had been drinking; she herself only admits having shared three half-pints of beer. Whatever blame, however, may attach to the woman herself, it is very much to be regretted that she and her children should have been allowed to lie on the pavement on a cold night in consequence of having been refused admission to the workhouse; and the porter has been censured by the Guardians for not having called the attention of the matron to the case. I may observe that there is ample accommodation in the casual wards of the Metropolis, and that it rarely happens that two-thirds of the beds in these wards are occupied.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (IRELAND)—LORD CHARLEMONT'S ESTATE—ACTION OF THE POLICE.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will state to the House the precise nature of the proceedings of the police with reference to Lord Charlemont's estate, and what the action on their part was which led to the report that they had visited the houses of respectable Protestant farmers, inquired if they had paid their rent, and asked when their rent would be paid; that they had followed the Secretary of the Tenants' Committee from house to house to ascertain what his business was; that they had made suggestions to the Protestant tenants as to the payment of their rents; and that they visited Mr. Arthur Byrne, the Chairman of the tenants' meeting, and subjected him to annoyance?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): All the police did in the matter was to make some inquiries from Mr. Arthur Byrne as to when certain meetings were to be held at which it was deemed desirable that some police should be present. I cannot allege any other reason for the reports.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE "QUEEN *v.* DILLON."

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether, in the case of the "Queen *v.* John Dillon, M.P.," and others, now pending, the accused having been returned for trial in the City of Dublin, the Crown have sent, or intend sending, up the Bills of Indictment before the Grand Jury of the County of Dublin; whether the Crown originally commenced the proceedings in the County of Galway, and abandoned that venue in favour of the City of Dublin; whether there is any precedent in recent years for the action of the Government in sending up the bills in the county, except the case of the York Street riots, when the change was made at the wish of the accused, who were Orangemen; and, what the reasons were which induced the Government to change the venue?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) (Liverpool, Walton) (who replied) said: Some of the traversers in the case referred to having been arrested under a warrant in Galway, it was deemed expedient to take steps to have them and others returned for trial in the City of Dublin, where the Plan of Campaign was originally published. A bill has been sent up to the Grand Jury of the County of Dublin, pursuant to a law which exists both in England and Ireland, and the value of which has been recognized by the Criminal Code Commission. In a jury panel of the County of Dublin there is no preponderance of persons of any particular religion or politics; and as regards all classes and creeds it is more generally representative than any other panel in Ireland. The sole reason for having the bill sent to the County Grand Jury, was the belief that a fair and impartial trial could in this way best be had. The change of venue in the York Street case was made on the suggestion of the Queen's Bench Division; and I am informed that this is not the only case in recent times in which the venue was similarly changed.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I wish to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman if it is alleged, on the part of the Crown, that there is anything in the constitution of either the Grand or the Common Jury panel sent up from the present Commission which would interfere with the fair trial of my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) and the other traversers in the City of Dublin?

MR. MAURICE HEALY: May I ask, also, whether it is a fact that nine-tenths of the legal business of Ireland is done in the City of Dublin?

MR. GIBSON: In answer to the second Question, I may say that a great part of the legal business of Ireland is done in Dublin, but I am not aware of the exact proportion. With reference to the Question of the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton), I have to say that I decline to go or enter into a controversy upon the merits of the jurors.

MR. SEXTON: I wish to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman, not to enter into any controversy, but simply to answer the Question whether there is anything in the state of the panel to prevent a fair trial being had?

[No reply.]

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES—THE "QUEEN *v.* DILLON."

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether the common jury panel for the County of Dublin at the forthcoming commission, at which the trial of the case of the "Queen *v.* John Dillon, M.P.," and others is to take place, has been increased to 250 names, the ordinary number being 90; whether the power of the Crown to order jurors to stand by on the first calling of the panel will be thereby enormously increased; whether the Sheriff, in making the alteration in question, acted under the instructions of the Government; and, whether there has been any change made in the form of the precept addressed to the Sheriff; and, if so, on whose recommendation, and by whose authority?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) (Liverpool, Walton) (who replied) said: The common jury panel for the County of Dublin at the pending Commission consists of 250 names—a number unusual in that county, but it is not unusual elsewhere. Power of the Crown to direct jurors to stand by is the same whether the number of jurors on the panel is large or small. The Sheriff received no instructions from the Government; and I am not aware of any change in the form of the precept, with the preparation and issuing of which the Crown has nothing to do.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Will the hon. and learned Gentleman say whether the ordinary panel in the County Dublin is so; and whether on a small panel the Crown are not sooner compelled to fall back on jurors who had already been told to stand by?

MR. GIBSON said, he was not aware of the exact number of jurors on the County Dublin panel as a rule. He believed it had been increased. With regard to the remainder of the Question, it was a matter of arithmetic.

MR. T. C. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour): Might I ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he is aware that both on the Grand Jury panel and on the Petty Jury panel of the County of Dublin, the great majority of the jurors on the panels are summoned out of the rotation?

MR. GIBSON: I am not aware of anything of the kind; and I wish to say at once that I think it a matter of very great inconvenience to the administration of justice, that Questions should be asked in this House as to matters of law which are pending in the Courts in Dublin, and which must be decided by the Judge upon his own responsibility there, and upon exception which will be taken to the record.

MR. T. C. HARRINGTON: Might I ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether the Question I have asked him is a matter of fact, and not a matter of law?

[No reply.]

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether, on the empanelling of the jury in the case of the "Queen *v.* John Dillon, M.P." and others, now pending, the prisoners, though five in number, will between them only have six challenges; whether the Crown will have an unlimited right of ordering jurors to stand by, the panel being now for the first time increased to 250 names; and, whether he will consent that the trial shall take place according to the English practice, under which the Crown and the accused have an equal right of objecting to jurors on the first calling of the panel?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) (Liverpool, Walton) (who replied) said: The traversers in the case referred to are entitled to six peremptory challenges in all, and to as many others as they can assign cause for. The Crown has no right of peremptory challenge; but it is entitled to direct any juror to stand by until the panel is exhausted. I cannot consent to introduce into criminal procedure in Ireland a practice hitherto unknown there.

MR. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.): Might I ask the hon. and learned Gentleman to amend his answer by informing the House whether in England the prisoner, on the first calling of the panel in trials for misdemeanour, is not entitled to an unlimited right of peremptory challenge?

MR. GIBSON: I am not acquainted with the English law; but I believe that there is no doubt whatever that in England there is no right whatever of peremptory challege in misdemeanours. That right was given in Ireland to the extent of six in favour of the prisoner, and it is a right which exists in Ireland and does not exist in England.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) said, he would ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland to reply to a Question of which he had given the right hon. Gentleman private Notice. It was, Whether it was correct that the Grand Jury of the County of Dublin had rejected the fifth count in the indictment contained in the Bill sent up to them in the case of the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. John Dillon) and others; whether this count charged the traversers with having entered into an unlawful conspiracy to compel tenants not to pay rents which they were lawfully bound to pay, and to compel tenants to combine and confederate together to obstruct and defeat the service of writs and processes for the non-payment of rent; and, if the above statement was correct, whether it was not the essence of the indictment and the main purpose of the Crown in instituting the proceedings to prevent the offences charged in the count; if not, what was the real intention of the Crown; and whether, in the face of the rejection of the fifth count, the Government would still persist in going on with the prosecution; and, if so, what useful purposes they hoped to achieve?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) (Liverpool, Walton) (who replied) said: I have no information on the matter referred to, except the report in *The Standard.* I have no copy of the fifth count (which is one of 11 counts), and, therefore cannot say what is contained in it; but I can say, from internal evidence, that the report in *The Standard* must be inaccurate. I may state that the Grand Jury, on the 10 counts in which they have round a true bill against the traversers, have two counts for an unlawful conspiracy to solicit tenants to refuse to pay rents; and there is a count for conspiracy to solicit tenants to resist and obstruct the execution of lawful writs. All those counts have been found by the Grand Jury, and I do not know the reason why they refuse to find the fifth, but perhaps it was because they considered the 10 counts sufficient.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS—RETURN OF OWNER-FARMERS.

MR. JASPER MORE (Shropshire, Ludlow) asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether, in view of the interest felt in questions relating to the occupation of land, the Agricultural Department would see any objection to authorize the addition of a line to the annual form now about to be issued to owners and occupiers of land, with a view of ascertaining how many owners farm their own land?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Lord JOHN MANNERS) (Leicestershire, E.): Yes; we think the annual form may be advantageously enlarged so as to include the information asked for in the Question; and I shall be happy to communicate with the hon. Member as to the wording of the addition.

COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH FRANCE, 1882—SURTAXE D'ENTREPOT.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, Camlachie) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If the imposition of a *surtaxe d'entrepôt* upon the owner of a British steamer carrying goods consigned to a French port, under a through bill of lading to be transhipped at an English port, is in contravention of Article 2 of the Treaty concluded with France in February 1882?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): The *surtaxe d'entrepôt* is an additional duty charged on goods the produce of a country out of Europe, when imported into France not direct from the country of their origin but through a third country. According to French law and practice, the *surtaxe* is levied whether such goods are landed and warehoused in the third country, or whether they are simply transhipped in one of its ports. It has never been held that the *surtaxe d'entrepôt* is included among the transit duties referred to in the Second Article of the Treaty of 1882, and it, consequently, does not come within the stipulations of the Treaty of 1882.

ADMIRALTY—TORPEDO BOATS—A "COMMITTEE OF DESIGNS."

ADMIRAL FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether 20 is the correct number of torpedo boats recently delivered by the contractor constructed with "bottle-nose" bows, which have now to be taken to pieces and re-constructed at considerable expense to render them efficient in a sea-way, and the cost per vessel of such re-construction; whether the design of these particular boats was prepared by the contractor or the Constructors' Department at the Admiralty, and approved by the Naval Members of the late Board; and, whether, in view of this and other recent serious mistakes in designs of ships, the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty will consider the advisability of re-constituting a "Committee of Designs," composed of scientific seamen and others, to whom shall be referred all future designs of vessels of war before finally approving of any?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): Messrs. Thornycroft supplied 25 torpedo boats, of which the bows and torpedo armament will have to be altered as the result of a trial at sea. The cost of the alteration is £246 per boat. The design was prepared by Messrs. Thornycroft. It was accepted by the Director of Naval Construction, and received the approval of the Board of Admiralty in April, 1885. Originally it was intended to try the first vessel before ordering others; but, under the pressure of the preparations in 1885, the order for the 25 was given on an untried design. My hon. and gallant Friend suggests that, with the object of preventing errors of calculation in designs, which, undoubtedly, have occurred in the past, a Committee of experts should be associated with the technical advisers of the Admiralty, whose approval should be necessary before new designs are passed. I am not in favour of such a proposal; for I am satisfied that the blunders of the past can be traced to a want of individual responsibility for advice given and action proposed, and we are now working in the direction of concentrating, rather than sub-dividing, personal responsibility.

ADMIRALTY—DEFECTIVE SWORD-BAYONETS.

COMMANDER BETHELL (York, E.R., Holderness) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he will state the names of the vessels from which complaints have been received as to the defective state of sword-bayonets; and, if the Admiralty have directed the Commanding Officers of Her Majesty's Ships to make a strict investigation into the state of the sword-bayonets supplied to their respective vessels?

MR. HANBURY (Preston) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, What vessels of Her Majesty's Navy have been supplied with sword-bayonets similar to those recently complained of at Devonport; whether any and which of such vessels are now on active service; whether the Admiralty make an independent official test of such weapons before they are issued to the officers and men of Her Majesty's Navy, or whether they rely upon the guarantee of the Ordnance Department; and, whether he will consent to place specimens of the defective sword-bayonets, for the inspection of Members of this House, either in the Library or in some room of the Admiralty?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): The Admiralty make no independent official test, as they rely on the guarantee of the War Office that the weapons issued are fit for service. Complaints have been received from the *Active*, the *Volage*, the *Rover*, and the *Devastation*. Some cutlasses and sword-bayonets in the *Active* having been found defective in actual use, orders were given for about half of those in the ship to be tested as follows:—The point of the sword was placed in the deck, and pressure applied at the handle until the point was turned about 50 degrees from the straight line. On being released, the whole of those marked defective remained permanently out of the original line. Of the 50 cutlasses tested in this ship 34 were found defective, and of the 55 sword-bayonets tested 40 were found defective. The same course was followed in the *Rover*; when 45 out of 50 cutlasses were found defective, and 54 out of 55 sword-bayonets. The same test was applied to the *Volage*, and 12 out of 50 cutlasses were reported defective, and 17 out of 55 sword-bayonets. The following was the report from the *Devastation*:—

> "On examining sword-bayonets it was found that many were bad, like hoop iron. Some could be bent easily by hand and remained bent."

No instructions have yet been given for a general naval test to be applied to these weapons pending a reply from the War Office as to the steps they wish to be taken, sword-bayonets being a War Office store. Admiral Phillimore, Commander-in-Chief at Devonport, ordered the cutlasses on board the *Indus* to be tested, as certain of them were reported to be defective. The result was unsatisfactory, a large number being rendered useless. The contention of naval officers is that these cutlasses are unserviceable, not from defects of pattern, but of temper or material. At the special request of the Secretary of State for War, I am collecting the particulars of all the complaints and of all the tests applied to different weapons supplied to the Navy by the War Office, in order that he may consider them. There would be no advantage in exhibiting specimens of these defective weapons, as suggested, as no sound conclusion could be drawn from their variable condition, unless the power of the test and the mode of applying it was in each separate case explained as well as the date and pattern of manufacture.

MR. HANBURY said, that the noble Lord did not state how many vessels had been supplied with these defective sword-bayonets, and how many of such vessels were in active service?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said, he was unable to give such information. The War Office kept a record of the dates on which the weapons were issued, as well as of the particular patterns supplied.

COMMANDER BETHELL wished to ask the Secretary of State for War, What steps he proposed to take with reference to these defective weapons; and, whether he intended to attach responsibility to any particular individual or individuals in respect to their original issue?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): I am glad of this opportunity, Sir, of stating the general view taken by the War Office on the subject. First of all, on behalf of the officials of the War Office, I have to say that the War Office is by no means prepared to accept the correctness of the view taken by the Naval Authorities. I do not think the House is in a fair position yet to judge. These weapons were made before 1859, and they have satisfied the requisite tests up to the present time. It is very difficult to say what the 50 per cent test of my noble Friend (Lord George Hamilton) means. At the same time, I feel that a conflict between two public Departments is on all grounds to be avoided; and also that the public have a right to know whether these weapons are serviceable or not. My noble Friend has just undertaken to supply the War Office with full particulars of the complaints received, and of the tests to which these weapons have been subjected. I have already, with the assistance of my hon. Friend the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, made careful inquiry into the complaints which have been received; but I feel that no such inquiry will now be sufficient. I propose, therefore, without waiting for the Report of the Royal Commission, to institute an independent inquiry into the condition of the weapons now complained of. I shall ask my noble Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty to nominate a representative to take part in it; and I can assure the House that the Government will place at the disposal of the Committee of Inquiry all the information necessary for arriving at a decision without delay.

Sir HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked, Whether the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Secretary of State for War would agree that a further test should take place of these weapons which had not already been complained of, in order that the whole matter should be inquired into?

Mr. E. STANHOPE said, that all these weapons would be tested; and if after being tested they were found inefficient and useless, the testing would then be carried further.

Mr. HANBURY inquired whether the Committee to be appointed was a purely official Committee?

Mr. E. STANHOPE replied that he had already stated that it was to be a purely independent Committee.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) inquired whether the stores now issued to the Army and Navy were subject to any inspection beyond those of the contractors and the purchasing authorities of the Army?

Mr. E. STANHOPE said, that the question of an independent inspection was one which was under the consideration of the Royal Commission. Up to the present, it had not been the practice to have an outside or independent inquiry.

Commander BETHELL said, that his Question had not been answered as to whether any person would be made responsible for what had occurred?

Mr. E. STANHOPE observed, that he should prefer to wait the Report of the independent Committee which would be appointed before coming to any decision on this matter. The responsibility for the original manufacture of these cutlasses dated so far back as 1859.

Mr. HANBURY asked whether, in the event of any person being found incompetent for his duties, any further punishment beyond dismissal from the Service would be awarded?

Mr. E. STANHOPE said, he was not prepared to consider that question at present; in fact, he thought the hon. Member could hardly expect him to express any opinion upon it.

ADMIRALTY—DRY DOCK, HAULBOWLINE.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether the Government propose proceeding with the second dry dock at Haulbowline, Cork Harbour; whether it will be possible to construct the second dock so that it may take in any ships of the Navy; and, when or at what time the Admiralty intend commencing the excavation or dredging of the channel leading to the larger floating dock?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): No; it is not considered that a second dry dock is required at Haulbowline, and I so informed a local deputation, as the present dock will accommodate any vessel in the Navy. Probably part of the dredging of the channel leading to the basin will be done this next summer.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SCOTLAND)—LENZIE PUBLIC SCHOOL.

Mr. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox) asked the Secretary for Scotland, What is the scale of school fees which the Scotch Education Department have sanctioned, under reserve, in Lenzie Public School; and, whether the school fees were fixed with a due regard to the ability of the Railway servants and working classes of Lenzie to pay the same?"

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): The scale of fees sanctioned under reserve for the Lenzie Public School in May last ranged from 7*s.* 6*d.* to 21*s.*, exclusive of the secondary department, on account of which it is presumed that no grant will be claimed. This provisional sanction is subject to the proportion which the total receipts from fees may bear to the average attendance, and the general question connected with this has recently been under their Lordships' special consideration. The second part of the Question relates to a matter which rests with the School Board, and not with the Department, which has no means of ascertaining the class of children likely to attend any school.

ADMIRALTY (SHIPBUILDING)—THE "ANSON."

Admiral MAYNE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether the public money would be saved by retaining the *Anson* at Pembroke Dock until she is much nearer completion than she will be next month, especially as most of what remains to be fitted is actually on board the ship or at Pembroke Dockyard, as Hobb's Point will be vacated by the time the *Anson* is ready to go there; and, as the contemplated Naval Review will throw so much additional work on Portsmouth Yard this summer as to delay the work upon the *Anson* if she goes there, whether he has considered if it would be more economical to send the Gunnery Officers from Portsmouth to Pembroke, to give the necessary instructions as to the gunnery and torpedo fittings of ships built at Pembroke, than sending the ships in an unfinished state to ports where all kinds of labour are dearer than in Wales, and much work is pulled to pieces and redone?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): We have carefully considered this question, and we find that sending the *Anson* to Portsmouth will be the cheapest and most expeditious course for completing and making this ship ready for commission. It would not be economical to send gunnery and torpedo officers to Pembroke. The cost of labour in Portsmouth Dockyard is the same as in Pembroke Yard, the rates of pay being uniform. The new Regulations issued and control exercised under them have put an end to the wasteful practice alluded to, by which it was in the power of one Dockyard to pull to pieces work done in another.

ARMY—BILLET MONEY.

Sir JOSEPH BAILEY (Hereford) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will consider the possibility of increasing the payment to licensed victuallers for billeting of soldiers and horses to such an amount as shall not cause them, as at present, to incur loss, but will leave them a small margin of profit?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. E. Stanhope) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Prior to 1859 the sum paid to the innkeeper for a soldier's billet with a hot meal was 10*d*. In that year, in consequence of the Report of the Select Committee on Billeting of 1858, it was increased to 1*s*. 0½*d*. In 1873, after very full inquiry by Lord Cardwell, it was further increased by 3½*d*., making in all 1*s*. 4*d*.—being an increase of 60 per cent over the rates of 1868. The addition made in 1873 was at the time considered ample; since 1873 the price of provisions has fallen about 30 per cent, and there appears, therefore, no reason for increasing the payment to innkeepers for billets of soldiers. In billets, horses are provided with exactly the same ration that the Government provide for them in barracks. The present average contract price of the forage ration is about 1*s*. 3*d*.; the innkeeper receives 1*s*. 9*d*., and I think, therefore, that he receives sufficient remuneration.

THEATRES AND PUBLIC PLACES (METROPOLIS)—THE SPITALFIELDS CALAMITY.

Mr. WOOTTON ISAACSON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the late lamentable accident at a Jewish Club in Spitalfields; and, if so, does he intend to introduce any measure whereby the exits and entrances of public buildings, other than those at present under the powers of inspection by the Government, shall be liable to such inspection?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said, he had no information on the subject; but he understood from the newspapers that the Metropolitan Board of Works, to which the matter belonged, had now under consideration a proposal to amend the existing law in order to give them power to inspect such buildings as that of the Jewish Club.

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING—TREASURY PATRONAGE.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it is true that—

> "The book containing the names of the newspapers allowed to be advertised in has been changed four times in the last three years, and is invariably revised by the Patronage Secretary of the Treasury directly there is a change of Government;"

and whether he will consent to surrender this remnant of the system of political patronage?

THE PATRONAGE SECRETARY (Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS) (Kent, St. Augustine's): A list of newspapers receiving Government advertisements is changed with every new Government; but though there have been three changes of Government within the last two years, there have been only two lists employed, the present Government resuming the use of the list prepared by them in 1885; while the late Government reverted to the list in use during the period from 1880 to 1885. In answer to the second portion of the Question, I have to say that the system of issuing Government advertisements is at present under consideration.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—SERVICE ON EVICTIONS.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the amount of the extra pay which (1) the officers and (2) the men of the Royal Irish Constabulary receive per diem during the time they are on service in connection with an eviction; whether while engaged on such service they receive, in addition to such special remuneration, their ordinary salaries and wages; and, whether, in relation to the Glenbeigh evictions, he will lay before the House a detailed statement of the cost of those evictions, showing, in separate items, the ordinary pay and the extra pay of officers and men; the amount paid for hire of cars, hotel, and railway expenses; and the cost of provisioning the expeditionary force during its three weeks' occupation of Glenbeigh?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.), in reply, said, that the additional pay was 15*s.* for an officer, 4*s.* 6*d.* for a head constable, and 3*s.* 6*d.* for the men of lower grade. These additional allowances were made irrespective of the service on which the men were engaged. There would be no charge for hotel expenditure, for such a charge would be paid by the officers and men out of the additional pay. He would have no objection to grant the Return if the hon. Member moved for it.

BRITISH HONDURAS.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (London) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If it is true that the troops are being withdrawn from British Honduras?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): Instructions have been sent for the withdrawal of one company, and it is proposed that the other shall be withdrawn not later than March, 1888, or as soon as the armed Constabulary Force which is being formed for the defence of the Colony as well as for police purposes is completely organized.

METROPOLITAN BRIDGES—THE WESTMINSTER BRIDGE ESTATE.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether the Commissioners have any property, known as the Westminster Bridge Estate, and held by them in connection with the maintenance of Westminster Bridge; and, if so, of what that property consists, and what is the annual income derived from it.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): The Westminster Bridge Estate consists of certain premises in Parliament Street and the neighbouring streets. It came into the possession of the Office of Works under the Westminster Bridge Act of 1853, which gave the Commissioners of Works power to sell the property and apply the proceeds to the construction of a new bridge. The income from the estate amounts to £5,172 a-year; but the capital value of the estate is much less than the capital value spent upon the bridge out of the moneys voted by Parliament.

THE CIVIL SERVICE—SUSPENSION OF APPOINTMENTS.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he will consider the advisability of suspending any further appointments to the Upper Division of the Civil Service, pending the Report of the Royal Commission on Civil Establishments?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): The subject to which the hon. Member draws my attention has been under the careful consideration of Her Majesty's Government for some time past, and in one of the great spending Departments all entries into the clerical staff have been suspended. The hon. Gentleman and the House must not, however, form any exaggerated expectations of the results to be obtained from these steps, as the average of the admissions into the Upper Division has been, for some years past, only 16 annually. The hon. Gentleman may be assured that the whole Question will continue to receive the careful attention of the Government, so as to effect every possible reduction in the charge for the Civil Service.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE—"BLOCKING."

MR. HANBURY (Preston) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the Government will give facilities for the discussion of the Bill, introduced by the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell), to include leaseholders in the benefits of the Land Act of 1881, and which has been "blocked" by the hon. Member for Shoreditch (Mr. Cremer)?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): My hon. Friend will, I am sure, anticipate the answer I am about to give him. It is utterly impossible for me, in the present state of Public Business, to promise facilities for any measures which may have been introduced by private Members.

EGYPT — NEUTRALITY — RUMOURED NEGOTIATIONS—THE NEUTRALIZATION OF EGYPT.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) begged to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs the Question of which he had given him private Notice, Whether he could, without detriment to the Public Service, give the House any information with regard to the proposals which were stated to have been made by Sir H. Drummond Wolff in Constantinople, having in view the neutralization of Egypt and the Suez Canal?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): I can only reply to my hon. Friend that Her Majesty's Government adhere to the explanations which they have previously given of their policy in regard to Egypt; but I am not able to make any statement with regard to negotiations that are proceeding. The rumours that have appeared in certain newspapers do not give any accurate representation of the objects Her Majesty's Government have in view.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—JUDGE CURRAN.

MR. PENROSE FITZGERALD (Cambridge) asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he had received any statement as to the action attributed to Judge Curran which he could communicate to the House?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Yes, Sir; I have received a communication from Judge Curran on this subject, which, I assume, I may state to the House. The statement was made voluntarily, and not in reply to any question put by me. The learned Judge informs me that he never gave a decree for a reduced rent unless where the landlord or agent consented thereto in open Court, with one exception—that being the case of a landlord whom he accidentally met, and who informed him that he would like the Judge to fix a reduced amount to be paid, as he could not be present in Court himself. Except on this occasion, the Judge had never had any communication either with landlord or agent as to the amount of rent to be paid by tenants. Except when Sir Redvers Buller handed the Judge Father Quilter's letter, the Judge had no communication with Sir Redvers Buller, or any other official, as to rent.

MR. T. C. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether Judge Curran has not himself said, in a letter published a few days ago, that he had been in communication on the subject of rent with Colonel Turner, private secretary to General Buller, and of the successor of the General at present in Kerry?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I have read to the House the precise words which Judge Curran used.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [ELEVENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [7th February], proposed to the Question—[See page 84.]

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the 8th paragraph, to insert the words, "But humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the relations between the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland have not been seriously disturbed in the cases of those owners who have granted to their tenants such abatements of rents as are called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce, and that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is not to be found in increased stringency of criminal procedure, or in the pursuit of such novel, doubtful, and unconstitutional measures as have recently been taken by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland, but in such a reform of the Law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people."—(*Mr. Parnell*).

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Debate *resumed.*

AGRARIAN AFFAIRS (IRELAND).

Mr. W. REDMOND (Fermanagh, N.) said, that on Monday next he should, in company with his hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) be called upon to answer in a Court of Justice for a criminal offence, for which, if found guilty, they might be sentenced to a protracted term of imprisonment. In view, therefore, of the circumstance that the House, in all probability, was not likely to be troubled by him for some time, he hoped that his present speech in defence of his conduct would be listened to with a fair share of attention. If he attempted—as he believed he should successfully attempt—to defend his action in Ireland in that House, it was not because—and he said it with all respect—that he felt under any obligation either to Parliament or to England to explain his action, because it was to Ireland alone Irish Representatives had for a long time looked for approval or disapproval; but he spoke there because the attack on himself and his fellow-traversers was commenced in that House by the Irish Law Officers of the Crown. The hon. Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), in reply to some Questions put with reference to the trial on Monday, had answered them, as the House saw, with pale face, with faltering voice, and with trembling hands. He did not think there were many hon. Members on that side of the House who would be satisfied with the obstinate refusal of the Solicitor General for Ireland to reply to the straightforward Questions addressed to him as to what there was in the jury panel of the City of Dublin that rendered it unlikely that a fair trial could be had in the city. The Irish Law Officers had quoted in that House the speeches for which he was to be tried. He believed that many of the Liberal Members of the House were of opinion that it would have been in better taste and better feeling for the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland, and the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland — both of whom were engaged for the Crown to prosecute in the case—to have refrained from indicting the traversers until the case against them was opened next Monday. He did not complain of this, however, because Irish Members must not expect good taste or fair play from the officers of the Executive Government in Ireland. There had been a great deal of talk, in the course of the debate, about the Plan of Campaign, and, as he was intimately connected with the carrying out of the Plan in Ireland, he could not help thinking how deplorable it was that hon. Members should take part in the debate, and denounce the Plan of Campaign without even having the slightest information as to what the true nature of the Plan of Campaign was; but as he was associated with the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) in that attempt to save the people, he might fairly be supposed to have some knowledge of the subject. From what hon. Members opposite said, one would imagine that the Land Question had been satisfactorily settled in Ireland until the Plan of Campaign came to upset that settlement. In point of fact, the discussion on the present Amendment was on the whole question of the struggle between landlords and tenants in Ireland. It was an error to suppose that the misery which became so apparent in Ireland this winter did not exist during the six previous years. These years had all been full of misery for the tenant farmers, the Land Act of 1881 having failed to fulfil the expectations formed by its authors; but the great crisis occurred this winter. It was absurd to say, as the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) did, that the crisis had been manufactured by the Nationalist Members. To endow them with the power to make contented tenants face eviction was to give them credit for what they did not possess. It was the distress of the people which induced them to join in the Plan of Campaign. Everybody got timely warning of the crisis that arose in Ireland last winter, and to meet that crisis the Tenants' Relief Bill was introduced by the hon. Member for Cork. But the Bill was rejected, and he would ask the attention of the House to the extraordinary fact that the single argument used by the Government to overthrow the Bill was the argument that the judicial rents were sacred, and that there was no necessity for these judicial rents being reduced. What occurred in Ireland? Immediately after the rejection of the Bill, the supporters of Her Majesty's Government in Ireland—the landlords—to a very large extent gave reductions in judicial rents, so that a large number of landlords more or less did voluntarily—some from a sense of humanity, others from considerations dictated by common sense—that which the Government said it would not do and should not be done in Ireland. That disposed pretty well of the only case that the Government put forward in support of the rejection of the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Cork. Well, the Government went to Ireland, and they endeavoured, with a dispensing power, and with "pressure within the law"—whatever that phrase might mean—to make certain landlords give reductions. But there was a fourth class of landlords, however, who stood aloof, and would not yield to humanity, to common sense, or to Governmental pressure, and who insisted on getting the full pound of flesh. These men he would christen the Shylock wing of the landlord class in Ireland, whom the Nationalist Members had tackled, and, he was proud to say, had tackled successfully under the Plan of Campaign. A great deal had been said about the law of the land, but there was a higher law than that—namely, the law of self-preservation. What were the Irish Representatives to do, with evictions pending all over the country? Bearing in mind what took place in 1847, when, owing to a blight on the crops, the tenants of Ireland were left penniless, and were by the thousand evicted by their landlords; the friends of the tenants, not seeing any evidence that the landlords had improved in humanity since then, did not think they would be doing their duty if they allowed them to be evicted for the non-payment of rent that they could not pay. The Representatives of the people did not want a recurrence of these sad events in Ireland, and so, as a last resource, they issued the Plan of Campaign, which was only another way for doing—though, perhaps, in a rougher and readier mode—what the Government was endeavouring to do with its dispensing power and pressure within the law; and it was only in exceptional cases, where evictions were pending, where it was absolutely necessary to protect the people, that the Plan of Campaign was applied. In no case where the landlord had shown a desire to meet his tenants in a reasonable and fair spirit had the Plan of Campaign been taken up. It was only adopted where the landlord proved himself utterly heartless and insensible to the sufferings of the people. Why had the Government waited for two months before taking any steps against the Plan of Campaign, or intimating that they considered it illegal? He had heard it said, by way of excuse and explanation, that the Government waited to see what the effects and results of the Plan would be. But upon this principle, if the Socialists of London placarded the walls with appeals to the people to assemble and burn London, it would not be the duty of the Government to interfere until the conflagration had commenced. He himself was to be put upon his trial for the part he took in the Plan of Campaign, but all that he did in collecting rents and making speeches he did under the eyes of the Royal Irish Constabulary. Yet for six weeks he got not the slightest intimation that what he was doing was illegal. The Tory Government, in fact, by standing by had led him into vicious courses. They might, he thought, have been good-natured enough to give him a hint that if he went on as he was going, he stood a chance of two years' imprisonment. Those who asserted that the Plan of Campaign was an illegal conspiracy had spoken a little too soon. No jury had yet decided the point. The question was to be tried for the first time on Monday, and he denied the right of any hon. Member of that House, whether he was in the Government or not, to say that he had been guilty of criminal conspiracy in promoting the Plan of Campaign before a jury had condemned that Plan as illegal. He (Mr. William Redmond) denied strongly the truth of the allegation that the Plan of Campaign had been introduced into Ireland from America, and was worked only by well-paid agitators simply for political purposes. Long before the Plan of Campaign appeared in Ireland, the tenants on numerous estates combined in order to obtain abatements of rents, it being impossible to pay the rents demanded. He wanted the House to allow him to read an extract from the report of a meeting held not by any tenants under the influence of the National League, or under the thumb of the parish priests, but a meeting of tenants in the County of Donegal, upon the estate of the Duke of Abercorn. The report said—

> "A memorial was unanimously adopted, petitioning for a reduction of 25 per cent of their rents for the present year. Memorialists assured their landlord (many of them Orangemen, and none of them having anything to do with the National League) that they followed no example in this matter, having hesitated as long as possible, and that they were constrained to make the application solely because to pay the present rents under existing conditions was absolutely impossible."

Could anybody say that these men had been intimidated by the Irish Members? The Plan of Campaign, however, came to the poor tenants as a helping hand, and they were glad to avail themselves of it. The dire necessities of the people alone had induced him and his Colleagues to enter into the movement. He (Mr. William Redmond) did not deny that the Plan of Campaign, like other organizations, might be devoted to bad objects. But he would remind the House that it had never been put in force except with the sanction and approval of the Catholic clergy of Ireland—from the Archbishop of Dublin down to the curates of the country—and he did not think there was a single hon. Gentleman present who would say that the Catholic clergy of Ireland would recommend their people to adopt any scheme which was immoral or dishonest, or uncalled for. The Plan had never been put in operation on an estate of which the landlord was desirous of treating his tenants with justice; and he (Mr. William Redmond) contended that the result of the movement up to the present had been to make peace on many estates where there had long been strife; to induce landlords to act justly who would not otherwise have done so, to reduce crime and stop one of the great causes of it—evictions; and to show the people that there was a better way of obtaining justice than by resorting to the old and violent methods against landlords which belonged to the dark days of the past. They had been taunted that the Plan of Campaign had not extended largely in Ireland; but he thought they should be congratulated that there had been no necessity for its being extended largely in Ireland. The result of the Plan of Campaign was to mark the winter of 1886, in the history of Ireland, as remarkable for the comparatively few evictions which had taken place, and for an almost total absence of crime. They had been accused of driving the people into the adoption of the Plan of Campaign, but it was the people who had driven them into it. In the County of Wexford the people had lodged their rents before the Plan was published, and the result was there were no evictions. He thanked God that there were no evictions, but he also thanked the Plan of Campaign. No one had suggested that the Plan of Campaign should be permanent. The Bill of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) had been proposed last Session as a temporary measure, and so also the Plan of Campaign was only temporary. The people of Ireland had not abandoned the hope that the people of England and Scotland would give a mandate to their Representatives which would finally regulate the tenure of land in Ireland; free the people from eviction, give the landlord what justly belonged to him, and happily enable this Parliament, relieved from debating this Irish Question, to pass measures which would benefit the English and Scotch working-men. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) the other evening taunted the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) because, on his return to Ireland, he had not advised the people to resist oppression and rise in insurrection, instead of having set off on a feeble attempt to stop the payment of rent. The hon. and gallant Gentleman said that the unarmed Irish people were afraid to fight; but he (Mr. William Redmond) said that if they had arms in their hands they might fight for their liberty like other people. But neither the hon. Member for East Mayo nor any other of the Irish Members had any desire to incite an unarmed people to rise in insurrection, nor could they be justly taunted with cowardice for not having taken such a course. They were willing to meet English Members half way if they would give Ireland a measure of self-government which would benefit Ireland, and benefit England also. If they gave such a measure, all the time and all the efforts of the Legislature of Ireland would be devoted to the building up of the prosperity of the Irish people, and they would have no time to interfere with this country. But the Irish people, as long as they were gagged, would devote all their time to obtaining liberty for their country. They might put him in prison a second time, and keep him there for three years, but he would rest himself in prison, and, re-invigorated by that rest, would come out and redouble his efforts against landlordism and Castle rule in Ireland. He would rather stand next Monday and receive sentence for defending the people of Ireland from eviction, and for working for the overthrow of Castle rule, than have all the wealth, power, honours, and titles which Her Most Gracious Majesty could confer. The only honour which he and the young men of Ireland were taught to look for was the honour of making a stand for the liberties and homes of the people.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON (Lancashire, Rossendale) said, Sir, whatever may be the necessity of the hon. Member for Fermanagh (Mr. W. Redmond) in Ireland, it is perfectly unnecessary for him in this House, at all events, to offer any defence, as he did just now, of the course which hon. Members from Ireland have taken in not prompting the people to resort to the extreme remedy of civil war. There is much in the conduct of the hon. Member, and of those with whom he acts, which we are bound to consider wrong, to consider ill-advised, and to consider unpatriotic; but the hon. Member may be perfectly certain that we, at all events, will never taunt him or his Friends for having abstained from inciting the people of Ireland to adopt the alternative of insurrection, nor will one word ever be spoken in this House tending to impute that abstention on their part to cowardice. We know that cowardice is the last imputation that should be made against the Irish people or their Leaders, or against the hon. Member for Cork. The fact that the hon. Member for Cork has not instigated them to armed resistance is due not only to the hopelessness that would attend such an effort, but because of the belief and hope of the Irish people that their object may be attained by other and more peaceful and legitimate means. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Fermanagh who has just sat down has not unnaturally—considering the position he will occupy next Monday—devoted almost the whole of his speech to an examination, and a defence of what is known as the Plan of Campaign. I shall have occasion to make some observations upon that movement by-and-bye; but I wish to point out as a reason for my not following the hon. Member in his remarks upon the Plan of Campaign just at this moment that that movement is not the subject immediately before the House, it not being directly referred to in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork, and although, undoubtedly, he did incidentally advert to it in his speech, and the question relating to it is indirectly raised by the Amendment, still it is not the main question which we are called upon to consider by the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork. Owing to the protracted debate upon the Address, I am afraid that the House is in some danger of losing sight of the real nature of the question raised by this Amendment. There may, perhaps, be some hon. Members in this House who are not aware that the practice of moving Amendments to the Address of the character of some of those which stand upon the paper is of comparatively recent origin. Down to a recent time no Amendment to the Address was ever moved unless it raised the direct issue of want of confidence in the Government of the day. No doubt the practice has been greatly altered of late years, and it appears to be the impression on the minds of some hon. Members that the debate on the Address to the Crown, in answer to the Speech from the Throne, is only an additional method to afford them an opportunity of discussing every possible question in which they may be interested. That practice is extremely recent, and I venture to assert that it is extremely inconvenient. Whatever may be the opinion of the majority of the House upon a subject raised by way of Amendment to the Address, it is impossible for the Government of the day, whosoever it may be, to regard an Amendment to the Address as a matter of indifference; seeing that such an Amendment must, in all cases, assume the character of a vote of want of confidence in the Government. Therefore it is that questions raised by such Amendments cannot really be debated upon their own merits, but must be debated by the House with reference to the effect which they must necessarily have upon the position of the Government. From this point of view I think that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork is more in accordance with the former practice of the House, and, in fact, is far more legitimate than many which have been moved on the Addresses in recent times, or than some of those which stand upon the Paper at this moment. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork does, undoubtedly, raise an issue challenging the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in Ireland—past, present, and prospective. The Amendment of the hon. Member brings certain charges, both of commission and of omission, against the Government. No doubt the hon. Member and his Friends feel no confidence in Her Majesty's present Advisers; and the hon. Member is perfectly entitled, if he chooses, to take the first opportunity he can of asking the House to eject Her Majesty's Government, and to replace it by another. But, although the hon. Member for Cork and his Friends are taking, in my opinion, a proper and a constitutional line in thus challenging the Irish Policy of the Government in moving this Amendment, I am afraid that that Amendment is going to be supported by many other hon. Members upon a totally different ground. Take, for instance, the speech delivered by my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) the other night. My right hon. Friend gives hardly any support whatever to the charges which have been brought against Her Majesty's Government by the Amendment. Of much which the Government has done my right hon. Friend expresses approval, but he is going to vote for the Amendment, not on account of the challenge which it contains against the conduct of the Government in Ireland, but because it contains certain words indicating a certain line of reform of the law, and the system of government in Ireland to which my right hon. Friend could give a general concurrence—that is to say, he intends to vote for the Amendment as though it were a sort of abstract Resolution in favour of Home Rule. Now I contend that that is a most extremely inconvenient mode of procedure. It is not a convenient way of raising a debate upon Home Rule in this House to mix that question up with a series of charges against a particular Government in relation to their administration in Ireland. If the question of Home Rule is to be debated in this House, let it be debated in the form of a separate Motion, or as an alternative policy to that adopted by the Government when they bring forward their Irish policy. But it is not reasonable for the right hon. Gentleman, or for any of those who agree with him, to vote for this Amendment, and in doing so to ask the House of Commons to pass a vote of want of confidence in the Government because they, having been placed by the majority of the electors of the country where they are for the purpose of carrying out a particular policy, have not thought it right, within six months from their having been intrusted with power for that purpose, to change their views, and to initiate a policy the exact reverse of that which they were appointed to carry into effect. There are numerous charges made by the hon. Member for Cork against the Government. He charges them with having rejected the Bill which he brought in last Autumn—with having been guilty of unconstitutional conduct in bringing pressure of an irregular character to bear on the Irish landlords in order to induce them to reduce their rents — with repressing meetings—with being guilty of unconstitutional conduct in prosecuting the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. John Dillon)—with packing juries, and, lastly, with suggesting some Amendment of the Criminal Procedure in Ireland, whereas they ought to look in other directions for remedies for the evils they sought to put an end to. These are the principal charges which the hon. Member for Cork has brought against the Government, and with the permission of the House I will proceed as briefly as I can to deal with them. In the first place, the hon. Member has made it a matter of grave charge against the Government that they had induced the House to reject his Tenants' Relief Bill of last year. In dealing with that matter the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) said the other day that the only ground upon which the Government had induced the House to reject that Bill was that there was no unusual depression of the price of agricultural produce in Ireland, whereas both the Government and the landlords now admitted that there has been an unusual fall in that price. But when we rejected that Bill we did not deny that there had been a fall in the price of such produce—did not attempt to base our action upon such an untenable ground. The ground which we took was that the measure of the hon. Member was unnecessary and was unsuited to the circumstances of the case. What we did say was that the prices of agricultural produce of last year were not lower than those which had prevailed when many of the existing rents had been fixed. It is not proved that the Land Commissioners in fixing judicial rents have not allowed a margin for a fall of prices. It was probable that the landlords themselves would, as reasonable persons, in particular cases, make a sufficient reduction of those rents, as had been done in England, without such a measure being passed; and, finally, they urged that the Courts in Ireland were already possessed, to a considerable extent, of an equitable jurisdiction, which would enable them to meet the vast majority of cases where it was sought to enforce the law too rigidly against the tenants, and to grant such relief or such suspension of proceedings as might be required. I maintain that upon those grounds the House was perfectly justified in rejecting the hon. Member's Bill. And, indeed, the course of events has shown that the House was justified in doing so. It has been admitted by the hon. Member for Cork, and by his Friends, that, in a large number of cases all over Ireland, the landlords have, of their own free will, offered to reduce the rents and enter into reasonable agreements with their tenants. What we say is, that if such a Bill had been passed as that of the hon. Member for Cork, the effect of such a measure would have been to have induced the tenants to refuse to come to such reasonable agreements, and would have prevented the landlords from making any reasonable concessions. If that Bill had been passed every judicial tenant in Ireland, at all events, would have obtained, at least, temporary security by the tender of half-a-year's rent and half the arrears due. Not a shilling would the landlord be able to collect without going into Court, without taking judicial proceedings, without being exposed to legal action, and without having the burden thrown upon him of proving that the tenant was able to pay more. I say that would have had the effect of suspending over the whole of Ireland the payment of more than half a-year's rent, or of placing the landlords and tenants all over Ireland in the position of contending parties in an action at law. We say that no case existed for such a proceeding as this, and we say that over a large part of Ireland no such measure was required, because tenant and landlord were able to come together and make arrangements. We say, further, that in many parts of Ireland, where real difficulties existed—and exist now—the Bill would have been altogether ineffective, because the tenants were utterly unable—as was known at the time when we were discussing that measure—to pay half-a-year's rent and half the arrears due, which alone would have entitled them to come under the protection of the Bill. Now, I feel disposed to doubt very much whether there exists in the greater part of Ireland what the hon. Member calls an agrarian crisis. I am willing to admit that over the whole of Ireland the relations between landlord and tenant are unsatisfactory; and I doubt very much, as I have said on more than one occasion before, whether those relations can be rendered permanently satisfactory so long as the dual ownership created by the Land Act exists. I believe that perfectly satisfactory relations can never be established except by some process which will convert or do away with the dual ownership which has been created, or will, to a large extent, make the occupiers of land in Ireland the proprietors of the soil. That is a very large and very difficult question, which cannot be settled in the discussion of an Amendment of this character. It is one which can only be approached by the House upon due deliberation and due information, and upon definite proposals placed before it by those whose duty it is to do so. But I believe, so far as the greater part of Ireland is concerned, that there is no greater agrarian crisis prevailing at this moment than during the last three or four years since the passing of the Land Act. In certain parts of Ireland, no doubt, there has existed for a considerable period, and there exists now, something which may be described as an agrarian crisis. It is a matter of most extreme difficulty to suggest a remedy for that state of things; but it is not difficult to make a very simple statement of the causes. There is a large part of Ireland—I think it is admitted on all sides—where a great population exists on the land, which has not, and which probably cannot subsist and pay rent for the land out of the produce of the land. It is a population which in times past has subsisted on labour given elsewhere, concurrently with the produce of its own holdings. Changes have taken place which have diminished the demand for that labour in other parts of the country; and this population, unable or unwilling to change its residence or change its habits, has, no doubt, long felt the greatest possible difficulty, not only in paying its rent, but to exist at all upon the holding. No doubt that is a state of things which may be described as an agrarian crisis. What the remedies are, and how the remedies can be applied, are matters of extreme difficulty; but I fail to see in what direction it is possible to look for a remedy, unless in the direction of providing a larger amount of employment for the population in their own districts or in other parts of Ireland itself, or something in the nature of emigration. To either of those remedies I believe Her Majesty's present Government are not averse. They have appointed a Commission for the express purpose of seeing whether the industrial resources of Ireland can be developed, and whether a greater amount of remunerative employment cannot be found for a great part of the population of Ireland. I believe they would not be averse to assist the Irish people or their Representatives in any well-conceived scheme of voluntary emigration; but if there are any other remedies than those, I confess I do not know what they are. Is it not the duty of the Irish Members to suggest in what other direction a remedy can be found? [*Cheers.*] I do not understand the cheers of my right hon. Friends behind me. I ask whether there are other directions in which remedies for this agrarian crisis, which exists in the West of Ireland, are to be looked for? If there are any, I suppose we shall hear from them at all events. We shall hear from them in what direction these remedies are to be looked for. Certainly, I contend it is no remedy for the state of things I have described to suspend, to reduce, or even to abolish the payment of rent. That would be no remedy for the state of things which exists in a great part of Ireland. Let the House consider for a moment a possible similar case. We are all of us agreed with my right hon. Friend that something should be done to enable the agricultural labourers in England to obtain allotments or small holdings; but it is not proposed that these labourers should live on the produce of their allotments or holdings. It is intended that they should live by their labour on larger holdings, and that they should have the comfort and additional assistance which they can derive from the produce of their own allotments or small holdings. But suppose circumstances should arise in England, as they have arisen in Ireland, to diminish the employment of agricultural labourers, would anyone contend that any encouragement should be given to any attempt on the part of those for whom these allotments or small holdings have been provided to continue on those allotments or small holdings by the reduction or by the abolition of the rent for them? Would anyone contend that a landlord, by such a change of circumstances, should be deprived of such rent for these allotments or small holdings as was commanded by the neighbouring agricultural land; or can it be suggested that it would be any alleviation of the sufferings of these people that they should be encouraged by any legislation of that sort to remain in the localities where there was not sufficient occupation for them? The condition of a great part of the West of Ireland is very much the same, and the remedy to which some hon. Members seem to be looking—the abolition of eviction, the reduction of rent, or the suspension of the payment of rent altogether—is no boon at all to those tenants for whom the only remedy, as I have said, so far as my knowledge extends, would be to increase the amount of productive employment in Ireland by some means, or to take them to some place where they can be productively employed. My right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) spoke the other day of something I had said as if emigration were my panacea for the evils which have arisen in Ireland. I had previously suggested emigration among other remedies; but it was from my right hon. Friend himself that I adopted his panacea. My right hon. Friend had spoken not only of emigration, but had expressed the opinion in one of his speeches that nothing but compulsory emigration would be sufficient to meet the difficulty of the case. The difference between my right hon. Friend and myself is solely that he considers compulsory emigration as the remedy, and that compulsory emigration can only be applied by an Irish Government. I do not believe in compulsory emigration at all. I do not believe that compulsory emigration could be applied in the congested districts of Ireland, either by a British Government or any Irish Government that could be created. I am not quite sure I should like to see it attempted; but I do believe that voluntary emigration, not conducted by, but assisted by the State and by the Government, initiated by and organized by the the Local Authorities possessing the confidence of the people of the country—is a remedy to which we may look with some hope and confidence. But I do not believe that we want a great State machinery for the purpose of ascertaining what emigrants desire to emigrate, where they desire to go to, or what assistance would be required to be given to them. My right hon. Friend referred the other day, in his speech in the House, to the difficulties that would arise if the attempt were made to emigrate paupers from Ireland indiscriminately to any of our Colonies or to the United States. No doubt, arrangements would have to be made with our Colonies and the United States. I ask, is there any reason why the British Government is less able to deal with these difficulties than an Irish Government? I should have thought that a Government which possessed a Colonial Office, which was in communication with our Colonial Governments—which possessed a Foreign Office, and which was in communication with Foreign Governments—would be in a far better position to overcome difficulties of this character than any Irish Government which you could create. As to any local difficulties that may exist, as I said before, I do not believe it requires a State Department to deal with those difficulties at all. The Local Boards, Boards of Guardians, and County Authorities are perfectly competent, if they are supported by a desire on the part of their own people, to initiate, to organize a system of emigration which only requires to be assisted, and, to a certain extent, directed, by the Central Government of the country. Now, Sir, it is also charged against the Government that they have brought to bear illegal and un-Constitutional pressure on the landlords to induce them to reduce their rents. It is not very easy to understand the view which the hon. Member for Cork takes of this dispensing power. In one portion of his speech he said that after the rejection of the Tenants' Relief Bill it was the best thing the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant could have done; but in another part of his speech he said the exercise of this power had done more to demoralize the tenants of Ireland than all the agitation which had been conducted by all the Fenian organizations which had ever existed. It is, therefore, rather difficult to say what view the hon. Gentleman takes of these alleged proceedings on the part of the Government; but, after all, what do they amount to? What proof has been brought forward in this debate of the existence or the use of this un-Constitutional dispensing power at all? We have heard something of the proceedings of County Court Judge Curran in the County of Kerry, and it has been said that he has exceeded his powers and acted illegally. I conceive that, if Judge Curran has in any way exceeded his legal powers, there are in Ireland Superior Courts which have the power of revising and correcting any abuse or excess of power or jurisdiction of which he may have been guilty. If any landlord, if any tenant, or if any person feels himself aggrieved by the un-Constitutional proceedings of County Court Judge Curran, there is, I conceive, in Ireland some power by which the injustice done can be redressed. But, Sir, what have we heard of any such grievance? Who has been aggrieved by such proceedings? Who has been injured by the course the learned Judge has taken? It appears to me, from all I have ever heard alleged of the proceedings of County Court Judge Curran, that he has used — boldly, no doubt—that equitable power which we have always contended was possessed by the Judges of the County Courts in Ireland under the rules of Court. The existence of this power was denied by our opponents.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): We deny it still. There is no such power.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Does the hon. Member still deny that there is such a power? It was stated by legal authorities in the House last autumn that, under the rules, County Court Judges did possess a very considerable equitable power of suspending evictions, and proposing equitable arrangements between landlords and tenants. I am very glad that that power exists, and that it has been used; and if the inquiries of the Land Commission should throw any light upon the subject—show a necessity for any further law on the subject—or if it should be found that such powers should be further extended, I should be most happy to consider any proposal which might be submitted in that direction. I think that power, in the existing condition of the Land Question in Ireland, and probably in any condition of the Land Question which may be created by legislation—the power of eviction, or something equivalent to the power of eviction, cannot possibly be dispensed with. I cannot conceive any circumstances, even if the tenants should be made possessors of their holdings, in which there should not be somewhere, in some person, a power of ejecting the tenant from his holding if he fails to fulfil the conditions under which he holds it; and I do not believe that there is any remedy for the Land Question that can be devised which will absolutely get rid of the necessity of the use of the power of eviction, or something equivalent to eviction. It is, no doubt, a tremendous power, and should only be used in the very last resort; and if there is reason still to believe that eviction is possible as the result of harsh, capricious, or unjust proceedings on the part of the landlord, and if there is not any power enabling County Court Judges to inquire fully into such cases and to satisfy themselves that substantial justice is done, then, I say, I should be very glad to see and consider any amendment of the law in that direction. So far as regards the proceedings of Judge Curran, what more proof has been adduced? There is a story—one story—about something that Captain Plunkett is supposed to have done. That has been denied, and I am not aware of any attempt that has been made to substantiate the charge against Captain Plunkett. The hon. Member for Cork referred to the correspondence that has been published between Sir Redvers Buller and Messrs. Darley & Roe, in the Glenbeigh case; and he said it contained a threat on the part of Sir Redvers Buller, in case the solicitors did not come to an arrangement. Sir, I have carefully read that correspondence, and I am prepared to state that that correspondence contains no threat of any sort or kind on the part of Sir Redvers Buller. I think that that correspondence does credit to the good sense and judgment of Sir Redvers Buller. He used no threat; he used no word implying that if the landlord insisted on the exercise of his legal rights protection would be refused him; but he did what it was his duty to do as a person in a responsible position; and, having a knowledge of the circumstances of the case, Sir Redvers Buller, as a sensible man, advised the agents to do what, in his judgment, would be best for the landlord, best for the tenants, and most in the interests of humanity and law and order in the district. That advice which was tendered by Sir Redvers Buller was accepted by the agent; and, in the opinion of an authority which can hardly be questioned, even by hon. Members from Ireland—the opinion of the parish priest —an equitable and a generous proposal was made to the tenants. Then, Sir, the hon. Member for Cork referred to the prohibition of the proposed Sligo meeting. As to that, there is a direct conflict of statement between the hon. Member for Cork and Her Majesty's Government that ought to be cleared up before the conclusion of this debate. What did the hon. Member for Cork describe as the object of the Sligo meeting? It was, he said, to discuss the Land Question, and to protest against the composition of the jury panel. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland read the other night from a notice which was published calling that meeting. There is nothing in it about the Land Question, and there is nothing about the irregular composition of the jury panel. The notice published was, I believe, textually read by the right hon. and learned Gentleman. What does it ask? It asks the Nationalists of Sligo to assemble in their might in Sligo town next Sunday to appeal to Sligo jurors to express their condemnation of the attempt of the Government to assassinate the liberty of the Press and to victimize the gallant defenders of "Saunders' Fort." What is there here about the Land Act or the irregular empanelling of juries? The right hon. and learned Gentleman said such a meeting, avowedly summoned to intimidate jurors, was, in the opinion of the Government, an illegal meeting. Sir, I trust the right hon. and learned Gentleman was right, and that it is an illegal meeting; and I hope that either in Ireland or any other part of the Kingdom the Government would prohibit and prevent the holding of any meeting which was summoned to appeal to juries to act in any particular manner not according to their conscience, not according to the evidence, but to accommodate themselves to the opinion of a particular section of the community. Sir, it is to be hoped that English and Scotch Members will receive with caution much of what they have heard of the process by which, in certain cases, juries in Ireland are placed in the box. Nothing which can in fairness be called jury-packing exists in Ireland. No doubt there are proceedings different in character from those to which it is necessary to resort in England, and which, I admit, are capable of shocking the feelings of many hon. Members. Some persons in Ireland have very curious ideas as to what the duty of an Irish juror is. There, as here, jurors are sworn to give a verdict on the facts according to the evidence; but it appears to me that those persons to whom I have referred seem to think that that is not the duty of a juror at all, and say they will do their utmost to persuade the Irish jurors that they are to ignore the facts, to ignore their oaths, to ignore the directions as to law given to them by the Judge, and that they are to give verdicts in accordance with their own opinion of what ought to be, and in accordance with what in the opinion of the majority of their fellow countrymen ought to be. Now, Sir, we have heard something of an article published in *United Ireland* previous to the holding of the Sligo Assizes. I have seen that article. It is stated in that article —and I do not think it will be denied— it was distinctly laid down that the prisoners whom juries were about to try were innocent men who ought to be acquitted, and who had been already tried and acquitted by the public opinion of Ireland, and that if they were convicted it would be regarded as an outrage on the people. The same article contained a distinct intimation that the names of jurors who acted in a particular way would be held up to public odium. When some of us are so shocked by proceedings such as are resorted to by the Irish Government to get jurors into the box, we ought to consider whether there were or were not upon the jury panel men who were likely to be influenced by exhortations and threats of that description. I suppose that those who made these threats thought they would have some effect, or they would not have taken the trouble to make them. Sir, unfortunately, we know that the office of juror in Ireland is not one that is entirely free from danger. We have heard of one juror in Dublin who nearly paid the penalty of his life for the honest performance of his duty. We have heard also that there are jurors in Sligo at this moment who are Boycotted on account of their conduct at the recent trials. If such a state of things prevails in any part of Ireland, is that not some extenuation of the course which the Government—and not this Government alone, but all Governments—have had to take in this matter? I ask whether, if any power exists by which those who are responsible for criminal procedure in Ireland may empanel a jury consisting of men who are least likely to be subject to such influences—I ask whether any Government would be doing its duty to the country if they were to omit to make use of those powers which the law gives them? Now, Sir, the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) referred also to what I think he described as the timidity and vacillation of the Government in regard to their dealings with the Plan of Campaign, and he seemed to make it a complaint that no tenants had been prosecuted for the Plan of Campaign. He also complained of the great delay on the part of the Government in expressing any opinion on it one way or another. As to the delay, of course it is not for me to express any opinion. I do not know whether it was possible to have acted before they did; but as to the course they took in prosecuting those who were the authors and advisers of the Plan of Campaign rather than the tenants, who were the instruments in putting the Plan into execution, I do not think there can be much doubt that the Government took a right, a straightforward, and an honourable course. If the Plan of Campaign was, in their opinion, an illegal plan and an immoral one, if it was an illegal conspiracy, surely it was their duty to attack those who were responsible for it, and who were doing their utmost to advise the tenants to adopt it, rather than to attack the tenants, who might be ignorant dupes, and who had acted under the advice of those in whom they had confidence. The speeches delivered in the House upon the Plan of Campaign have been extremely conflicting, because they have produced a number of opinions from Gentlemen of great weight. Some of them are of a remarkable character. My right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) expressed his opinion on the Plan of Campaign. He says that it is a consequence of our action in rejecting the Tenants' Relief Bill last year. That may be perfectly true. The Tenants' Relief Bill did all or a great deal of that which the Plan of Campaign was invented to do; and in that sense it might be contended that the Plan of Campaign would have been absolutely unnecessary if the Tenants' Relief Bill had been passed. But it would have been interesting for the House to know whether the right hon. Gentleman thought it was a legitimate consequence of our rejection of the Bill, and whether, whenever the House of Commons rejects a measure which is asked for by any section of the community, that section of the community is legally and morally entitled to take the law into their own hands, and to do for themselves that which Parliament had refused to do for them. [An hon. MEMBER: Church rates!] The hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth) gave his opinion of the Plan of Campaign. He has invented a new term, I think, by describing it as extra-legal, and declared that to be extra-legal which does not, or may not, exactly square with the ordinary principles of the law. The hon. Member said that, if he had been an Irishman, he would not have shrunk from bearing his part in the prosecution of the Plan of Campaign. Sir, I think that that definition ought to have been a little further enlarged; and that it would have been desirable to have an explanation of the precise difference between that which was illegal and that which was extra-legal. I should have been glad to know whether the hon. Member had any responsibility for the Land Act of 1881. I want to know whether the hon. Member thinks that that Act is, as against the tenant, absolutely of no effect, and that, by some extra-legal process, while the landlord is entirely bound by the provisions of that Act, the tenant is under no responsibility whatever with respect to his engagements. But, Sir, the most important declarations of all that we have had on the Plan of Campaign is that which was given by my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) the other night. My right hon. Friend protested against being called upon to give an opinion at all; but he did give an opinion. He said—"If I must pronounce judgment at all, I must be allowed to pronounce judgment in full." Now, let us see what that judgment in full is. His judgment in full is, that however immoral, however unpatriotic, however objectionable the Plan of Campaign might be, it was not more immoral, more objectionable, or more unpatriotic than the conduct of certain Irish landlords who had been denounced by the Chief Secretary. Now, the House can understand why there has been so much hesitation in various parts of the House in giving a direct opinion on the Plan of Campaign. The hon. Member for Cork shrinks from actually approving it, because such an open approval of the Plan of Campaign might alienate the support of some Members on this side of the House. My right hon. Friends who sit near me hesitate absolutely to denounce or to condemn the Plan of Campaign. That may be owing to the circumstances that such a denunciation might alienate the support of those who are sitting below the Gangway. However that may be, I am quite certain that my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle did not, in the slightest degree, satisfy the House with the judgment in full which he pronounced the other night. There is no man in the House who can see more clearly than he can the fallacy in regard to the differences between the two cases which he cited. My right hon. Friend referred to the conduct of bad landlords. Well, Sir, we have been trying, for some years past, to make landlords—English landlords to a certain extent and Irish landlords to a greater extent—good by Act of Parliament. We have done a good deal, and have gone a good way; but perhaps we have not gone far enough. But why has Parliament stopped short at the point at which it has? Why has it stopped short at the point which would have enabled it to deal with the conduct of those landlords to whom my right hon. Friend has referred? It has stopped short because it felt, rightly or wrongly, that by further interference with the remaining powers of the landlords it would do more harm on a large scale than it could possibly do good on a small scale. Irrespective of the legality or the morality of the Plan of Campaign, why is that Plan to be condemned by the House? Because whatever may be its effects in particular instances, whatever provocation may have been given by particular landlords, if its legality be admitted, if its validity be maintained, it is calculated to do far more harm on a large scale than it can possibly do good on a small scale. Why, Sir, if this Plan of Campaign is legal, and if it cannot be stopped, there is an end to all the legal relations between tenants and landlords. It is all very well to say that it has only been applied in a small number of cases; but it is capable of being applied in every case. If it is capable of being applied to obtain a fair reduction of rent, it is equally capable of being applied in order to obtain any reduction of rent, or a total cessation of rent, as the tenants may choose. It is a weapon which those who have invented it cannot possibly control the use of; and if its legality is admitted by the Courts of Law and by Parliament, there is evidently and obviously a total destruction of all the remaining rights of every landlord in Ireland. Look at the consequences to the tenants that the success of this Plan of Campaign is likely to entail. Whatever may be the legality of the Plan of Campaign, you cannot deprive the landlord of the right to resort to his existing legal remedy. He cannot be prevented from attempting to re-enter on that property from which he receives no rent; and I maintain that if the Plan of Campaign be extensively resorted to, the only remedy left to the landlord is not partial but indiscriminate and total evictions if he wishes to retain his title to any land. I put it to hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House whether that is not for the landlords the desperate, and as it seems to me the only, remedy, if the legality of this Plan of Campaign is admitted? It is an invitation to internecine war between landlord and tenant. Now, Sir, I think that it is the duty of the Government to do everything in their power to prevent the further progress of a system which could only lead to such results, and it is equally the duty of Parliament to support the Government in any measures which they may think necessary for the attainment of that object. There is only one other subject that I will refer to, and I will be asbrief as possible. The hon. Member for Cork warned us in very solemn language against the probable consequences of any attempt to resort again to what he described as coercive legislation. I desire to acquit the hon. Member of making any statement in the nature of a threat, and I am perfectly willing to accept his own declaration that anything which he said was by warning, and that when he referred to what had occurred in the past it was only to warn us against what might occur again. But what is the hon. Member's argument? He says that coercion has been used by former Governments, and that any fresh coercive measure will be used by the present Government as a weapon against their political opponents, and that the suppression by the Government of political discussion in Ireland has always been followed by outrage, not only in Ireland, but elsewhere. The answer to that appears to me to be that anything which can be described as a reform of criminal procedure can only be used by the Government against political opponents in the event of their committing illegal action. The argument of the hon. Member may be a good one as against the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act and other provisions of that sort, which may be used indiscriminately and arbitrarily by the Government against political opponents; but criminal procedure can only be used against political opponents if they put themselves in a position to be prosecuted for criminal offences. It may be perfectly true that if the law is allowed to remain powerless outrages will not take place; for when the law is not asserted there is no occasion for active resistance to it. But I maintain that neither Parliament nor the Government can acquiesce in passive resistance to the law any more than in open resistance to it—indeed, the consequences may be more serious from a passive than from a more active form of illegality; and that, if the consequences of a recognition of the duty be even to provoke a conflict with a more active form of illegality, no Government is justified in permitting a paralysis of law in any part of Her Majesty's Dominions. I should have thought that the argument to be drawn from the observations of the hon. Member for Cork was rather that the law in Ireland, as in every part of the Kingdom, ought to be made sufficiently strong to deal, not only with active, but with passive resistance, with every form of resistance to the just laws of the land. The hon. Member reminded us that coercion had been followed, not only by outrages in Ireland, but also by dynamite and assassination elsewhere. Well, Sir, that warning gives some cause for reflection. I will not admit that outbreaks of dynamite plots or assassination plots are the natural and spontaneous results of a firm or even a coercive administration of the law in Ireland. Those plots and attempts are the deliberate reply of an organization existing in America to every attempt by the British Government to assert the law. They are not the spontaneous action of individuals. They are parts of the organized plan of an association deliberately formed. The hon. Member may say that he is unable to repress the proceedings of any such organization. That may be perfectly true, and I do not doubt it for a moment; but I think that the House and the country expect something more from the hon. Member than that. It is in the power of the hon. Member, not only to warn us of what may happen in consequence of certain legislation which we may be contemplating, it is also in his power to denounce the methods which will be adopted by some persons on the other side of the Atlantic. It is in his power to sever himself and his political organization absolutely and completely from those who are responsible for such a line of conduct. There is no doubt whatever that the hon. Member has from time to time sent delegates to Nationalist conferences in America; and he has, undoubtedly, received large subscriptions from America for political purposes. Has the hon. Member satisfied himself, or will he satisfy himself now, that his delegates have not associated with those who have been guilty, and who, he warns us, may be guilty again, of crimes which I fully admit he is not in a position to control, but which he is in a position to disown and denounce? When the hon. Member has done this—when he has placed beyond the possibility of doubt the absence of any connection, direct or indirect, between himself and any association which seeks by other than political methods to accomplish its ends, then I think the House will be disposed to listen to the advice which he may give it, to the warnings which he may address to it, in a very different spirit from that which it is disposed to show now. From what I have said the House will understand that it is impossible for me to concur in the censure which it is proposed by the hon. Member to pronounce upon the action of the Government. As to the affirmative declaration which the Amendment contains, and which commands the approval of the right hon. Member for Newcastle, it appears to me that that declaration may mean everything or nothing. My right hon. Friend must know by this time that the great difficulty in the way of Irish legislation is not the framing of a Resolution in plausible terms; the difficulty lies in framing the details of a large measure which will be accepted in Ireland and in Great Britain. It will not advance us much to pass a Resolution urging a "reform of the law and of the system of government in Ireland which will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people." The difficulty is to include in legislation conditions which will satisfy British interests and British ideas, as well as the demands of the Irish people. My right hon. Friend must be as well aware as the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian himself that there exists at this time the solid barrier of 100 votes in this House against the policy for which the late Government made themselves responsible in the last Parliament. My right hon. Friend the other day reproached the Government with inability to grasp the conditions of the Irish problem, or to understand the true difficulties of the Irish Question; but is it not equally necessary for a statesman to grasp the true conditions of the British problem, and to ascertain the true nature of the difficulties felt by the British people? It is not enough that a measure for the reform of government in Ireland should command the confidence and approval of the Irish people; it must be accompanied by conditions which will command the approval of the British nation. The British nation said at the last Election by a large majority that the plans of the then existing Government would not secure the conditions which they themselves considered necessary; and until they have made some further progress, until they have grasped more completely the conditions which are necessary to secure the confidence of the British people, it is idle for them to ask us to agree to a Resolution which speaks only of satisfying the needs and securing the confidence of the Irish people. We none of us are averse to reforms, either of the law or of the system of government, which would satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people. I retract nothing of what I have ever said at any time as to the conditions under which I think it is possible to make an attempt to satisfy those needs and acquire that confidence; but I do not see the use of, and I refuse to be a party to, a vague Resolution which may be held to pledge me to that which I may be unable to perform. And, above all, I decline to vote for a Resolution which holds out as the sole and only object to be borne in mind by the House of Commons that of satisfying the wants and securing the confidence of the Irish people, and fails at the same time by a single sentence—by a single word—to recognize that there are securities and there are conditions which are equally required, and equally justly required, by the people of Great Britain, and which must be secured before they can assent to any such legislation as is contemplated by some of my right hon. Friends near me.

MR. A. E. PEASE (York) said, that he felt bound to remind the House that the Government had been warned of the critical condition of the Irish tenants and of those circumstances which had culminated in the adoption of the Plan of Campaign by others than the Irish Nationalist Members in this House; and in support of that contention he desired to be allowed to quote the letter of Sir Eardley Wilmot, who for many years was a Tory Member, which appeared in *The Times* in September last. The hon. Baronet said—

> "As an old and staunch Conservative, as a cordial supporter of Lord Salisbury's Administration, as an earnest well-wisher of its success, and, last but not least, in the cause of peace and prosperity in Ireland, I hope that the Government will see its way to accept, subject to modifications, the 3rd clause of Mr. Parnell's Bill dealing with evictions. The interests of leaseholders and the adaptation of the amount of rent to current prices may well wait the issue of the proposed Royal Commission on Land and Industries, but misery and hunger cannot wait; and if nothing is done to arrest the iron hand and heel of the agent, thousands of families will be thrown in cold and shivering and nakedness upon the cruel mercies of the coming winter. Evictions cannot serve the purpose of the landlords for the present condition of the country; and if the land-hungering squatter will dare to occupy the vacated land, among rational and calmly-judging men in Ireland there is but one opinion—namely, that evictions

> should be temporarily suspended, subject, of course, to investigation of the local Court as to the capability of the tenant. Because the proposal emanates from a Home Ruler whose political doctrines we abhor, if it is a good proposal, in God's name why should we reject it?"

But, further than that, he (Mr. A. E. Pease) contended that they on that side of the House were justified in placing the responsibility of the Plan of Campaign on the shoulders of Her Majesty's Government. He noticed amongst the Bills introduced into the House a Bill for providing a close time for hares; and if that were a desirable object, he asked if it would not have been a good thing to have, for at least a few months during the winter season, a close time for the poor Irish tenants? He listened the other day with great respect to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), and he thoroughly believed in the genuine sympathy for these sufferers, and the high purpose of the right hon. Gentleman in striving to temper with mercy the application of the law—and he believed that the country generally approved of the action of the right hon. Gentleman with respect to the pressure brought to bear upon Irish landlords. But the approval of such action implied to a greater or less degree the acknowledgment of the inequitable incidence of certain laws; and that approval and acknowledgment of the wisdom of the course adopted by the right hon. Gentleman was also inconsistent with the new doctrine and principles adopted by the Unionist Party of late, that any principle, whether right or wrong, moral or immoral, was to be regarded as absolutely sacred and irreproachable if once it had become embodied in the law. According to the new Unionist creed, anyone who dared to question the justice of a law, or the infallibility of an Irish Judge who had pronounced an acceptable *dictum*, was to be exposed to all manner of reproach and harsh criticism; but there seemed to be a different test of right and wrong when an Irish Judge said something which implied disapproval of the action of the Irish Executive. Then, indeed, the Unionists fled to a very different code of morality. The Government had over and over again stated their determination to maintain, at all risks, law and order in Ireland, and quite right too. They on that side of the House were quite as anxious to maintain law and order as any hon. Members opposite could be; but they advocated different methods of achieving that object. They believed that law and order could only be satisfactorily maintained in any country by winning the confidence and securing the acquiescence and good-will of the main body of that people. If he might be allowed, he would quote a few words on this point by an author whose name had, of late, been in every Unionist's mouth—

> "No jurist"—said Professor Dicey—"can question for a moment that the ultimate strength of law lies in the sympathy, or at the lowest the acquiescence, of the mass of the population."

But, he would ask, was the conduct of the Government such as was likely to obtain the acquiescence of the Irish people, much less their sympathy or reverence for the law? Regarding their policy, and guessing from it what the future might bring, he regretted to say that he could not look forward to any good result following from the measures foreshadowed in the Speech of the Queen. Certainly, the past afforded no hope for the future. There was a time when he, like hon. Members opposite—and he believed, also, the majority of the people in England—treated as absolutely incredible the allegations as to the wrong-doing and tyranny of English officials in Ireland which were made by Nationalist Members. He could not bring himself to believe that such things as jury-packing, scales of fees for Crown witnesses, and exclusion of Nationalists from all public official life in Ireland, wholesale evictions, the driving of poor people out wholesale upon the road-side, and the destruction of their dwellings in the depth of winter, and other iniquities, were possible under a British Government, and some hon. Members opposite appeared still to cherish this pious belief, though there were others who were not afraid to acknowledge the existence of those terrible evils. Unhappily, it was no longer possible, in the presence of the fierce light which had recently been thrown upon Irish affairs, to have any doubt on the matter; and if such things could take place during the last few months when the Government was exerting itself to the utmost, and the landlords were upon their good behaviour, he would ask, what must have been the state of things when those influences were not at work? The evictions, and the packing of juries at the Sligo Assizes, enabled them to form some idea of what the Irish people had had to suffer in the past in the name of the maintenance of the law. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), in his able speech, taunted Liberals with their change of attitude upon the Irish Question; but there was a very good cause for the change; of attitude, the wider suffrage and the great preponderating strength of the Nationalist Party was testimony enough to any reasonable man—it was testimony which, under our Constitution, we were bound to recognize of the genuineness of Irish desires. They were asked—"Do you mean to hand over the management of the affairs of Ireland to the National League?" But, if he (Mr. A. E. Pease) understood matters rightly, the National League existed in consequence of two things which bound the League together — the desire for settlement of the Land Question, and the desire for self-government—and if these two questions were settled to the satisfaction of the Irish people there would be no National League to hand over the affairs of Ireland to. They would be handed over to the Irish people. The fact was the Tory Party looked upon the Irish Question from the narrow point of view of the present; whereas the object of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), and of the Liberal Party, was not to get rid of the Irish Question for a short time, but to make, as far as possible, a final settlement of the Irish problem —at least, a settlement for the generations to come. They all admitted the deplorable events which had taken place in Ireland in the past; but the ruling people in Ireland and the landlord class must take their share of responsibility, for they had wickedly neglected the interests of the masses for long series of years, and it was not to be wondered at if, in the struggle of the people against enormous odds, regrettable events had taken place. But now that the people had found an adequate voice in the House, he hoped and believed that the House would lend an ear to the reasonable demands of the Irish people, and do its best to meet them. He would also ask the House whether the Nationalist Representatives had already shown themselves more unfitted for taking part in the government of their own country than past English Governments. He would like to quote a few lines from writings of a man whose opinions were always respected in that House—namely, Edmund Burke, who, writing in 1797, said—

> "There is no hope for the body of the people of Ireland so long as those who are in power make it the great object of their policy to propagate an opinion on this side of the water that the mass of their countrymen are not to be trusted."

He (Mr. A. E. Pease) believed that in those words lay the secret of the Irish problem. It was the refusal of England to trust the Irish people that had done the mischief. The old system of the government of Ireland—the landlords supported by English soldiers—was disappearing, and whatever Government was in power would have to find a substitute for it, either in a representative institution, or resort to a despotic and arbitrary government of the country. They were told that they ought to yield nothing to agitation. When the Irish agitation was spoken of, or when Irishmen agitated, it was said that they did not deserve anything; but if they did not agitate it was said that they did not want anything. He should feel it very difficult, if he were an Irish Nationalist Representative, to know what course to pursue. If the Irish people remained perfectly still and neutral it was taken as a signal that Ireland had no grievances. They had had an appeal from the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh to suppress the National League, which was very similar to the language used by the right. hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) at Liverpool, when he asked the people of the town to help him to put out the fire in Ireland. If the means by which the Party opposite attempted to put out the fire in Ireland was by piling on more fuel in the shape of repressive legislation, they on that side of the House certainly would not help them. There was another way in which the fire might be put out, in which his (Mr. A. E. Pease's) Party would be most happy to help the Government. The noble

Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), in his speech in the general debate on the Address, alluded to the treatment of Ireland in the past as being like "jobbing a horse in the mouth," and he thought the simile was peculiarly appropriate. The noble Lord also said he would support any repressive measure which should also be applied to England and Scotland. He would like to know what comfort Englishmen would have in looking forward to repressive measures to be applied to themselves, by which they would also get a "job in the mouth" at the same time as the Irish people. If the Government pursued, or allowed the Irish Executive to pursue, those courses which had spread the belief among the Irish people that conviction and not justice was the object of the Government in the country —if they appeared to be desirous of introducing measures by which they would be able to evade existing law, they would stir up a great antagonism to the Irish law. It had been well said that if the people regarded the laws as their enemies, they would be enemies to the laws; and that was the feeling which they on that side of the House hoped, by the policy they advocated, to remove. They hoped to let the Irish people see that the laws existed for themselves and their protection, and not for interference with their liberties or for their persecution. He (Mr. A. E. Pease) believed there was no desire on that side of the House to monopolize the policy of conciliation. He thought they would heartily support any indication on the part of the present Government showing a wish to adopt a different attitude towards the Irish people. On the other hand, if the Government pursued the course which would exasperate the Irish people, he believed the Liberal Party would as heartily oppose it as they would cordially support the other course. He thanked the House for its indulgence, and he would not have spoken if he had not felt strongly the danger of the course of extraordinary legislation in the matter of the repression of crime in Ireland, and if he had not also felt very strongly the necessity of showing a generous and conciliatory spirit towards the Irish people.

Mr. DE COBAIN (Belfast, E.): Mr. Speaker, I think it necessary that I should apologize for interposing the few observations I propose to make in the course of this debate, because I am one of those who recognize that in the very lengthy and discursive discussion of the subject-matter of the Queen's Speech it may be wise for those who desire the progress of Public Business, and who regard with disfavour the expenditure which is now taking place of the time of the House, to remain silent. But certain observations of a personal character have been made with regard to myself, and I hope the House will accord me its indulgence while I make some reference to them. In the cold, cynical, and passionless speech addressed to the House on Monday by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) he alluded to the well-worn, stale, and stereotyped argument of coercion, and he indicated that it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to put coercive legislation strongly in force in Ireland. But the hon. Member did not stop to consider whether the restraining of Boycotting was coercive legislation, or whether any legislative attempt to resist the Socialistic conspiracy which is at present in full swing in Ireland, or to interfere with those who are seeking to obtain money legally owing by one man to another, and to impound it in order to promote some object of their own, is, or is not, coercion. In the somewhat ambiguous and remarkable speech which was made the other night by the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hanbury), in which he skilfully trimmed his sails in order to catch both winds, the hon. Member told the House that he had no objection to coercive legislation if it was found to be necessary, and providing that it was applied to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects and to all parts of Her Majesty's Dominions. I am quite prepared to admit the force of the logic of the hon. Member; and I presume that if the same causes exist in this part of the Queen's Dominions as exist in that unhappy part of them to which I have the honour to belong, where we have had Boycotting, Moonlighting, assassination, and the Plan of Campaign in full swing, it would be the duty of those who are intrusted with the administration of the law to step in, and say whether this course of procedure was in harmony with the law, and if allowed to continue would be to the advantage of Her Majesty's subjects. [An hon. Member:

How about the riots in Belfast?] I will come to that question by-and-bye. The hon. Gentleman has stated that the policy of coercion would bring Her Majesty's Government to the apex of an inclined plane, and one would imagine that the hon. Member and his Friends would be delighted to see them there, so that they might be able to apply the momentum which would be requisite for precipitating the Government into the chasm below. If the principles of the Plan of Campaign are permitted to pass unchallenged a most grave and serious precedent will be set, which will not only affect the question of the rent payable to the landlords, but will touch ultimately the profits of the trader and every sort of industry and enterprize in Ireland. Apart from the question of the legality of the operation, it is, as far as I can judge, nothing but Socialism; and I hope that Her Majesty's Government will exhibit, in relation to this phase of Irish agitation, carried on in so illegal and arbitrary a manner, the firmness which is required by the conditions of the country. Of the different phases of discontent and agitation which we have seen in Ireland, this Plan of Campaign is only part of the dismal whole. The maiming of cattle, the dynamite explosions of which we are threatened with recurrence, the Phœnix Park assassinations, the attacks upon life and property, and Boycotting, are simply parts of the same movement, and are well recognized as springing from the same source, and all pointing to the same disastrous end. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork has stated that the effect of repressive legislation is merely to drive crime under the surface. But when, some years ago, the hon. Gentleman, with some of his confederates, was imprisoned for a brief season in Kilmainham, the country enjoyed during the period of their incarceration a qualified tranquillity. They were imprisoned on a charge of treason-felony, and they were let out of Kilmainham without an investigation of the grave and serious offences with which they were charged. The hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) and other hon. Members have complained of the constitution of the jury lists; and it appears that in the estimation of hon. Members below the Gangway no jury can possess adequate qualifications for coming to a right and proper decision unless it is composed of men who are under the influence or intimidation of the National League. But the only way in which the law can be properly carried out is by calling upon all jurors to stand aside who are under the power of such intimidation. I have had an opportunity of hearing the grounds on which a Member of the Party led by the hon. Member for Cork relinquished Parliamentary life. That hon. Member told me that he gave up his position as a Member of Parliament, and of the Home Rule Party, because he found that that Party was a conspiracy of blood. [*Laughter from the Home Rule Benches.*] I would ask hon. Members to restrain their laughter for a moment, until they hear the whole of what I have to say. This Gentleman told me that he had relinquished his connection with the Home Rule Party because he had been given to understand that the money collected by a lady in Ireland—a near relative of the hon. Member for Cork—was applied in the payment of those wretches who committed the Phœnix Park murders, and of others who had been guilty of similar deeds. The hon. Member further told me that the feeling of remorse with which that lady reflected upon the application of the money she had industriously collected led to her being immured in a place of privacy. [*Renewed laughter.*] Well, the hon. Gentleman who made this statement to me was as worthy of credence as any hon. Gentleman now sitting below the Gangway opposite. [*Cries of* "Name!"]

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. DE COBAIN: I have no desire that a messenger with a black mask should be sent to the residence of this Gentleman; and therefore I shall decline to give his name. The hon. Member for Cork has told the House that dynamite has been used, that explosions have occurred, and that threats have been uttered that bombs will be thrown from the Strangers' Gallery on to the floor of this House; and, because of these things, the Parliament of the British Empire is to be placed under a feeling of intimidation, and by threats and menaces of this kind prevented from doing its duty to the people. An hon. Member—I think it was the hon. and gallant Member for North Galway (Colonel Nolan)—

who touched, and, I think, accurately, the cause of the agricultural evil when he told us that the distress which exists in so many parts of Ireland is attributable to the small holdings of the people. If the Government and the country would make a searching inquiry into this matter, and if legislation is promoted to remove these small holdings, and to enable those engaged in agriculture to cultivate a larger amount of land, I believe we should deal with what is mainly the vital source of the suffering and privation of the Irish people. My sympathies have always been with the agricultural interest. I have ever been in favour of the tenant farmers, and I have always advocated the recognition of their rights in the soil, and the justice of their being compensated for every shilling of money they have expended in their holdings. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. Morley) charged the Government the other night with not having grasped the situation of affairs in Ireland; but there is very little wonder that the Government cannot immediately grapple with the state of affairs in Ireland. They entered into office under circumstances of unusual complication and difficulty. They were the immediate Successors of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), and the right hon. Gentleman's administration of Irish affairs was not calculated to make easy the task of anyone who succeeded him in such administration. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle says that Chief Baron Palles had charged the Irish Government with weakness. I wonder whether the right hon. Gentleman recollects the circumstances under which Chief Baron Palles made that observation. Was it not to rebuke the indifference and apathy with which the police stood up and allowed the process of the law to be defeated. And then the right hon. Gentleman charges me with writing an incendiary letter on the strength of the Report of a Royal Commission.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-on-Tyne): Will the hon. Gentleman pardon me. I made no charge against him. I simply stated that he had been pointed out by a Commission issued by the Lord Lieutenant for public censure and reprehension.

MR. DE COBAIN: The right hon. Gentleman did not allow me to finish my sentence. What I meant to say was that the Commission was originally composed of three Members appointed by the right hon. Gentleman himself.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: No.

MR. DE COBAIN: I am under the impression that the Commission was originally constituted by the right hon. Gentleman, and that it was composed of three Members, of whom the dominating spirit was a legal gentleman who undertook the defence of the Phœnix Park murderers—Mr. Adams, General Buller, and Mr. Justice Day. That Commission sat at Belfast, and Mr. Adams was practically its presiding genius, though aided and abetted by Mr. Justice Day. They went there to investigate matters affecting the interests of Belfast, and they carried out their inquiry in such a manner as to leave a sense of injury which is still rankling. Under these circumstances I wrote a letter, not one word, or one phrase, or one sentiment of which am I prepared to alter, qualify, or change. I wrote a letter complaining of the insobriety of the police force, and their acts of cruelty and crime; and that letter, as well as some other deliverances of the same kind, acted on the town of Belfast as a sort of escape valve for the feelings of an outraged people who felt placed under a force which was incapable or unwilling of giving them protection. I regard the censure of hon. Gentlemen opposite as a diploma of merit. I never could have met my own constituency with any sense of deserving or enjoyment of their confidence if I had not been met with words of reprobation by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle. That right hon. Gentleman believes that the only policy for Ireland is a policy of Home Rule, or, in other words, that the Legislative and Executive power of the country should be handed over to the element most incapable of carrying out just and fair government. May I take the liberty of saying that, in my opinion, the accession of the right hon. Gentleman to the late Government by no means added to its strength. I think that his abdication of the stool of the pedant for the seat of a Cabinet Minister did not augment the influence of the Party to which he belonged. If he had stuck to the pursuit of penmanship, the right hon. Gentleman might have been more successful.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is dealing very discursively with the Amendment, and his remarks do not appear to be at all relevant.

MR. DE COBAIN: I must apologize, Mr. Speaker, for having deflected somewhat from the merits of the Amendment in order to make a sort of personal rejoinder to the right hon. Gentleman. I have only now to express my belief that in the hands of the present Government, led by the noble Marquess in the other House (the Marquess of Salisbury), and assisted by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), and of that illustrious man of whom every Englishman is justly proud—the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright)—and his brilliant and accomplished Colleague in the representation of that City, the interests of the Empire will be thoroughly safeguarded. No matter how leaden the atmosphere may appear to the right hon. Member for Newcastle, and however fearful he may be as to the future progress of legislation in this House, I believe that the statesmen to whom I have referred will hand down to their successors a supreme Imperial Parliament, together with a stable, progressive, and ever-united Empire.

VISCOUNT KILCOURSIE (Somerset, S.): I rise for the purpose of supporting the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). But, Sir, I am not able to give to the whole of that Amendment an unqualified assent. I can give my entire approval to the second and third portions of it; but I can only give a qualified assent to the first part. The first part of the Amendment represents to Her Majesty that—

> "The relations between the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland have not been seriously disturbed in the cases of those owners who have granted to their tenants such abatements of rents as are called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce."

Now, Sir, I happen to know of cases where the National League has interposed to induce tenants who could afford, and easily afford, to pay their rents, not to do so. But I am bound to say that these have been exceptional cases. In remote districts in the West of Ireland—that portion of Ireland which I have heard described as "Ireland beyond the Pale"—I have known cases where persons, even in those distressed districts, could have paid their rents, and would have paid them, had it not been for the inducements held out to them by the National League not to pay them. In regard to that portion of Ireland to which I refer, I do not think anyone has more thoroughly grasped the condition of the people than Lord Dufferin did in 1880, when he said—

> "That no legislation could touch it; that no alteration in the Land Laws could effectually ameliorate it; and that it must continue until the world's end, unless something be contrived totally to change the conditions of existence in that desolate region."

If I may be allowed to read another quotation from an article written by my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley), it will, I think, show what, in his opinion, at any rate, ought to be the course taken by Her Majesty's Government, with the view of ameliorating the distress in that district. He says—

> "Instead of relief, what a statesman must seek is prevention of this great evil and this strong root of evil; and prevention means a large, though it cannot be a very swift, displacement of the population. But among the many experts with whom I have discussed this dolorous and perplexing subject, I never found one who did not agree that a removal of the surplus population was only practicable if carried out by an Irish authority, backed up by the solid weight of Irish opinion. Any exertion of compulsory power by a British Minister would raise the whole country-side in squalid insurrection, government would become impossible, and the work of transplantation would end in ghastly failure."

Now, I am thoroughly aware of the difficulties in which Her Majesty's Government are placed with regard to Ireland; but may I not ask them, in spite of the mandate which their supporters received from the constituencies, whether they could not have done something to ameliorate the condition of the people living in these portions of Ireland? Would it have been impossible for them to have entered into some negotiations with hon. Members who represent popular opinion in Ireland; and would it have been in vain to have attempted, at all events, to do something to relieve the dreadful distress in the West of Ireland? I am sorry to say that nothing of the sort has been done. I admit that, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, it may be stated that there are great difficulties in the way. I acknowledge those great difficulties. I may be told that there are difficulties in treating with hon. Members whose speeches in Ireland have not, on every occasion, corresponded with their speeches in this House. And in so far as their speeches in Ireland have not corresponded with their speeches here—in so far as their speeches delivered in Ireland have had an illegal complexion, I, at least, cannot be accused of having been indifferent to them, because, both in the public Press and in public speeches, I have in unmeasured terms condemned the speeches which have been delivered by hon. Members from Ireland. But while I have condemned those speeches I could not forget, for a single moment, the circumstances in which those hon. Gentlemen were placed. I trust that in my future career, as in the past, I shall always endeavour to use such moderation of language as may commend itself to the hearers I have the honour to address. But if, in the constituency I represent, there had been 600 evictions from one property alone, I should have been very sorry indeed to answer for the language that I might have used. But, Sir, I will go one step further, and say this—that if I have denounced in unmeasured terms what I have considered to be the immoderate language made use of in Ireland, I may ask whether there have not been speeches, on the other hand, from hon. Members from Ireland in this House which have been moderation itself, especially those which have been delivered by the Leaders who sit below the Gangway? No more moderate utterances have ever been delivered in this House than those which proceeded from the hon. Member for Cork when he introduced his not unreasonable Bill in the autumn. Nor could there have been a more moderate speech than that which was made by the same hon. Member the other day in this House in moving his Amendment. And if immoderate speeches have been made by irresponsible persons, I cannot forget the position in which they find themselves placed. I should like to know what the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland and the Lord Advocate have been about for the last three or four weeks? Have they not been consulting with the Scotch Members as to the best legislation to be carried out for Scotland? Has there been any reciprocal feeling with regard to Ireland? In my opinion, a want of responsibility is the only reason for the unreasonable and immoderate speeches which have been delivered. Hon. and right hon. Members opposite will themselves remember that there have been times when they did not occupy quite such a responsible position as that in which they find themselves placed today, and on those occasions they have indulged in language which has probably been less marked by moderation than that which they use to-day. I would ask whether, if responsibility were given to hon. Members below the Gangway, it would not have the same effect upon them? With regard to the Plan of Campaign, I fully endorse what has fallen from the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) this evening as to the attitude of Her Majesty's Government in reference to it. If the Plan of Campaign is illegal, it is unquestionably the duty of Her Majesty's Government to suppress illegality; but may I not, at the same moment, remind them of what occurred in this country with regard to Church Rates? Why, Sir, that which was then illegal has now become legal, because the popular feeling in this country was against Church Rates, or, rather, against the compulsory payment of Church Rates. Popular feeling in Ireland, I trust, is not entirely in favour of the Plan of Campaign; but popular feeling in Ireland is distinctly in favour of the objects of those who are carrying out the Plan of Campaign. With reference to the last portion of the Amendment to the Address—that portion in which the hon. Member says he considers that—

> "Such a reform of the Law and the system of Government in Ireland should take place as would satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people,"

I entirely concur with the view of the hon. Member; and I may remark, in passing, that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), in a recent speech, has expressed a hope that Members of both Parties might unite in order to secure the confidence of the Irish people and to satisfy their needs. For my own part, I fear that if I have ever indulged in such a hope, it has been during that portion of the 24 hours which are devoted to dreamland; but I do look forward, and I look forward with hope, to the re-union of the Liberal Party, which, I believe, can alone satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people. There are various methods which have been attempted to be adopted by different persons in order to bring about the union of the Liberal Party, for the purpose of securing the objects which are mentioned in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork. There has been a remarkable attempt made in this direction by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), who has endeavoured to gain over as many persons as possible to his method of reasoning, in order that he and his Friends may be able to satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people. But he has spread his net in a somewhat remarkable manner. We are told that it is in vain to spread a net within sight of the bird we wish to bring into it; but the hon. Member has not spread his net at all; on the contrary, he has planted it and framed it so as to form an attraction, as he supposes, for the birds outside, such as the right hon. the Member for West Birmingham, and he has armed himself with the blunderbuss of caricature and a rifle of wit and sarcasm to attract them. I presume that the hon. Member is astonished that so few persons will adopt his view; and when he finds how few, I hope he will be induced to reconsider the method he has hitherto adopted. I rejoice to think that the question to-day is not the same as it was last June and July. The question in June and July last was whether or not it was safe to concede Home Rule in any shape to Ireland in consequence of the demands of hon. Members from Ireland. But the question of to-day is, I believe, among thinking minds, simply and solely how, when, and under what circumstances, it will be safe to grant such a reform of the law, to use the exact words of the Amendment, and such a system of Government as will satisfy the needs, and will secure the confidence of the Irish people. That, Sir, is the great question we have now to consider. My humble efforts have always been directed towards the attainment of that end; and however long my life may be spared, I shall certainly never rest until, to use once more the expression contained in this Amendment, the needs of the Irish people have been fully, fairly, honestly, and safely satisfied.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, S.E.): I think that, as a novice within the walls of this House, I may be allowed, in the interests of my constituents, to say a few words with regard to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). The hon. Member has been congratulated on his recovery from a recent illness. Although we are all glad to see the hon. Member sufficiently recovered to be able to attend to his Parliamentary duties, I think he ought also to be felicitated on the remarkable fact that his temporary retirement from public life, occurring as it did during the last few months, has been a very timely and useful one, because it has enabled him to keep aloof from the Plan of Campaign, and to give to this House an entirely colourless view of his ideas. He has allowed the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) to come to the front and take the most active part in the Plan of Campaign, and by that means he has himself been prevented from coming into personal collision either with Her Majesty's Government or the late Prime Minister. I, therefore, think that I am entitled to congratulate him on his temporary retirement. So far as the Plan of Campaign itself is concerned, it has been described by an hon. Member opposite as extra-legal, and it has also been described by the noble Lord at the head of Her Majesty's Government as organized embezzlement. Whatever it is, there can be no doubt that if the Bill for the better Government of Ireland should ever pass, the Plan of Campaign will be applied to every trade and every industry in Ireland. I can quite understand the affection entertained for the Plan of Campaign by hon. Members opposite who represent Irish constituencies, because I cannot conceive many more delightful occupations than sitting as self-constituted and irresponsible agents at a table, whether round or square, collecting the landlords' rents, and very little of it, I am afraid, has been handed over to the legitimate owner. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] At any rate, that is my opinion. The hon. Member for Cork spoke of a threat, or rather a menace, of dynamite. Hon. Members here possibly do not know what that menace of dynamite was to which the hon. Member alluded. I think I can tell them. In the year 1885 a man named Daly was commissioned to go into the Strangers' Gallery of this House and throw a dynamite shell, which was to explode upon the Table beneath me and between the two Front Benches; and the only reason why it was not thrown was that it might have inflicted some trouble upon the man who threw it, and those who gave the order for the commission of that outrage, as well as Her Majesty's Government. The hon. Member for Cork says in his Amendment that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish affairs is to be found in such a reform of the law and system of Government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people. Now, I do not think that it is to be obtained by rhetorical flourishes, to be followed up by outrages and crime. I allude particularly to the speech delivered by the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner), some days ago, at a meeting of the National League in Cork. In the course of that speech the hon. Member said that a resolution had been carried warning the women of the district from engaging in the abominable and unnatural crime of conversing with members of the Royal Irish Constabulary. The local branch of the Irish National League intimated in their resolution that conduct of that kind would be taken notice of.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid): I rise to Order. Perhaps the hon. and gallant Gentleman has an accurate report of my speech. He does not appear to have seen that the statement he refers to has been denied by the Secretary of the local branch of the National League, who asserts that no such resolution was brought before the League or passed.

MAJOR RASCH: If I am wrong I beg to withdraw the statement. All I have to say is, that it was reported in the newspapers that the local branch of the National League had intimated that any woman seen speaking to members of the Royal Irish Constabulary would be followed, and their conduct taken notice of. [*Cries of* "No!"] Hon. Members opposite will not deny that on Monday last an outrage was committed at the house of an Irishman — a National Leaguer — named Murphy, whose two daughters were dragged out of bed, their hair cut off, and they themselves covered with pitch. I would ask hon. Members opposite whether they consider that measures for amending the criminal procedure of Ireland in regard to such cases are wrong, or whether such a measure would be novel, doubtful, and un-Constitutional?

MR. LACAITA (Dundee): After the great discussion that took place yesterday, and the day before, on the subject of the Plan of Campaign, and, above all, after the strictures which have been made on the wording of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) this evening by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), it is incumbent upon everyone who, like myself, intends to vote for that Amendment to explain pretty clearly the reason why he is doing so. Although the wording of the Amendment may be in some respects vague, it does raise indirectly, if not directly, and has throughout this debate been treated as raising, two distinct questions—a question as to whether the Government are justified in the course they have adopted towards the Plan of Campaign in Ireland, and a further question as to whether the whole Irish Question ought not to be solved in a manner which amounts to Home Rule? If we vote against this Amendment, we very clearly declare that we think the proposals of the Government for dealing with the present troubles in Ireland are better ones than the suggestion contained in the closing words of the Amendment itself. If we vote in favour of the Amendment without explaining our reasons we shall certainly be considered to have altogether blessed the Plan of Campaign, as has already been done by many hon. Members on this side of the House. Now, it is quite clear that the main question about the Plan of Campaign is not its legality or illegality in the narrow sense of the word, but its political aspect. I have listened to long legal arguments on both sides in regard to its legality. I have heard the hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Coleridge) argue more subtly than conclusively that the Plan of Campaign was only to do what Judges, juries, and witnesses had done in this country before. I have heard also the hon. Member for Crewe (Mr. M'Laren) explain that the campaigners are only acting on the same principles as the members of his persuasion—the Quakers. When it can be proved that Irish tenants and their friends are losers in their property by their devotion to the Plan of Campaign then will their case be on all-fours with the case of the Quakers, and not until then. But I do not propose to speak solely on that narrow legal question. A further question has been raised in this House of the morality of the Plan of Campaign. When there is a dispute on the subject of the morality of a particular course of action it is somewhat dangerous ground to tread; and the chief argument I have heard in support of the morality of the Plan is that it is only exactly the same course which is adopted by Trades' Unions in this country—that it is neither more nor less than the defence by the tenants of their case by the method of a strike. I think the cases are very clearly distinguished in many ways. I shall only mention one distinction, and it is this. A strike often is answered in this country by a lock-out on the part of the employers. That lock-out may be successful, or it may fail. The employers may bring the workmen to their terms, or they may give in to the terms of the workmen; but if the thing be pressed to the last extremity, the employers always have it in their power to withdraw from the undertaking in which they are engaged, and if they do so withdraw, the plant and the capital which they have employed do not thereby either become the property of the workmen or benefit them in any way whatever. Now, if the Plan of Campaign were pushed to such an extremity as to make the landlords of Ireland prefer to leave their estates altogether, I think it is very clear that the tenants would benefit by that of which the landlords were deprived. I am not going to say whether that is a desirable end or not. I merely point out this one very clear distinction between an ordinary strike in this country and the Plan that has been adopted in Ireland. Strikes now generally lead to a solution by means of arbitration, the arbitrator being usually some person who has the confidence of both parties. What hon. Member, representing a Nationalist constituency in Ireland, is going to have the confidence of both Parties on this question? What is the really weak part of the Plan of Campaign? It is that the judges of what is a fair and necessary reduction of rent are not a Judicial Court appointed in consequence of legislation and on the authority of this House, but are either the tenants themselves or their advocates and partizans. I am not accusing hon. Gentlemen who sit below the Gangway of acting with the slightest unfairness in the matter. I feel it is extremely difficult for hon. Members of this House who are not Irishmen to form anything like a judicial decision as to the right or wrong of any particular suggested abatement of rent in Ireland. There is abundance of evidence from hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway on this side of the House—there is abundance from Gentlemen of an Orange colour on the other side—but we have not got it in our power to sift that evidence. The evidence is not given on oath, and there is no power of cross-examination. Of course, the only way in which hon. Members who sit for English or Scotch constituencies can really attempt to understand these details of the Irish Question is by themselves going over to Ireland, but when they go over there it is very obvious with what object they go. They go there to investigate this subject, and their conclusions, I venture to say, will in every case be determined by the fact of their either being the guests of hospitable landlords belonging to the persuasion of hon. Gentlemen opposite, or being personally conducted by some Nationalist Member from below the Gangway. I confess that in my own case I could not resist the fascination of any Irishman of whatever political colour. The difficulty in which we find ourselves is one of the stock arguments for Home Rule, and to me it is really a very strong and persuasive one. Most of the questions touching Ireland on which we are called to vote in this House are not great questions of principle, but they are endless questions of detail regarding the action of the Executive in some particular case, or regarding the action of landlords or tenants in some particular district in Ireland; and I feel that it is quite impossible to attain to anything like a serious conviction as to the rights and wrongs of each particular case as it arises. We have certainly hitherto heard the Plan of Campaign either altogether blessed or utterly cursed by hon. Members who have taken part in this debate. I have even heard it argued by the hon. Member for one of the Divisions of Edinburgh (Mr. Wallace) that the Plan, if not legal, ought to be made legal. I hardly think that even hon. Members who sit below the Gangway would propose a Bill in this House by which the Plan of Campaign in its present form should be made part of the law of the land. There is only one sense in which it could be made legal, and that is by extending the powers of the Land Courts which already exist, or by the establishing, if necessary, of new Courts with further powers, when they think fit from the evidence given, to reduce rents. This is a very different thing from making hon. Gentlemen and their friends in Ireland, who are undoubtedly and rightly strong partizans in all Irish questions, the real Court to decide as to whether in every particular case a tenant is able to pay or unable to pay, or as to the amount of abatement which should be granted. It is a weapon which, if used on a wider scale, would become a weapon so powerful, and one to use which the temptation would be so great, from the influence that it necessarily adds to influence already possessed by hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway, that unless there be Home Rule granted to Ireland, it seems to me perfectly clear that no Government can allow its use. [An hon. MEMBER: It is legal.] The question as to whether it is legal or not is the question for the Courts of Law. There is no matter in which this House more easily goes astray than in attempting to decide on questions of technical legality or illegality. I will only refer to the case of the hon. Gentleman who now sits for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh) to show how far astray this House may go when it attempts to decide on what is and what is not the law. But I return to the point that hon. Members who sit below the Gangway are hardly an adequate tribunal to decide how far the Plan of Campaign should be extended and exactly what abatement of rent should be granted by landlords. I admit and agree with the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington when he said that the Plan of Campaign had not been very widely put into execution. Its importance so far has been considerably exaggerated, and I believe that, if confined within the present limits, it is at at any rate tolerable; but its further extension is politically impossible, because it must necessarily lead to the ousting of the Government of the day by the hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway and other hon. Members of the National League in Ireland. That may be a very desirable result, but it is a result which should be obtained with the consent of Great Britain and by the action of this House. I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. John Morley) and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, whether they consider Nationalist Members for Ireland are the right tribunal to whom questions of the amount of abatement of rent should be referred. I think my question is answered when I refer to the fact that those right hon. Gentlemen introduced concurrently with the Home Rule Bill, a Bill for settling the Irish Land Question. I do not think it is necessary that we should go as far as these right hon. Gentlemen seemed to have gone in their doubt of the propriety of leaving the Land Question to be settled by Irishmen themselves; because, supposing such a Legislative Body as was then proposed to be established in Ireland, there would be a minority representation in that Body of Gentlemen who now sit opposite; and a House so formed would be representative of Irish opinion as a whole, and would be a proper body to deal with the Irish Land Question, and with the adequacy or inadequacy of abatements in accordance with general Irish opinion as a whole. Now, it seems to me that the right hon. Gentleman to whom I last referred is thoroughly sensible to that difficulty, and we can, therefore, quite understand why, when he came down the other night to this House and was called on by daily newspapers and by hon. Gentlemen who sit opposite to curse the Plan of Campaign, he did not see his way to play the part of Balaam, and, therefore, I shall leave it to other hon. Members of this House to play the part of Balaam's ass. But if the Plan of Campaign cannot be allowed by any British Government which is responsible for the state of Ireland to develop itself in any great degree, it does not at all follow that we can endorse the proposal of Her Majesty's Government as contained in the Queen's Speech. How do they propose to deal with this difficulty in Ireland? They propose to deal with it by a reform of legal procedure. By that reform they think they can crush out this movement. Really that proposal of theirs is not directed at outrages, because they themselves admit there are fewer outrages in Ireland than there were a year ago. There is no such state of things in Ireland as calls for any extension of the power of the Criminal Law to deal with outrages. Outrages I believe to be deplored by every Party in this House—not by hon. Gentlemen opposite alone, but by the Nationalist Members for Ireland themselves. And if they have not always in clear and strong terms condemned outrages, I believe they, as we do, in their hearts deplore them. I would remind hon. Gentlemen that in times of revolution—and it is impossible to disguise the fact that these are times of revolution in Ireland—no Party has ever been found in any country to do the full extent of its duty by denouncing those deplorable acts which may indirectly have conduced to its own interest. I will only quote the well-known instance of the struggle for Italian independence, and ask hon. Gentlemen whether they do not well remember that it was impossible to obtain a condemnation of the Orsini plot and other like deeds by the Mazzinian party; and that after independence had been obtained the reactionary Party winked at and covertly assisted a system of brigandage which involved horrors before which the worst cases of outrage in Ireland are as nothing. It does not follow that because hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway had not made up their minds to the strong condemnation which it was their duty to utter of brutal and gross outrages, which struck not at the political system which they wished to attack, but at innocent and poor tenants themselves—it does not follow that they were not absolutely bound in duty to do so, and that we should not be equally bound. But this proposal for the Amendment of the Criminal Law is not aimed at outrage. It is aimed at the political and social state in Ireland, and therefore we are entitled to vote for the Amendment, even while we cannot endorse the policy of the Plan of Campaign. I am not going to dispute the possibilities of restoring order and quiet in Ireland by the plan known as "Thorough"—by measures of strong coercion—but I venture to deny the practicability of that method, not the physical or moral impossibility, as the history of Europe, not to say of the world, shows, but its impracticability, owing to the character and opinion of the great body of the electors of Great Britain. It is impossible for any man to persuade them to take those measures which would really be necessary in order to produce the results desired by hon. Gentlemen opposite. You may repeat the Coercion Acts you have had before. You may make them more stringent; but make them as stringent as you will, and you will not crush out the free expression of the opinion of Ireland. We have all heard it suggested that an Empire may be of adamant, but that a free Press will grind it to powder. Now, in Ireland you have a free Press, and I have yet to learn that the foundations of Dublin Castle are of adamant. You have to do something more than keep Ireland quiet and orderly for 20 years. You have to ensure that a new generation will grow up loyal to the connection with Great Britain. Therefore you would need to take inquisitorial measures in connection with the instructions given in Irish schools and with the whole body of Irish youth. It may be that something of the kind might have been possible had the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland in past days been made to depend upon the State for support; but the possibility of that has passed away. And even if you were to win the Roman Catholic clergy to your side you would not produce the effect you desire, for I believe the hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway will allow me to remark that the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland have almost ceased to be Roman Catholic, and have almost become Irish Catholic. Therefore I do not believe that the Plan of Coercion can possibly produce the results which we all desire to see in Ireland. There is a second Plan—that of some of the Radical section of the Liberal Unionists. That is the settlement of the agrarian question without in any way satisfying the political aspirations of the people of Ireland. I admit it might be possible to settle the question by such a complete confiscation of landlords' interests as would remove the basis for any agitation in favour of political autonomy for that country; but that would be open to the same objection—that for this possible scheme it would be as impossible to find support in the constituencies of Great Britain as it would to find support for a thoroughgoing system of dealing with Ireland by a high hand. Therefore I cannot but think that the position of the Liberal Unionist and Radical Members, who, as the Member for Gloucester (Mr. Winterbotham) tells us, will under no circumstances approve of coercive measures, and yet will not give any vote which will fulfil the political desire of the Irish people, is an untenable one. If the House will allow me to continue the metaphor which the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington tossed at his late Colleagues before he left the country, I should say that in driving a high-mettled horse they have thrown the reins on his neck, and have flung away whip and spur, and then they have hallooed it in terms only heard from a Spanish muleteer. The position held by these hon. Gentlemen leads me to hope that with the adoption of more conciliatory language than we hear, especially from the hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Northampton, they may be induced to accept such a measure of Home Rule as will really satisfy the aspirations of the Irish people themselves, whilst being acceptable to the great majority of the Members and the Liberal Party throughout Great Britain. I do not think the way to ensure that result is continually to taunt those hon. Gentlemen who have thought it their duty to vote against the late measure introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian; but without attempting any compromise, without giving up any of the points that were settled at the Leeds Conference, to treat them in the most friendly way, and to induce them gradually to return to the great body of the Liberal Party, which they left hurriedly perhaps, but conscientiously. Now, I am glad to think that whilst I have been obliged to refuse assent to the Plan of Campaign, that does not involve the necessity of expressing no sympathy with the tenants of Glenbeigh. It has been conceded on both sides of this House that the Glenbeigh Question is not involved in that of the Plan of Campaign. I believe the measure proposed by the hon. Member for Cork last Session would not have dealt with the people of Glenbeigh. I agree with the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (The Marquess of Hartington) that if you remove landlords altogether the question of the congested districts of the West of Ireland would still remain, and some scheme of migration or emigration is the only way to remove them from their present miserable plight. But I hold this to be another argument in favour of Home Rule. What raises the great difficulty in the way of the acceptance by the Irish people of a scheme of emigration now? It is that it is proposed by those whom they do not believe to be their friends, and that their schemes are nearly always opposed by the men in whom they put trust and confidence. Grant Home Rule, and then I say hon. Members below the Gangway, having become Members of a Legislative Body for Ireland, will be prepared to adopt such reasonable measures of migration and emigration as may be necessary to meet the facts of the case, and that without the slightest suspicion of it being hostile to the interests of these poor tenants. The difficulty now existing, of making local bodies or any bodies that may be constituted work together with the Imperial Government, will then be removed. The very fact of local authorities needing to apply to Government in the way of receiving loans, or putting them in communication with the Colonies and other countries to which they may wish to emigrate, would in itself be a guarantee—not a paper guarantee—but one of the material guarantees that under a local Legislature the affairs of Ireland would be wisely conducted.

Mr. SMITH-BARRY (Hunts, S.) said, that, as one of the few Irish landlords who had a seat in the House, he should like to say a few words on the question before them. He did not propose to argue as to the legality or illegality of the Plan of Campaign; he would only observe that it was enough for him to know that the great majority of those who had considered the matter from a legal point of view deemed it an illegal combination, and those who had studied the Ten Commandments deemed it an immoral one. ["No, no!"] He proposed, with the permission of the House, to say a few words with regard to the application of the Plan, and to give a few instances of the terms offered by landlords in the South of Ireland against whom that Plan had been put into operation. They had been challenged by hon. Gentlemen opposite to deny that the Plan of Campaign had been applied only to estates on which the landlords had declined to deal justly with their tenants. He hoped to be able to show that that statement was absolutely incorrect, and must be allowed to express his disapproval of the manner in which certain Irish Members had interfered with tenants to prevent them paying rents even in a considerably reduced form. He would take, first of all, the case of the Ponsonby estate, which was one of the first to which the Plan of Campaign was applied. The hon. Member who spoke the other night (Mr. Lane) said that it was only brought into operation against absentee landlords, or mainly so; and he had been good enough to state that the majority of the County Cork landlords had acted with justness and fairness; and the hon. Gentleman did him the honour to single him out as one who had given reasonable reductions, and against whom it was unnecessary to proceed with the Plan of Campaign. In the Ponsonby case, the tenants demanded 25 per cent on judicial rents and 35 per cent on non-judicial. They were offered 10 per cent on judicial and 20 per cent on non-judicial rents; and the landlord himself told him (Mr. Smith-Barry) that he had given instructions to his agent to make exceptional allowances in exceptional cases. If these instructions never reached the tenants of the estate, it was because hon. Members stepped in so hastily, so anxious were they to try this new weapon—["No, no!"]—that they never allowed time to see whether Mr. Ponsonby or his agent was prepared to act generously or not. On Lady Kingston's estate, the tenants had been offered a reduction of from 10 to 20 per cent on a sliding scale; but they had demanded a general reduction of 20 per cent, and because their demands were not acceded to the Plan of Campaign was put into operation, and threatening notices were posted all over the estate. Beyond that, the people were summoned to attend meetings in the South of Ireland, and to resist what was called landlord tyranny by adopting the Plan of Campaign. Bills were circulated headed "Boycott, boycott, boycott," showing that boycotting was not yet done away with. In the case of Mr. Leader's estate the tenants had been dealt with with peculiar liberality, an abatement of 12½ per cent which was given in famine time of 1849 being continued to the present day; but the tenants had insisted upon a reduction of 25 per cent upon the judicial rents, and in default of the landlord, who resided upon the estate, accepting their terms, the Plan of Campaign was adopted. In the case of the O'Grady estate, in County Limerick, which had formerly produced £2,000 per annum, the rental of the estate had been reduced, by a valuer appointed by the tenants themselves, to £1,712. Mr. O'Grady was not an Englishman, and he was not an absentee. His land was the best in Ireland, and yet upon this estate occurred the case of the celebrated Moroney, who had been sent to gaol for contempt of the Court of Bankruptcy. The Poor Law valuation of Moroney's land was £73, and yet his rent was only £63 15*s*., upon which his landlord offered him an abatement of 25 per cent, which was refused, and the Plan of Campaign was put into operation. These figures showed that the statement of hon. Members opposite that the Plan of Campaign was only put into operation in cases where the tenants had been unable to obtain fair reductions, was inaccurate. The fact was that the Plan was adopted only against the weak, and only in those cases where victory was tolerably certain. Out of the four cases he had mentioned one of the landlords lived some distance from his estates, and was not able consequently to make arrangements with his tenants in time, although, in previous years, he had granted considerable reductions; and in two other instances ladies were the victims, probably because they were not so likely to resist as well as men. The Plan of Campaign was, in reality, adopted not to obtain justice for the tenants, but because it offered a means of attacking landlords as such. It was part of a scheme to bring landlords to their knees, and to drive them from the country, as the Parnellite Members knew well that, with all their faults and weaknesses, they were still looked upon as an important factor in the country, and as a considerable obstacle to the repeal of the Union.

MR. STOREY (Sunderland): I have listened with much pleasure—and it is always a pleasure for me to do so—to the speech of a high-minded Irish landlord, noted in his district for strict honesty and uprightness towards his tenants, and am able to agree with a great deal of what the hon. Member for South Hunts (Mr. Smith-Barry) said. But there was, however, a final remark he made which struck me as rather going beyond the fact. He said that this Plan of Campaign was an attack on the Irish landlords "as such." Now, may I ask the hon. Member where he has been attacked in that manner? No attack has been made upon him, because in his personal relations with his tenants he has remembered not only what was due to himself, but what was due to them. He complained of hon. Members for Ireland because they are active. I wish I were not able to return the compliment to him, and I warn him that in his personal relations with his tenants he may do well, but as President of the Patriotic League—or whatever it is called in Cork, he knows, and no man knows better, that he has, as President, supported the actions of men, which actions, individually, he would scorn to commit. Sir, I am sensible of the kindness of the House in permitting me to speak at all on this subject, and I promise the House not to speak at any great length, and to address myself immediately to the Question before us. The noble Marquess who spoke earlier in the Debate (the Marquess of Hartington) made a challenge not only to right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench, but also to the Liberal and Radical Members in this House, to pronounce their opinions upon the Plan of Campaign. I feel that I need have no hesitation in accepting the challenge of the noble Marquess, being a Home Ruler when it was not a fashionable thing to be one. I was one of the five English Members to stand up in support of Home Rule when it was not supported as it is now, and I shall accept the challenge, and as an English Member and a Home Ruler, I say what I think of the Plan of Campaign. Now, Sir, I may say in a word that I should be in favour of the Plan of Campaign, if it were not that I have an old-fashioned prejudice in favour of the Ten Commandments ["Hear, hear!"] Very strange doctrines and strange declarations have been indulged in during the present debate from this side of the House. I listened the other night to a right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Shaw-Lefevre) who was selected to occupy a distinguished position in the late Government. He told us that he doubted the expediency of resorting to repressive legislation before remedial measures were introduced. The right hon. Gentleman referred to the present difficulty of the Irish landlords; and he said that Lord Dillon, and persons of that type, ought to be thankful and grateful that they had been permitted to receive 80 per cent of their rents. ["Hear, hear!"] That was a specimen of the opinions of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Central Bradford, who had filled the Office of Postmaster General. Well, Sir, I listened with amazement to such a speech coming from the right hon. Gentleman, because five years before I heard him make a precisely opposite speech; and I comforted myself with this conclusion—that if I live for another five years, and circumstances should alter again, I might happen to hear the original speech from the original man. Well, I have heard also the opinion of my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Mr. John Morley) upon the Plan of Campaign—or, rather, I have not heard his opinion. I do not wish to indulge in more criticism of my right hon. Friend than the occasion demands, because, if I understand matters aright, if there is a man who has a difficult position to maintain at the present time it is my right hon. Friend. When I heard and read the speech of my right hon. Friend it put me in mind of what has happened to me, when I go away from this House and indulge in a little fishing—if the House cares to take an interest in the matter. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman seemed to remind me of my position on a sunny morning, when I went fishing—when I did not know whether to put on a fly or put on a worm. [*Loud laughter.*] Well, Mr. Speaker, we are yet to hear, I hope, a more authoritative deliverance from the Front Bench of the Liberal Opposition. If it be a fact, which I hear to-night, that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian is not to take part in this debate before its close, I shall deplore it very much; for if the right hon. Gentleman were here, and he for once listened to my words, I should venture to say that he should take and express a larger view of this question than is bounded by the exigencies of the present. We should, on this side, beware of the inclined plane spoken of in connection with the French Revolution—it is easy, once you get on it, to slide into disorder and anarchy. Connivance at evil brings after it a subjection to evil; and if the late Prime Minister were here I would have him say once, and once for all, and so affirm an old Radical principle—that what is morally wrong cannot be politically right. We have had strange declarations and strange expressions of opinion from this side of the House. My hon. Friend—who, I may almost say, ought to be right hon.—the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) has said, in his lordly way, that the action under the Plan of Campaign was exactly like the action of trades unionism in this country, and another hon. Gentleman has expressed strange doctrines—I mean the hon. Member who defeated the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Edinburgh (Mr. Wallace), and so got him returned for St. George's, Hanover Square, in a constituency, I understand, where there is not a single Board School; and this may explain the action of the constituency yesterday. Well, this hon. Member for Edinburgh, who is a clergyman—[*Cries of* "No!" *and* "A lawyer!"]—oh, he was once a clergyman; and we know it is said, Once a priest always a priest. The hon. Gentleman represents a Scotch constituency, he is a Scotchman, and he has expressed moral views calculated to make the bones of John Knox turn in their coffin. I entirely repudiate that statement; and I feel anxious to do so—the statement made by the hon. Member for Northampton, that the Plan of Campaign is nothing more nor less than the application of the principle of the English Trades Unions. I cannot think that the hon. Member for Northampton could have spoken with anything like accurate knowledge of English trades unions and what they do. English working men combine, and they do well to combine; Irish tenants combine, and they also do well; English workmen assist each other—those that require help receiving it, and thereby they do well. The Irish tenants who are better off ought to help those who are worse off. [*Cries of* "They do."] Yes; but they ought to do it out of their own pockets. They do, says an hon. Member; well, let me argue the point. Here is a tenant who has contracted to pay a rent, and he cannot pay it. There can be no moral obligation to pay if he cannot. With his inability expires the moral obligation until he is able. But there is another tenant who says he can pay, and that he ought to pay, 80 per cent, and there is another tenant who says, "I can pay all." I heard my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), in this House the other night, and I have heard others say, that there were tenants who could pay and who did not pay, and the hon. Member said he advised them not to pay. I would not speak in the language of passion or as a politician on that matter—I would speak seriously, as a man to men who know how the fabric of society is built up and how it is destroyed. I would say to you that if you once admit the contention that a man may refuse his legal obligations when he admits they are just—["No, no!"] Ah, but that is the point. ["Oh, oh!"] I challenge my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo—I will take my answer from him. When he said in this House the other night that he advised tenants who could pay not to pay, did he mean only those who had unjust rents? [Mr. DILLON: Most certainly.] Then, if I can pay, and I have made the bargain honestly—[An hon. MEMBER: There is no contract.] There is no contract; well, let me examine that point before the other. There was no contract. They say the Court made the contract. Well, but did not the two parties accept the contract? ["Oh, oh!"] I say they did. But let us examine the other side of the contract. It appears that the contract, being made by the Court, and in fact accepted by the landlord and the tenant, things have turned out badly for the tenant. Suppose the opposite had happened, or suppose some catastrophe had swept away the corn lands of America and India. [Oh, oh!"] I dare say I am putting the case more strongly than it need be put. Well, let my Friends be patient with me. Many a time they have cheered me. I say that, suppose from some circumstance the fact turned out the other way. Suppose that after the contract was made the price of agricultural produce had gone up, and as a consequence the tenants had got much more for the sale of their produce than ever they had expected—would those hon. Gentlemen have admitted the right of the landlord to take the higher profit the tenant had made under the contract? If they would not, how can they maintain the opposite? But I return to the point I was on. As I understand the Plan of Campaign—and I know I understand it—it is in Ireland not merely tenants who could not pay, not merely tenants who are rack-rented, but tenants who could pay, who are advised not to pay. ["No, no!"] Well, at any rate, that is my proposition. I say, according to my understanding and my reading, tenants who could pay all or who could pay part have not paid, and have been sustained in not paying, in order to help their brothers. If the tenants who could pay had paid their rents, and had subscribed out of their own pockets to help their brethren, that would have been on an equality with trades unionism. The argument of the hon. Member for Edinburgh amounted to this, that if the Plan of Campaign was not legal, it ought to be made legal, and that if it was not moral it ought to be moral, and he complained that in England trade unionists might do what they were not allowed to do in Ireland. No trade union I was ever connected with, or ever heard of, proceeded to combine without first of all fulfilling its legal obligations. ["Oh, oh!"] If the shipwrights of Sunderland strike, this is what they do first: they work out their legal notice, they fulfil their legal obligations; and if they do not, the English law steps in and makes them. And I say that until Irishmen put themselves in that position they cannot say they are on an equality with trades unions in England. I have come deliberately to the conclusion that what my hon. Friends from Ireland have suggested under the stress of circumstances may be legal or not, I cannot tell; that it must be left to a Court and a jury, and I for one say that a very different Court and a very different jury from what you propose on Monday will be necessary to satisfy me; but that it is morally wrong I cannot for a moment, in my innermost conscience, doubt. And I say it is the business of Radicals, who have always preached the doctrine that political right should be founded on moral right, to stand up here and tell the Front Bench that if they want to win the Home Rule fight—and they did not lose by many last time—they must take account of the existence in every constituency in England of a large amount of public opinion, of Dissenters and Churchmen both, who really do believe in the Ten Commandments, and who want them given effect to in political as well as in daily life. [*Cheers.*] I am much obliged to my hon. Friends for having cheered the sentiments I have expressed, and I proceed now for a few minutes to test whether they cheered me because they accepted my statement as a fair statement, or whether they cheered me because they were delighted that a Radical should say something unpleasant about his own Leaders. [*Laughter and* "Hear, hear!"] If the latter, I cannot pretend to contend with them; but, if the former—if they really cheered me because they thought I was expressing my conviction and the truth, I ask them to permit me for five minutes to say to them, as Englishmen of perfectly independent character and without reference to the effect it may have on the success of Tories or of Liberals, what may fairly be said in behalf or in extenuation of the Plan of Campaign. In the first place, hon. Gentlemen opposite must admit that the Plan of Campaign has been practically successful. [*Laughter.*] Aye; I do not laugh at the silence of hon. Members opposite, because, in their inmost souls, I know that they rejoice, as I do, that in some way or other evictions have been prevented to a large extent in Ireland this winter. The noble Marquess, in order to prove that he did quite right to reject the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) last Session, plumed himself upon the fact that things had been quiet in Ireland, that evictions had not been numerous, and that there had been very few offences against the law. But how much has that quietness been due to the action of the Front Bench opposite, and their pressure on the Irish landlords, and how much of their action—their most extraordinary action—was due to emulation of hon. Members near me and the Plan of Campaign? This, too, may be said for the Plan of Campaign that, the evils of Ireland being admitted, if the Parliament does not act, and will not act, some one must. The noble Marquess admitted to-night that our legislation was behindhand. Everyone who writes on the point admits that our legislation always has been too late, and that, owing to the House along the corridor, it has never been complete. The world cannot stand still. Irishmen cannot see their friends die, or be turned out of their holdings, till a Tory Government makes up its mind. I told the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Mayo that I disapproved of the Plan of Campaign; but I have got this to say—that if I were an Irishman, living in Ireland, and seeing these poor people turned out on the hill-side, from homes which are as much theirs as their landlord's—I say, if I were an Irishman so circumstanced, it would go very hard with me. I should feel, perhaps, like the hon. Member for East Mayo, that I would strain a point under the circumstances. ["Hear, hear!"] I do not, however, say I would do it. We all know that everybody does break some of the Ten Commandments now and then, and I venture to think that there are a good many Gentlemen sitting on that side of the House—for I have admired the amiable characteristics their faces display—there are, I say, a great many Gentlemen on the opposite side who, if they had seen these deeds done, would have felt very much disposed, like the Irish Members, to go with their people, and put an end to this state of things with a high hand. Moreover, if the Irish tenants are now stealing, and if the hon. Member for East Mayo, whose nobility of character is recognized by every man in this House, whether he agrees with him or not, if he is to stand forward as a man who recognizes that they should break the Ten Commandments—I wish to ask the landlords in this House who taught the tenants to break the Ten Commandments? What has been done in Ireland for the last 50 years? Why, the Land Acts stand as a living proof that there has been rack-renting, evictions, barbarous thefts by law—for every man who has taken more than what is just from his tenant has committed a legal theft. If the tenants, poor men and ignorant men, have for years and generations seen their undoubted rights in their property confiscated by the landlords, are they much to be blamed if they have learned the bad lesson? I have been very much astonished, Sir, at the excitement which the evictions at Glenbeigh have caused in this country. Some hon. Gentlemen have got quite excited over them. What; a house burned down! A man and wife and their child turned out on the hill-side in the winter! Why, Sir, for 50 years, since the Act which deprived the Irish freeholder of his vote, the case of Glenbeigh has been the case of hundreds of Irish tenants and cottagers. Every winter, for 50 years, the flame of the cottage has lighted the dark hill-side; and, what is more, that flame may be out in Ireland, but it is living in the hearts of thousands of Irish men and women in America. Can you wonder at the bitterness which you see in these men's faces, when you remember the misery they have gone through and by whom this bitterness has been caused. ["Hear, hear!"] Hon. Members opposite cheered the Ten Commandments just now; the Ten Commandments were made known to men through Moses; but a greater than Moses gave us an Eleventh Commandment—"Love thy neighbour as thyself." In other words—"Do unto others as thou wouldst be done by;" and I want to know is there any hon. Gentleman in the House, Irish landlord or another, who will get up and defend the evictions and the burnings in mid-winter that have been going on for 50 years in Ireland. I want him to ask himself this question, whether the circumstances of the past, whoever may be to blame for them, are not such as to justify this House in making a supreme effort to put an end to miseries that have so long afflicted Ireland and disgraced us. But now I want to point more directly to the Amendment before us. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork, in so far as it refers to the past, does not present any particular attraction for me. But penetrated, as I am, with a sense of the evils we have done in Ireland by connivance, I want to know whether the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) is not the only remedy for the ills of the past and the difficulties of the present that has been presented to the House? Neither in the past have we, nor in the present and future can we satisfy the great wants of the people of Ireland. I laughed when the Leader of the Government opposite talked of resolute government for Ireland by the Conservative Party. I do not often go to the other

House to look at the noble Lords there; but I have sat very quietly here, in a position that gives me good opportunity of observing the right hon. Gentlemen occupants of the Front Bench. I look at the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith), kindly, good-natured, clever in business. I look again—I am sorry not to see him present, as I should like to point the moral—I look at the quivering lip of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach); I look at the trembling hand of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland, and I think then of a resolute Government from these Gentlemen! Why, Mr. Speaker, there is only one resolute Unionist in the House that I know, and that is the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) who sits below me. Give him the reins, and he will govern on Strafford's plan. Happy for him if he does not meet with worse than Strafford's fate. ["Oh, oh!"] But while the noble Marquess in the other House amuses himself with talking about resolute Government, there are some innocent souls on this side, like the hon. Member for Bath (Mr. Wodehouse), who plaintively cry, "Let us govern Ireland without reference to Party divisions." But let the House think what meaning is there in that? Here in so trifling a matter as the speech I am allowed to make to-night, when I said something apparently unpleasant about a hon. Gentleman, my own Leaders—whom I am glad to recognize as Leaders—I hope they are as fond of their Follower as he is of them —when, in the course of the present speech, I seemed to say something unpleasant of them, it gave a point to hon. Members opposite, and smiles o'erspread the visages of right hon. Gentlemen on the Bench opposite. It was not because what I said was particularly true or good; but it was a point against the Party opposite to them. Then, again, when I said something about the right hon. Gentlemen who now constitute the Government — Well, I cannot say the noble Marquess looked particularly happy; but I noticed the faces of my right hon. Friends (Mr. Morley and Mr. H. H. Fowler), and I know they were not dissatisfied at what I had said. After this simple example of what goes on in the House, there are hon. Gentlemen so particularly dull as to believe that any government of Ireland is possible without reference to the exigencies of Party here. No, Sir, depend upon it our coercive measures have failed and have embittered the relations between the two countries; our policy has driven out a whole nation; our remedial measures have been insufficient; and our Party conflicts in this House make a continuity of resolute government in Ireland an impossibility. I have heard some hon. Gentlemen say who grant all this, that to adopt Home Rule is the counsel of despair; but rather, I think, we may call that of our opponents the counsel of despair, when they declare that the resources of statesmanship are so feeble, that if we do not go on as we are, we must have separation—and better separation, they say, than Home Rule. That, I say, is the counsel of despair; but I say, on the contrary, we have been continually ameliorating the condition of the relations between the two countries; and, I believe, if hon. Members opposite would look the thing fairly in the face with hon. Members here, that the great scandal to the country, which brings disgrace upon us in the eyes of the civilized world, might, by a measure resulting from the combination of Parties, put an end to the miserable state of things existing in Ireland. I want to make one reference to the action of the Liberal Unionists. I do not presume to make any appeal to the noble Marquess, because I recognize that there is between his political opinions and mine so great a divergence that it would be impertinent to make any appeal to him. But there are sitting on the Front Bench— or there ought to be—and there are sitting behind here a number of Gentlemen who, intensely Liberal, and even Radical in politics, yet feel it to be their duty to sustain the Conservative Party in Office. I want to say a word to those hon. Gentlemen; and I should particularly have liked, if the Leader, who represents them, I suppose more nearly than anyone else on the Front Bench, had been present, to listen to my appeal—I refer to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain). The last time I spoke in the House, I made some rather severe remarks about that right hon. Gentleman, and I am very much afraid publicly in the country and privately, too, I have not been guiltless of the same thing on several occasions since. I do not want to withdraw any observations I have made; but if the right hon. Gentleman had been here to-night, I should have begged him, by the community of sentiment we Radicals possess, by our common agreement upon the great measures which we propose, if we can get the power, to put before the country, to take the present, the earliest occasion, to bring to an end this conflict between himself and his Friends, and let us present to the country once again—as we ought to present—the spectacle of a united Radical Party. ["Oh, oh!"] I do not wonder hon. Members opposite do not particularly like that tone of observation. They would much rather I should have said as severe things as I could. ["No, no!"] But I give them friendly notice that there is a growing inclination amongst all Radicals to come together on this matter. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham has taken a very self-willed course. He reminds me, in his conduct, of an Oxford Professor, of whom I have heard. One of the young men in his charge turned Catholic, and he was summoned, of course, before the Professor, who gave him a severe castigation, remonstrated with him, and finished up by saying—"Sir, by your conduct you have imperilled your immortal soul, and you have seriously offended me." Now, some such feeling as that seems to have entered the mind of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. The Liberal Party, by going over to Home Rule, has not only imperilled its future, but it has offended the right hon. Gentleman. All I have to say about him is, that I trust he will realize—and I think the noble Marquess, in his speech at Newcastle, seemed to realize—that with them or without them, the Home Rule movement is sure to be carried to a triumphant issue. Sir, I want hon. Gentlemen to do us the credit of believing that we are not for Home Rule for any base or unworthy motives. There are hon. Members sitting on the Front Bench who know that I have been for Home Rule for many years. I do not want them to indulge longer in the fun of calling me a Separatist. I want them to believe that the English Radicals who are for Home Rule love their country, and are as proud of their Empire, and are as anxious the Empire should continue one united Empire, as any Conservative in England. I beg them to do us the justice to accept what I say. I hope they will not again accuse one of us of being Separatists. We want nothing but real union between the two nations, and we think we know the way to get it. Sir, this House of Commons, with its four Parties at present fighting one with the other, playing at sixes and sevens, is a spectacle to all the Legislative Bodies in the world. The time has been when this English House of Commons was proudly pointed at by all the Legislatures of all lands. Now there is scarcely a Legislature in our Colonies that does not laugh when it reads the accounts of our proceedings. ["Hear, hear!"] But do not hon. Members who cheer that statement see what is the cause of it? We are a Representative Chamber; we exist on the representative principle, and there—(pointing to the Irish Members)—come the mighty majority of the Representatives of a nation, and they ask us for self-government in their own local affairs. They tell us that that will settle the controversy between England and Ireland, and I know it will settle the difficulties of this House. Sir, you yourself, sitting in the august Chair, must have felt many a time that you could heartily desire that the present disjointed system was at an end. If I might give an illustration, I would say that this English House of Commons has, for several years past, been like the travellers lost in an enchanted wood, everywhere vistas opening before them, and at the end of every vista appears one terrible awe-inspiring figure—the Irish Question. There is no escape from it but one. As in every enchanted story, when some brave knight steps up to the figure and grasps it boldly; at the touch of trust and of love, the spectre turns into the familiar image of a long-sought friend. We believe we have the disenchanter on our side of the House. You may think you may have him there. Our disenchanter may be old in years, and his tongue may have lost some of its trumpet tones, but the indomitable will in him and the principle of justice by which he is guided will, when applied to this Irish spectre, turn it into a friendly figure, and will thus enable this House to resume its dignity in its deliberations, and the two nations to sit down together bound in the golden bonds of peace and love.

General FRASER (Lambeth, N.) said, the experience of a residence in Ireland for the last 13 years as a tenant, and not as a landlord, urged him to raise an earnest protest against the Amendment, and to exhort the Ministry to guide and govern that country with continuous firmness. During the last six years he had had full opportunity of watching the disastrous effects of wavering concession and so-called coercion. It was his duty in 1881 and 1882, when in command of the Curragh Camp, on the requisition of any magistrate, to send out troops to the Land League meetings through the country, simply to be present at the delivery of seditious speeches and to march back again. It required no prophet to foretell what would be the consequence of those great meetings, and the effect which the distribution of rebel newspapers throughout the country would have upon the people. Since that time we had seen the rise and the fall of the Land League; we, too, had seen the rise of the National League—and Unionists trusted to see it fall. The relations between owners and occupiers had been most seriously disturbed by the Plan of Campaign. It had forced the long-suffering owners to remain without their rent or else to accept, in numerous cases, a pittance quite out of proportion to any passing fall of prices, simply to save themselves and their poor relatives from utter destitution, and even to keep clothes upon their backs. The preposterous Tenants' Relief Bill having been thrown out, the Plan of Campaign was started as a desperate step to add to the account of which no account was given—to starve out the owners of property, "to make the land of Ireland as free as when the waters of the Flood left it," and to lead to that great day when "not a penny of rent is to be paid for a sod of land in the whole of Ireland." A hundred thousand men in Ireland were looking to the Government to be firm. They must proclaim the League, suppress the continual publication of disgraceful and seditious articles in the rebel Press, and find employment for the poor in the West. Let them also have some scheme to promote fair trade. The words and acts of the Nationalist Leaders during the last six years rendered it impossible to hand over to them the welfare of Ireland any more than Burmah could be handed over to Dacoits, Egypt to a Mahdi, or the Cape to the Zulus.

Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): Sir, I am not about to follow the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Storey) through his very able, amusing, and extremely impartial speech. I think he has chastised every part of the House with perfect freedom; and, on the whole, he has been tolerably impartial. I cordially reciprocate the friendly feelings which the hon. Member expressed towards those who sit on this Bench, and also the sentiment with which he concluded his speech, when he said it was his desire to strengthen the tie which he is so anxious to maintain. I rise, however, for the purpose of making some observations upon the powerful and statesmanlike speech of my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington). It was a speech worthy of himself, and worthy of the occasion. My noble Friend took exception to the form of Amendment as somewhat trenching on the practice of the House, and creating a rather dangerous precedent. He laid down the doctrine somewhat broadly, that no Amendment should be moved upon an Address which does not amount to a want of confidence in the existing Administration. Well, Sir, as far as precedent is concerned, I think my noble Friend would have some difficulty in establishing his contention, for I find that no longer back than two or three years there have been Amendments moved to the Address which have not taken the form of a direct Vote of Want of Confidence. In the debates upon the Address, both in 1883 and 1884, it will be found that hon. and right hon. Gentlemen now sitting on the Benches opposite distinguished themselves by a very prominent departure from what my noble Friend calls "Constitutional precedent." I find that in 1882, the right hon. Gentleman the present Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) very early interposed in the debate upon the Address to move an Amendment in reference to Egyptian affairs, and on that Amendment a division was taken. No sooner was that Amendment disposed of than my hon. Friend the present Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) interposed another Amendment upon Ireland. A division was also taken upon that, and then the debate upon the Address languished; but it was not brought to a final close until the usual period of 11 or 12 nights had been reached. In 1884, Mr. Bourke, who had been Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in Lord Beaconsfield's Administration, moved an Amendment on foreign affairs; the hon. Member who then represented Birkenhead (Mr. M'Iver) moved another on the depression of trade; the right hon. Gentleman the late Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Chaplin) moved a third in reference to the importation of diseased cattle; and then the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) moved another in reference to Ireland. With one exception only, those Amendments were all pressed to a division. Hon. Members will, therefore, see that the precedent has not been to move a general Vote of Want of Confidence in the Government, but Votes of Censure on specific acts of policy. Well, we do not want to turn out right hon. Gentlemen opposite. [*A laugh.*] I repeat it. I do not think any man—at least any man with a grain of political common sense—wishes, at the present moment, to have a change of Government. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who sit upon that Bench have a fair and just title to be there. They were returned at the General Election to carry out a specific policy. It is their duty to proceed with that policy, and it is the duty of the Opposition to give them a fair trial. Our desire is to hear—we have heard nothing of it in this debate—what the policy of the Government is in regard to Ireland. How do they propose to govern Ireland? How do they propose to deal with the evils which my noble Friend admits do exist in Ireland, but with regard to which we have had no response, except two speeches from the Irish Legal Advisers of the Government. It is said that the Government is behind the solid wall of a majority of 100; but it is the duty of the Opposition to criticize, and it is upon that ground that I shall support the Amendment, and deal not with ingenious and subtle arguments as to what the Amendment involves, but with the important issue which it raises. The right hon and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) told us that, if we vote for the Amendment, we shall be voting in approval of the Plan of Campaign, and in disapproval of the measures the Government intend to introduce for the repression of crime and lawlessness. He further asserted that we should be voting in favour of the measure which was introduced and rejected last year. Now, the Motion before the House has nothing to do with the Plan of Campaign; and I want to show the House what it is the Amendment really means. It contains a simple statement of facts—that the agrarian disturbances, to which the Queen's Speech alludes, have not prevailed—

> "In the cases of those owners who have granted to their tenants such abatements of rents as are called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce."

It then proceeds to express an opinion that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is not to be found in the coercive measures which the Government have promised—

> "But in such a reform of the law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people."

My noble Friend states that, in his opinion, there are two remedies. One is a large expenditure on public works. Now, our past experience of expenditure on public works in Ireland has convinced us that it means jobbery, corruption, waste of English money, pauperism of the worst class of the Irish people, no impetus to Irish industry, no real good to the Irish people. My noble Friend then put the whole strain of his argument upon emigration; but he proceeded to admit immediately afterwards that emigration, if it is to be successful, must be voluntary, and to be voluntary, it must be with the consent of the Irish people. We quite agree with him. My right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) has never advocated compulsory emigration, but he said that if such a plan was proposed it must be put in force by an authority in which the Irish people had confidence. Our contention is that any system of voluntary emigration, to be successful, must be carried out with the consent and concurrence of the Irish people; whereas, any system of emigration proposed by an English Government would be regarded by the Irish people as a system of compulsory emigration, and would be resisted accordingly. But whether we are able to carry out a system of emigration upon a small or a large scale, I do not believe that, under the most successful auspices, it would cure much of the evil to which this Amendment calls attention. My noble Friend said he knew no other remedy, and he called upon the Irish Members and my right hon. Friends, in their speeches, to suggest a remedy. What can be a more conclusive proof of the absolute hopelessness of this Irish problem than that one of the most experienced and trusted Statesmen in the House—a man of whom we are all proud, and look up to with the greatest confidence—has no remedy whatever to suggest. There is a remedy, but my noble Friend did not suggest it, because he thinks it involves a danger. When the noble Marquess calls on us to suggest a remedy, we suggest one at once. We say that the only remedy for Irish distress and discontent is to bring the sympathy and the action of the Irish people into harmony with the mode of administration and of government in Ireland. We have heard a good deal of the remedy of abolishing the dual ownership of land; and it now seems to be agreed on both sides of the House—in rather strange contrast with the debates which took place in 1881,—that the dual ownership is to be swept away, and that the true solution of the difficulty is the creation of a peasant proprietary, and the abolition of landlordism altogether. Is the House prepared to accept that principle? I am not. I do not think it would be an unmitigated boon to Ireland to completely abolish landlordism, although it might be to have a large accession of peasant proprietors, and to deal with those holdings which are under 20 acres, and which represent something like 600,000 of the tenants of Ireland. Neither would it be possible to get rid of dual ownership, because if you created a system of single ownership, in a very few years afterwards, from the force of circumstances, property in land would come to be bought and sold as a commercial transaction; and as it would not be possible in all cases for the owners to be the cultivators, there would be tenants again. Without stopping to argue that point, I submit that it would be impossible to carry out the scheme of my noble Friend unless there were some local authority in Ireland by whose agency this reform would be attempted. My noble Friend took exception to that part of the Amendment which complains of the action of the Government during the Recess having been novel, unconstitutional, and doubtful. Now, I never understood the hon. Member for Cork to complain of the action of the Government in reference to the reduction of rents. My noble Friend has asked what proof there is of pressure having been applied by the Government. We have the action of Judge Curran, and of General Buller; but the best proof of that pressure we have had is from the Chief Secretary for Ireland himself. At Bristol the right hon. Baronet said that he had put pressure upon the landlords in regard to the reduction of rent, and I myself would be the last man to blame the right hon. Gentleman for what he did. But there was other unconstitutional action during the Recess of which I wish to say a word—I mean in reference to the question which has been called jury-packing. That raises a very grave and supreme difficulty in the present position of Irish affairs. I should like for a moment—although the House may not give me credit for what I am going to say—I should like for a moment to look at the jury question totally apart from Party politics. The very general want of confidence in the administration of justice which exists in Ireland constitutes a very serious embarrassment. I think we are all agreed that it is absolutely necessary in a civilized State, to say nothing of a free State, that justice should be fairly and impartially administered, and, not only that, but that the people themselves should believe that it is so. You may administer justice impartially, firmly, and fairly; but if the people among whom it is administered think the contrary, then you have a very serious obstacle in the way of carrying out your administration. It has been one of the proudest characteristics of the rule of England in all parts of the world, that wherever it has extended and wherever Englishmen have gone they have administered justice. Whether in the self-governed Colonies, or in the Crown Colonies, or in India, the one thing at least as to which we are able to look the world in the face has been the administration of justice. The English Constitution recognizes no difference of class, no difference of creed, and no difference of position. All men are equal before the law, and all men must be tried fairly by the law. But that is not the state of things in Ireland. ["Oh, oh!"] I say that in Ireland the Courts of Justice are battle-fields where contending social and political forces meet; I say, further, and I will quote my noble Friend in support of my argument, that a trial is not an unbiassed inquiry, but the arena for Party conflicts and Party triumphs. That remark applies not only to Sligo, but to Belfast. Let me remind the House what it was that Mr. Justice Lawson said at the last Assizes. We have heard the question of intimidation put with great force and eloquence to-night, and if there was intimidation at Sligo, the censure of my noble Friend to-night in regard to it was not too strong. At Omagh a man was put on his trial for murdering a soldier. The Judge said that in that case the jury had no alternative but, on the evidence, which was clear to demonstration, to find the prisoner guilty of wilful murder. The jury did not find him guilty of wilful murder, and the comment of the Judge was that they must have been influenced by some other motives than a due regard to the oath they had sworn. It is a very sad thing, whether the trial took place at Omagh, or at Sligo, or at Dublin, there is an impression, sanctioned by high judicial authority, that juries regard the discharge of their duty, not as the sacred trust which English juries regard it, but as a weapon of political warfare which they are at liberty to use, first on the one side and then on the other. I speak of the Irish Judges with the utmost respect; but the ordinary staff and machinery by which justice in Ireland is worked belong to one class and one sect. I regret that the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland is not at this moment in the House, for I would ask him what is the opinion of men like Sir Robert Hamilton on the subject—whether Sir Robert Hamilton and others who are well acquainted with the government of Ireland do not look on the administration of justice as a far graver difficulty than the agrarian difficulty? I will take the alleged charge of jury-packing in Sligo, of which we have heard a great deal in the course of this debate. It was a very simple business, and I am not going to impute improper motives to anyone in connection with it. The Crown in this country had originally an unlimited right to challenge peremptorily. But by an old statute passed, I think, in the reign of one of the Edwards, the right to challenge was limited to challenge for sufficient cause, or in other words it must state the grounds for the challenge. But the practice has grown up for centuries, and is sanctioned by authority—that the Crown is entitled to say "Stand by," without assigning any ground, until the panel is exhausted. Then the panel is called over again, and the Crown is bound to state the reasons for its challenge. In regard to Sligo, the charge is that the Crown deliberately ordered every Roman Catholic juror to stand aside, implying thereby two things—that the professors of the Roman Catholic faith were in league with the accused, or that the professors of the Roman Catholic faith were prepared to violate their oaths. Hon. Gentlemen opposite may imagine the feeling of indignation which would arise in this country if anything approaching to this system were followed here, at any English Assizes. Suppose that an official ordered all Nonconformists to stand aside. I should entertain sanguine expectations as to what the fate of the Government would be which allowed any official to do that. It would be an insult to the religious feelings of a minority; but in Ireland it is the majority against whom this action has been taken. A document has been signed by the Bishops and Priests of the Roman Catholic Church, protesting against this insult to their faith and their church. [An hon. MEMBER: And by Protestants as well.] Yes, and Protestants as well; and, therefore, I do not think that action of this kind is calculated to strengthen the administration of justice in Ireland. My noble Friend expressed some doubt as to the state of things in regard to trial by jury in Sligo, and he asked how such trials were to be carried on unless some measure of this kind was adopted. But my answer to him would be this—if that is the state of things in Ireland, and there is reason to believe that the jurors will not give a fair trial, abolish trial by jury altogether, and no longer have this sham—do not pretend to give trial by jury with one hand and then take it away with the other. If you abolish trial by jury, and place the power in another authority, that authority would be responsible, not only to public opinion, but to Parliament, and we should be able to test the evidence on which that authority had acted, and the reasons for the decisions at which it had arrived. Though we speak sometimes very lightly of this matter now, it is well to remember that one of the greatest Statesmen who ever lived and graced this House and our literature, Edmund Burke, said this—The whole array and machinery of the British Constitution, and the object at which it aimed, was to bring 12 honest men into the jury box. He regarded that as of great importance, and if it was important in that day, it is no less important to our jury laws now. It is a matter of the utmost importance to the people of Ireland at the present day. There is another remark which this suggests to me, and it is with reference to the mode in which trials are conducted. I would point out the essential difference that exists between an English and an Irish trial. In an English trial, conducted, we will say, by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the Isle of Wight (Sir Richard Webster), the present Attorney General, or my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bury (Sir Henry James), the object always is—and everyone who knows anything of the practice of an English Court of Justice is perfectly aware of this—to arrive at the truth. In criminal cases, as a general rule, an English counsel does not care for a verdict. He cares for getting a just decision; but an Irish trial always appears to be a battle for a verdict. We hear that next Monday you are going to put on trial the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) with four or five other Members of the House of Commons, and some other persons. Well, it is a serious thing to put a Member of Parliament on his trial. [*A laugh.*] It is not a thing for a man to laugh at, or to regard lightly. The occasions in our history on which Members of Parliament have been made the subjects of criminal trials are very rare. It is true that the House of Commons possesses no privilege which exempts its Members from the criminal law of the country; but the House is not chary in inquiring into the character of the whole proceeding; and I think hon. Members have but little knowledge of the capacities and powers of hon. Members from Ireland if they imagine that if a certain number of those Irish Members are put into prison for what they regard as a political offence we shall not hear a great deal of it in this House hereafter. That drama will not be closed by the verdict in the Court. Is it not, then, absolutely essential that there should not be a taint or suspicion of injustice in the whole procedure of this trial? Is it not absolutely essential that you, sitting on the Government side of the House, should be practically confident that there is not a shadow, jot, or tittle of justification for any charge brought against the officials in Dublin, either of favouritism, unfairness, or prejudice, in the attempt to form a jury? Let me take the statement which was given to-night in answer to a Question put by an hon. Member below the Gangway on this side of the House. What did we get from the legal representative of the Irish Government? We got the statement that the offence for which the hon. Member for East Mayo and the other traversers are going to be tried was committed in the County of Galway. It was there they committed the offence of conspiring and inciting the people not to pay their rents; but the hon. Members are to be tried in Dublin, upon the technichal ground that the academic discussion of the Plan of Campaign took place in Dublin. Though the overt acts were committed in Galway, or Kerry, the trial is to take place in Dublin. Then, having brought the trial to Dublin, what is the next step? Not content with the City of Dublin, they transfer it to the County of Dublin, and not content with that, as the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) has told us, though the ordinary number of names on the jury panel in the County of Dublin is from 80 to 100, on this occasion it is to be raised to 250. Not even content with that, the hon. and learned Gentleman tells us that the Defendants are to have no right of challenge beyond six. [An hon. MEMBER: That is the law!] So it is; but let me tell the House what one of the highest authorities on criminal law in this country says in reference to this point—

"In cases of misdemeanour"—

this is a case of misdemeanour—

"there is no right of peremptory challenge; but the defendant is generally allowed to object to jurors as they are called, without showing any cause, till the panel is exhausted;"

and that practice was approved of by Mr. Justice Williams. We are told to-night that the traversers are not to have this privilege; they are only to be allowed the right of challenge up to six. Now, let us see how this will work. The Crown orders jurymen to stand aside without giving any reason. That is the law. The six men that the traversers have the right to challenge will soon be exhausted. If you had a small panel, the Crown would order such a number to stand by that the panel would be exhausted, and then they would be bound to give their reasons for objecting, and the matter would be openly tried. But to appoint a panel of 250 men is practically placing the jury in the hands of the Crown. There is a general impression among hon. Members that—I find not from speeches of hon. Members in this House, but from association with hon. Members—an under-current of opinion through a large section of Members which will not find expression, perhaps, in any speech—that, under these circumstances, these men will not have a fair trial. I may be taking too much on myself at the present moment by giving utterance to the opinion. ["Hear, hear!"] You may well say "Hear, hear!" I am telling you a fact. There are a large number of Members of Parliament who believe that these men will not have a fair trial, and you are beginning the prosecution of these persons under such auspices as that. ["No, no!"] I am not saying that these men will not have a fair trial. I am merely saying that a large number of people think they will not.

MR. TOMLINSON (Preston): What is your opinion?

MR. HENRY H. FOWLER: The hon. Member for Preston is extremely anxious to know my opinion. I will not shrink from giving it to him. I thought I had expressed it already. I say the whole course of procedure with reference to the jury panel on which these traversers are about to be tried is one that is unknown, and would not be tolerated by this country. I think it is a system of procedure which the English authorities in the present Government, the men who are animated with what my noble Friend (the Marquess of Hartington) described as British spirit and feeling, ought to put their foot upon. Those English authorities ought to tell the authorities in Dublin that they will not allow Dublin Castle to interfere in the matter as they have done and that there must be as fair a trial given to these men in Ireland as would have been given to English prisoners at the Old Bailey, under similar circumstances. My noble Friend found complaint with reference to the wording of this Amendment—as to the increased stringency about to be imparted to criminal procedure in Ireland; and he propounded the rather singular doctrine that all the Government contemplated was a reform in criminal procedure, and that such a reform would not amount to the enactment of coercive laws. He said it would not be a weapon against a political opponent unless he were arraigned for criminal offences; but, as a matter of fact, the whole safeguards of our Constitutional system are a matter of criminal procedure. Trial by jury is a matter of criminal procedure; so also was the Court of Star Chamber. I do not know what the legislation of the Government is going to be; but any attempt, say, to subject prisoners to examination would be a very serious reform in criminal procedure, and if they propose to extend it to this country, they will find, I imagine, a pretty considerable amount of popular feeling excited against it in this country. But, however you may disguise it, under the guise of a reform of criminal procedure you might abolish every one of the privileges now enjoyed by people who are put upon their trial in this country. I adhere to the old-fashioned maxim that it is better that 20 criminals should escape than that one innocent man should be punished, and I am inclined to look with great jealousy upon any interference with those details of our criminal procedure, which have for their object the prevention of injustice, which are the safeguards of our Constitutional system, and which are designed for the prevention of innocent men being found guilty, though sometimes, in practice, they may interfere with the conviction of the guilty. I do not wish to occupy the time of the House any longer; but I would point out, in conclusion, that we have got in Ireland an administration of justice which is distrusted and doubted. My noble Friend has shown you that the land system is not working satisfactorily. Everyone believes that there must be a radical alteration in the law of landlord and tenant. You have got a system of education in Ireland distasteful to the vast majority of the Irish people. You have got a system of Local Government equally distasteful, equally incompetent, equally extravagant. You have the whole of your internal administration of Ireland arousing the feelings and treading upon the susceptibilities of the vast mass of the people. Now, what is the remedy you are going to offer for that state of affairs? Emigration will not be a remedy—public works will not be a remedy. You have got a deep-rooted sentiment of Nationality to deal with; you have got that which is, perhaps, stronger—namely, a deep-rooted discontent with the whole working of Irish administration. Now, we are bound to do one of two things—we are bound either to govern Ireland ourselves, and do it properly; or we are bound to allow the Irish to govern themselves instead. The Government have told us they have no intention of proposing any great alteration in the administration of Irish affairs—in other words, that we are to go on as we are. I can only predict from that a continuance of the hopeless failure in which we are now found. I do not disbelieve the competence of Englishmen to govern Ireland. England has governed India, and has governed it splendidly. And if you govern Ireland by Englishmen, I believe you could govern it well too. But you do not; you govern it by a sect and a class of Irishmen. Conceive what the state of things would be in India if you endeavoured to govern that country by classes and castes, by Mahommedans or Buddhists, instead of by ourselves. If Englishmen would take upon themselves the administration, I do not say that Ireland would accept it, or that England would tolerate it, but you would secure a good Government in that way; whereas, at present, you have the very worst Government imaginable, which does not fulfil even the primary duty of government, which is to secure the confidence of the people. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Bath (Mr. Wodehouse), in his address, very sarcastically alluded to the peroration of the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill). The noble Lord told the House, or rather his unsympathetic Friends around him, that he intended to appeal to Cæsar. I thought the hon. Member for Bath (Mr. Wodehouse) was not very confident about Cæsar. He expressed considerable hesitation as to the change which might have come over Cæsar's mind; and though he was rather severe on Cæsar for being subject to these mutations of opinion, I saw that he did not look forward with very great confidence to the next appeal. I would say to hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway—your duty also is to appeal to Cæsar; do not retard the Business of this House; do not obstruct the course of English legislation; do not put yourselves in antagonism with the law, but tell the English people —not the people of one class—I do not care for this constant reference to an appeal to the democracy, but tell the English people the story of what is going on in Ireland. The Glenbeigh evictions, notwithstanding all the explanations we have heard, and all the apologies which have been made, have rooted themselves in the mind of the English people; and there is not a man sitting on the opposite side of the House who does not know that he will have to talk about them at the next General Election. I tell hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway to persist in their appeal to Cæsar, and I venture to predict, with some confidence, that when the final judgment of Cæsar is given, the best of the classes and the best of the masses will sweep away the hideous imposture of Dublin Castle, and will confide to the Irish people what has been given by the Anglo-Saxon race to every race in the world to which its power and influence extends—namely, that principle of self-government which I believe, and which you believe, although you may laugh at it now, to be both the bulwark and safeguard of law and of liberty, and conduces to what the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) spoke of the other night as the freedom of the individual and the unity of the Empire.

Colonel SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): Sir, the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has earned for himself a reputation as being a sound lawyer, and I think that reputation will be considerably increased by the speech we have just heard. At any rate, the right hon. Gentleman will be set down as an astute lawyer, for he has carefully avoided in the speech he has made, the most interesting subjects we are debating and the most difficult part of the subject with which he ought to have dealt—namely, the legality or otherwise of the Plan of Campaign. The right hon. Gentleman began by saying that he had no desire whatever to turn out the Government. He then with remarkable logic informed the House that it was his purpose to vote for an Amendment which, if carried, would turn out the Government, because we conceive that no Amendment to the Address that was ever moved in this House was more utterly opposed to the policy of Her Majesty's Government than the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). Now, Sir, the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork has one peculiarity. The main question which we have been fighting and debating with hon. Gentlemen opposite for a long time past—namely, the question of Home Rule, is, in this Amendment, towed like a small boat after a larger one. The question comes at the very extreme end of his Amendment. I have always supposed that the question of self-government for Ireland is really the question which hon. Gentlemen opposite have most at heart. We have sometimes ventured to say that the Land Question is the real question in Ireland, and hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite, as a rule, say "No, no!" when we make that assertion. But when I listened to the speech of their Leader—a very long and able speech—I wondered when he would come to the great question. But he hardly touched it at all except in a very few words at the end of his address. The hon. Member for the City of Cork found great fault with Her Majesty's Government all round; but the principal fault he found with them certainly struck me very much with surprise. He found great fault with Her Majesty's Government because they did not maintain what they call the law in Ireland. I never heard the hon. Gentleman object to any Government for that reason before. Well, undoubtedly, we in Ireland did think that there was considerable delay on the part of the Government in grappling with the Plan of Campaign; but, on considering the question, and on realizing the difficulties which presented themselves to the Government under the existing condition of law, we came to the conclusion that the Government was not at any rate so much to blame in the matter as at first we had supposed. The Plan of Campaign first appeared on the scene in *United Ireland*. But though not a lawyer, I am perfectly well aware of the fact that it would be impossible for the Government to prosecute, with any hope of success, a newspaper for the conspiracy in which they have brought out a plan of this kind. Well, the Government had to wait until the plan was further developed, and they had not to wait very long. Hon. Members opposite—and I give them full credit for candour—have never expressed any shame whatever for the part they have played in promoting the Plan of Campaign. I am perfectly certain that hon. Gentlemen opposite are quite clear in their consciences as to this matter, though the highest Court in Ireland has decided that it is an illegal and criminal conspiracy. I have no doubt that hon. Members opposite believe in their consciences that they are perfectly right in the course they have pursued. Well, they are not the first criminal conspirators who have had easy consciences. [An hon. MEMBER: No; Orangemen!] I am alluding to a mediæval personage—Robin Hood. He was a gentleman engaged in freebooting in this country, and we hear that his men in green had their consciences kept clean because they retained among them a certain Friar Tuck. Hon. Gentlemen opposite have also their Friar Tuck in no less a personage than the Roman Catholic Archbishop, who has given his *imprimatur* to the morality of the proceedings in which they are engaged. [An hon. MEMBER: What about roaring Kane?] Hon. Gentlemen opposite say that this is a spontaneous manifestation on the part of the farmers in Ireland of their desire to oppose extortion on the part of the landlords. Have hon. Gentlemen opposite, either directly or through the National League, endeavoured to terrorize the tenantry of Ireland into the adoption of this so-called Plan of Campaign? [*Cries of* "Never."] Hon. Gentlemen say "Never;" but with the permission of the House—and I commend this to the right hon. Gentleman opposite who has just spoken and who possesses a legal mind—I will show that this is not correct. I wish to point out to him, and to other hon. Members, that if I am able to show that the tenants of Ireland have been unwillingly compelled to join in the operation of this Plan of Campaign, it should have the effect of causing them to think twice before giving it support in England. With regard, then, to the terrorism exercised in connection with the Plan of Campaign, I have here letters which show this in regard to one estate in Ireland. [*Cries of* "Name."] I do not intend to mention the name, but in order that the House may not suppose for a moment that this is a trumped-up case, and in order to satisfy hon. Members below the Gangway opposite, I will, with his permission, submit the case and the letters to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley), and I will say of that right hon. Gentleman now what I always say about him in public and in private—that, although I disagree with his policy, I am perfectly convinced that he means to be fair and just. I believe that the right hon. Gentleman has studied the Irish Question in those Attic groves in which he has won such distinction, and that he has gathered his ideas of the state of Ireland rather from books than from observations, and by mixing with Irishmen themselves—the very worst plan that can be adopted; but acknowledging, as I do, that he is a fair-minded Englishman, I am sure that I shall convince him that the cases I am ready to submit to him are absolutely authentic, as I myself know them to be. Well, Sir, there is a district in Ireland which has adopted the Plan of Campaign. A meeting was held there, and a man was present who not only proposed the Chairman, but supported the plan that the tenants were not to pay their rents except on certain conditions. This man had paid his rent two days previously. [*Laughter, and cries of* "Name!" *from the Irish Benches.*] I shall submit the name of the individual to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, and that will satisfy the House. That is case number one. Here is case number two in connection with this subject. I hold in my hand a letter from a tenant on the estate, who says—

> "Sir,—I enclose a cheque for £4 19*s.*, half-a-year's rent, according to promise. I sent it to—"

a certain person whose name I will not mention—

> "Because I was afraid to send it otherwise. I am afraid to send it by post, as I am watched."

[*Cries of* "Name!"] I shall submit it to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle. But here is another letter, one which I have received from a priest of the parish; and it appears that Father Quilter is not the only priest that takes an interest in the tenantry of Ireland. I am happy to say there are many such men. The letter is as follows:—

> "On behalf of—"

the person whose name is mentioned here—

> "I enclose you a cheque for £21 10*s.*, for half-a-year's rent, including costs, and I request you to keep this payment private, as the knowledge of it among other tenants might bring upon her very detrimental influences in her present delicate state of health."

This is from a priest who has a personal knowledge of the tenants on the estate, and who even assists them in fulfilling their legal obligations. I have in my hand another letter, which is the last I shall trouble the House by reading. It is from a Roman Catholic; he is a grazier, and writes to make a tender to the owner of the property for some grass land. He says—

> "I have been asking for certain grazing land. I know it will be a dangerous thing for me to take it, owing to the National League influence. However, I will chance it, on account of my having the grass for the last five years past."

Now, Sir, we have here cases of persons who have supported tho Plan of Campaign, and yet have violated the first of its rules by paying their rents secretly, owing to the terrorism of the National League. So much for the Plan of Campaign. Perhaps the House will allow me to say why we refuse to obey the rule of the Plan of Campaign. I do not argue whether a reduction of 20 per cent is a reasonable reduction or not. It may be or not be. I do not know all the circumstances and therefore I cannot tell. But we object to the Plan of Campaign coming between us and our tenants; we refuse to accept the law of the hon. Gentlemen opposite, who must remember that they have not yet secured the passage of a Home Rule Bill. But there is another point of interest connected with this subject. We have had one hon. Gentleman the Member for Sunderland (Mr. Storey) in his speech this evening condemning the Plan of Campaign in the most eloquent terms, but who I believe is going to vote for the Amendment before the House. The hon. Member for Sunderland said some hard things of the hon. Member for East Edinburgh (Mr. Wallace) and alluded to the breaking of the Ten Commandments, as well as to another Commandment intended to be kept in England, but not in Ireland. As to the morality of which I say nothing, but I take it that what is held to be right and just in England is equally right and just in Ireland. What appears to me to be the most dangerous doctrine that has yet been preached in this House, at any rate in our time, is the doctrine that the law is to be obeyed only so long as it is just. But who is to say whether the law is just or unjust? We have always imagined that if a law is thought to be unjust, it is brought for Amendment before this House. It is Parliament which makes the law, and which, when it is thought right to do so, can alone abrogate or change it; but that people who object to a law shall have power to break it at will is a principle which I have never before heard of. If this is the law of the new Party opposite, if we are to be at liberty to obey those laws only which we approve, and disobey those which press hardly upon us, all I will say is that pocket-picking ought to look up. I do not know whether the criminal class in the Metropolis read our debates, but I take it that the pickpockets and light-fingered gentry will take heart of grace when they understand that right hon. Gentlemen in this House lay it down as their policy that the law is only to be observed so long as it is chosen to be obeyed. The pickpocket is at war with society. He says that one man has no right to be richer than another, and when he filches a purse from the pockets of the rich, he says he is only establishing a monetary equilibrium between those who have too much and those who have too little. I hope, Sir, that this will never become the policy of this House. Undoubtedly, there are many hon. Gentleman opposite who, to my mind, have gone astray. But it is only a temporary aberration, and I believe that when they come to face the consequences they will turn again into the good old paths along which all classes in the country have hitherto walked. But there is another important point which has been brought prominently forward in this House, and which has been dwelt upon by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle as the principal reason in his mind why the latter part of this Amendment should be passed, that part which deals with the question of a separate Parliament for Ireland. Now why is it that my right hon. Friend apparently desires a Home Rule Parliament for Ireland? In his speech the other night, he said he wished to remove an impediment which for so long had been a shame and disgrace to the English Parliament. I did not hear, when my right hon. Friend said that, any sound of approval from below the Gangway. My hon. Friend generally speaks in that way outside the House; but, in the speech which he made on Tuesday, he said that until we get rid of the Irish Members in this House, England would never be mistress of her own actions. Knowing the relations which exist between hon. Members below the Gangway and the right hon. Gentleman, I feel that they cannot take up the cudgels in their own defence, and therefore, with the permission of the House, I will take them up, and say a word or two to show that the course pursued in debate in this House by hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite has not been pursued with a desire unduly to interfere with the progress of business, but that they have all along aimed at an object which they have consistently kept in view. What is that? Hon. Gentlemen opposite are possessed of unbounded eloquence on every subject, whether they understand the subject or whether they do not; and they are capable of making speeches at any length. That is a great power to possess. It has often struck me that Samson confounded his enemies with a jawbone, but the hon. Member for the City of Cork deserves the credit of having resuscitated that implement, and, with 85 implements of the kind, he has succeeded in confounding, confusing, and demoralizing the British House of Commons. The object in view is to clog the wheels of the legislative machine, to prevent their turning round, so that at last, like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, the House of Commons should come to the conclusion that so long as Irish Members remain below the Gangway, so long would it be impossible to proceed with the legislation of the country. But does the right hon. Gentleman think that it would be worth while to try an experiment so tremendous that it would practically dismember the Empire in order to get rid of men who are unmanageable? Now I absolutely deny that hon. Members below the Gangway should be given up by the right hon. Gentlemen as a bad job until some effort has been tried to render them amenable to reason. We have before us an alteration of the procedure of the House. I have, in former times, done a good deal of riding, and have found that some horses are dangerous to ride until you put on a gag-snaffle. That is the meaning of the first resolution that will be put forward.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. and gallant Member that he is proceeding beyond the Question before the House.

Colonel SAUNDERSON: I submit to your ruling, Sir. There appear to me to be two policies which can be pursued by the House of Commons. There is the policy indicated by Earl Spencer and by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle, which I call the policy of despair. Earl Spencer holds views very similar to those of my right hon. Friend. He holds that it is impossible upon existing conditions satisfactorily to govern Ireland, or to manage affairs in the House of Commons, and that, therefore, in his opinion, a Home Rule Bill should be passed. The noble Earl, at Newcastle, in company with my right hon. Friend, and speaking on the Irish Policy of the Liberal Party, which is described as a policy brought forward with the laudable object of satisfying all the just requirements of Ireland, said that some of the measures—

> "Were so strong that we had to strain the loyalty of many English Members to carry them, and yet those measures were hardly allowed to have effect in Ireland. The National Party, in order to get the Government into their own hands, would not allow those remedial measures to take effect. They would not allow them then, and they will not allow them hereafter."

Well, some right hon. Gentlemen opposite have asked, what is the policy of Her Majesty's Government? I say it is the direct opposite to the policy indicated in the speech of Earl Spencer. Earl Spencer, in this speech, says there is a power in Ireland which prevents the Irish people accepting the remedial measures that this House has passed in former times. I take it that Her Majesty's Government means that no Party in Ireland shall have the power in the future of preventing the Irish people accepting the remedial Acts passed by this House. I hear hon. Members sometimes allude—I heard one hon. and learned Gentleman on this side of the House allude—to the mis-government in times past, to the crushing out of the industries of Ireland in times past, as a reason why we should now deal leniently with the Irish people. Did he forget the remedial measures adopted during the last 40 years—measures which have conferred on the Irish boons which, I believe, no other tenantry or people on the earth have ever received from any Government? I take it Her Majesty's Government realize that as the very first principle of governing Ireland the law must be re-established, that the law of the land and the authority of this House must be maintained, and that the authority of the League must be crushed. I said, on a former occasion, that I hoped the Land Act of 1881 would get a fair chance, and that those Acts which enable the Irish tenantry to purchase their farms would carry with them those blessings and benefits which I believe they can, if they are only allowed. But some hon. Members opposite do not think there is at present any chance of the Irish tenantry becoming possessed of their farms, of the tenantry separating themselves from the National League. What is the opinion of one of their most distinguished Members—the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. T. M. Healy), who took his seat in the House to-day? Speaking on the 10th of October, 1885, the hon. Gentleman said—

> "There were two points that should be seen to, two chinks in the armour; first, a combination that would make it impossible for the rich farmers to break the organization."

Now, Sir, who are these rich farmers? I have given you a specimen of one of them, this grazier who dared to confront the authority of the National League by taking a certain grazing farm. There are thousands in Ireland like him. Then the hon. Member went on to say—

> "And the second was a sufficient sum of money in the National Treasury to show the landlords it could not be quickly exhausted; and that it would be a farmers' fund that would guarantee them from all reasonable losses."

Why, Sir, even so long ago as the 10th of October, 1885, the Plan of Campaign was in contemplation. A National Fund! I do not know how much of that fund will ever be seen by the tenants, but I hope that when the accounts are furnished they will give more satisfaction than was given when the accounts of the Land League were published; for those accounts showed a deficit of £120,000, though the money had been subscribed for a definite purpose and object. I believe most firmly that if the law is maintained in Ireland, and if the Irish people are taught that the law is capable of defending those who obey it, we shall find that the organization of which the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) is the head will crumble away, and that the Irish people, realizing that law and order is on their side and capable of making itself respected, will ultimately come to the side of law and order, and settle the Irish Question as, I believe, it alone can ever be settled, by the decided opinion of the Irish people themselves that the law of England is the law under which they are most likely to attain prosperity and happiness, and under which, ultimately, Ireland will be able to take her place as she has a right to take her place, owing to the genius of her children and the wealth and resources of her soil, as a credit, and not a disgrace, to the Empire to which she belongs.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster): I hope it will be understood, if we consent to the adjournment now, the debate upon this Amendment will be allowed to close to-morrow. I do not undervalue the importance of the debate, but to-morrow night it will have lasted five nights, and, therefore, I trust that to-morrow we shall be allowed to take a division.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Debate adjourned till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

MARRIAGES (ATTENDANCE OF REGISTRARS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General, Bill to amend the Law respecting the attendance of Registrars at Marriages in Nonconformist Places of Worship, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, and Mr. Stuart-Wortley.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 164.]

CITY OF LONDON FIRE INQUESTS BILL.

On Motion of Sir Robert Fowler, Bill to define the jurisdiction and to regulate the proceedings of the Coroner of the City of London with regard to Inquests upon Fires within the said city, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Robert Fowler and Mr. Hubbard.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 165.]

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 11*th February*, 1887.

ARMY (SMALL-ARMS)—DEFECTIVE SWORD-BAYONETS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of HARROWBY said, that, following up the conversation in the House yesterday, he desired to put a Question, of which he had given private Notice, with reference to the startling announcement made as to the issue of untrustworthy weapons to Her Majesty's Navy. He wished to ask, Whether any complaints had been received by the Admiralty of untrustworthy weapons having been supplied to them for the use of the Fleet previously to those announced to the House yesterday; if so, at what dates, and in connection with what ships such complaints were made? Upon so important a matter the revelations made were so startling that he need make no apology for asking the Question at once.

Lord ELPHINSTONE (A Lord in Waiting): My noble Friend has no need to apologize. I can only say, as I did yesterday, that it is not the custom of the Admiralty to keep any record of complaints, or of defects regarding the stores supplied to the Navy. Any such complaints are at once handed on to the War Office; but I may add that a Schedule of complaints made to the Admiralty from different ships has been printed, and is in the hands of the Commission now sitting.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, that he would move for a copy of that Schedule on an early day, as he thought their Lordships ought to have it in their hands.

PRIVATE BILLS.

AMENDMENT OF STANDING ORDERS.

Standing Orders Nos. 62, 64, 66, 115, 116, 117, 133A, and 177, *considered* and *amended;* and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 18.)

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 11*th February*, 1887.

MINUTES.]—PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*) — *Second Reading*—London City Tithes (St. Botolph Without, Aldgate)*; Orkney Roads.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

ORKNEY ROADS BILL (*by Order*).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Dodds.*)

MR. LYELL (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to move the rejection of the Bill. This Bill is the same as the Private Bill with the same title which was introduced last year, and rejected on the second reading. It is a Bill which is promoted by a certain number of private landowners in the Islands of Orkney, who seek to relieve themselves from certain liabilities which have been imposed upon them by the Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Act of 1878. The object of the promoters is to revert, as far as they are concerned, to the arrangement which existed previous to the passing of the Roads and Bridges Act, and under which the principal roads in the Islands of Orkney were constructed. The Roads Act of 1867 was abolished when the Roads and Bridges Act of 1878 was adopted, and the latter Act was put in force in the County of Orkney in 1883. Under the Roads and Bridges Act, the county was made the unity of assessment, and the various debts incurred in making the roads were consolidated into one county debt, and imposed upon the property in land or heritage in the county. The debt allocated to these island proprietors was something like £9,000; and because they say that no debt is existing in the islands of which they are proprietors, they claim to be relieved from their contribution to the debt which exists in regard to other portions of the Islands, and to throw the whole debt on the owners of property in the Mainland. Now, I hold that to be unfair, because they have taken a large share in the management of the roads under the Roads and Bridges Act; and they have taken their part in the levying of taxation. But I have another objection to this Bill, over and above that—namely, the fact that by this Private Bill legislation, the promoters seek to override a public enactment, passed after considerable deliberation by this House. In 1867 the assessments were limited to 1s. in the pound on the owners of the land, and were fixed at a less sum on the owners of house property. This has been done away with, and the assessment has been uniform upon the owners of land and houses. It would, therefore, be impossible to revert to the state of things which existed prior to the passing of that Act. The promoters of this Bill, not content with the defeat they suffered last year, and not having been able to get other parties to join with them in proposing a modification of the Roads and Bridges Act, have further refused to compromise matters, and have insisted on proceeding with their Private Bill. I am quite ready to admit that in any general Act it would be impossible not to inflict some hardship on the different parties concerned in it. In a general Act, dealing with different districts and different classes of people, it is easy to rub against the grain in some way or other; but I hold that, by reverting to the original state of things, a far greater hardship would be inflicted, and that it would be unjust to relieve the promoters, who are well able to pay their fair share of a public debt incurred, in a great part, under their own management and auspices, and to throw it on the great bulk of small owners and householders on the Mainland. There is another great objection to the proposal contained in this Bill. The money has been borrowed for the making of these roads, and the creditors, who are petitioners against the Bill, declared, with justice, that the security given to them under the Roads and Bridges Act would be greatly depreciated by the narrowing of the area of assessment in respect of which the loans have been guaranteed. In point of fact, many of the promoters of this Bill, who are proprietors in the Islands, and who seek to be relieved, have not incurred any debt whatever in the making of roads in such islands. The roads have been made for the most part under a private arrangement between themselves and their tenants. It is impossible to get at the exact facts of the case; but it is generally known in Orkney that the roads have been made by a private arrangement between the proprietors and the tenants. Where the latter have been unable to bear their full share of the pecuniary burden, it has been taken out of them in the shape of labour in making the roads, and there has been a private arrangement with the proprietors, who paid the poor rates during the time the roads were being constructed. Therefore, at the time they were constructed both the tenants and the labourers received great benefit from the work; but because, under such circumstances, no debt has been incurred by the proprietors, I maintain that that is no reason why the proprietors should be relieved from their fair share of the burden of the county debt. It is asserted that the roads on the Mainland are of no benefit to the people of the adjacent islands. But it is not so. The whole assumption on which the Roads and Bridges Act was passed, was that the roads throughout the county were of more or less benefit to the whole of the inhabitants of that county. It is quite true that there were no tolls on the Islands of Orkney; but the Roads and Bridges Act was passed to consolidate the road management and debts for the general benefit of the whole people, and it was held that the proprietors in distinct parts of the county away from the Mainland were interested in the road management, and should bear their fair share in the administration and payment of the consolidated debt which had been incurred prior to the passing of this Act in the formation of a road trust under the Act. For these reasons, I hold that it would be unjust and unfair to pass the Bill now before the House, and I hope it will be rejected on the second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member propose to make any Motion?

MR. LYELL: Yes, Sir; I beg to move, as an Amendment, that the Bill be read a second time upon this day six months.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College): I rise to second the Amendment, on public grounds. I am aware that this House is not a very fit tribunal for entering into the details of a dispute between Local Authorities, and I should not attempt to ask it to interpose in the second reading of this Bill on any such ground. Broadly, this Bill is introduced by half-a-dozen landed proprietors, who wish to relieve themselves from the assessment imposed upon them in common with other proprietors similarly situated in Scotland, by the Roads and Bridges Act, 1878. Now, I maintain that if it is desired to amend a Public Act it should be done by a Public Act. It would be subversive of the principle which governs Private Bill legislation to allow an exception to be made in favour of persons who are rich enough to introduce Private Bills into this House, and to deny it to persons so situated that they are not able to indulge in the luxury of Private Bill legislation. The whole case of the half-dozen Orkney proprietors who are promoting this Bill is to be found in a Paper issued by them to Members of this House in a paragraph printed in italics. They complain, in that document, that the effect of the Public Act of 1878 has been to impose on them assessments for the payment of the debt of the islands. They say that having no roads or no road debt, or having extinguished their road debt, it is unjust to impose upon them any burden in connection with the debt incurred in the construction of roads upon the other Islands. But the burden they now have to bear is only similar to that which the proprietors of land in other districts of Scotland are called upon to bear. This subject was referred to in the Report of the Crofters' Commission, which states that it is felt to be a considerable grievance in many of the Highland counties, and one which requires further legislation. On pages 62 and 63 of the Report of the Commission, it is pointed out that in a place called Glen, in the Island of Skye, there is a population of 200 persons who are paying road assessment without possessing a branch road, or even a tolerable track, and living more than four miles away from the public highway. In the Island of Lewis, on the south side of Loch Snizort, there is a population of 17,000, and the Commissioners say that they have no road available for their local use; and if they go by land they have to go the best way they can for some 14 miles round the Loch in order to reach the main road. And yet they are called upon to pay the assessment for roads. On the north coast of Applecroft there is an inhabited track, extending over 50 miles, on which there is no road, although there are 400 inhabitants, and they have to contribute to the assessment for roads, notwithstanding the fact that, as far as they are concerned, they have no roads to maintain. What the people of the Highlands complain of is, that they should be assessed for the maintenance of roads which they do not possess; whereas in the case of Orkney, these proprietors complain that they are assessed for the extinction of debt. That is a distinction without a difference. An assessment is an assessment in the one case as in the other. The Crofters' Commission recommends that the whole subject should be dealt with by general legislation, and I protest against this proposal for dealing with half-a-dozen proprietors specially. I beg to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Lyell.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Colonel MALCOLM (Argyllshire): As representing a constituency which, in a great measure, resembles in its general features that of Orkney, which is now under discussion—inasmuch as it is broken up very much by arms of the sea, and also having very much the same division of the road management between different districts, I hope I may be allowed to say a few words on this subject. I feel bound to differ materially from the two hon. Gentlemen who have moved and seconded the rejection of this Bill, as to their interpretation of the Act of 1878. I believe that if the Trustees of the Orkney Roads had appeared in this House at the time of the passing of that Act, they would have been protected in their insular character exactly in the same way as different districts in the County of Argyll were protected. It is specially provided in the Roads and Bridges (Scotland) Act, 1878, that—

> "If at the passing of the Act any island or group of islands, or part of an island, is treated as a separate district, as respects the management of highways, such district shall in all times, after the commencement of the Act, in the county of which such district forms part, be considered to form part of a separate district, thereafter called an insular district for the purposes of the Act."

Clause 58 relates to the construction of new roads and bridges, and the cost is confined especially to the district which is affected by such new road or bridge, and it is provided that—

> "No proposal shall be carried into effect without the consent of the District Committee of such district, and that no assessment shall be levied in any part of the county for the expenditure upon such construction; nor shall any assessment be levied in such district for the expense of constructing any new road or bridge in any part of the county."

That distinctly shows that the Legislature contemplated that the Islands and insular districts should be treated as entirely separate, or as counties in themselves. But, unfortunately, in the 71st clause of that Act, the whole of these districts are massed together for the purpose of paying the interest on debts already incurred. Therefore we meet with this difficulty—that these Islands are to be massed together as far as regards the debt, but that in every other respect they are to be regarded as separate districts. Now, it has been stated that the Gentlemen who are promoting this Bill are merely proprietors in some of the islands, who ask to be relieved from a payment to which they are justly liable. Well, that may be so to a certain extent, and under Clause 71 they undoubtedly are liable; but I believe that if they had not neglected their opportunity—if they had been represented at the time of the passing of the Act of 1878—they would have got some such clause inserted in that Act as Clause 81, which, in the matter of the district debt of Argyllshire, provides that—

> "The provisions of the Act shall not apply to the principal and interest due from the Mull district, nor to any debt incurred by a road district in any of the several districts into which the County of Argyll is divided."

Thereby showing that the Legislature was ready at that time, on a representation being made to it, to treat the debt incurred by one district as a debt due from that district, and payable by that district only. This debt, I may mention, has not been incurred recently. It has been asserted by the hon. Member who moved the rejection of the Bill. that some of the Gentlemen who are opposing the measure are of opinion that the security they possess for the existing debt is likely to be depreciated. Now, the real truth is that the whole of the money was borrowed under the Local Acts of 1857 and 1867—especially under the Orkney Road Acts of 1867, and even in that Act there was a distinction made in the case of the mainland district, which was allowed to borrow to the extent of 10 years of the gross proceeds of the assessment; whereas the Island districts, being much poorer, and not being able to raise so much money, were allowed to borrow up to 12 years of the gross proceeds of the assessment leviable in such districts. The distinction between the two has always been maintained, and the money was borrowed on the faith and security, not of the whole county, but of the separate districts. As to the roads being of no use to the general public, I think that any hon. Member who takes a glance at the map of Orkney will see that, really and truly, the roads are only available to the people of the different islands. I do not mean to say that they may not walk on them, but they would hardly go to the trouble and danger of transporting either horses or vehicles so as to make them make use of the different roads. Therefore, I think it is rather hard to levy on these islands, some 16 in number, which either have no roads, or else have no debt, having themselves made what roads they require—in some cases by the proprietors, and in others jointly by the proprietors and tenants—and who have already paid their share for the making and maintenance of their own roads—I think it would be a great hardship upon them to require them to continue their contribution towards the discharge of the debt incurred by the road trusts of other islands, simply because, by an oversight—you may call it neglect, and in that I cannot altogether disagree—they failed to make a proper representation of their case when the Roads and Bridges Act of 1878 was passed. But having been excluded from the exceptions contained in that Act by an oversight, I think it is hard that they should be taxed, having no debt of their own, as much as 9½*d.* in the pound upon their assessable rental for a contribution to the road debt of the mainland. Those Islands which gain under the present system, as brought about by the Act of 1878, are only two in number—namely, the mainland, which gains 4*d.* in the pound, and Westray, which gains 3*d.* in the pound. Perhaps I may be allowed to mention that many of the Gentlemen who are supporting and promoting the present Bill are large owners of property on the Mainland; but they think that as honest men, they ought to pay the debts they have incurred on the Mainland. They are also owners of property in the other Islands, and they are willing to bear their full share of the burdens incurred there. I trust that the House will read the Bill a second time, and send it to a Committee in the usual way.

MR. FINLAY (Inverness, &c.): I desire to say a few words in regard to this Bill. I do not propose to say much after the fair and lucid statement which has just been made by the hon. and gallant Member for Argyllshire (Colonel Malcolm); but I wish very shortly to state to the House why I consider that this is a measure which ought to be read a second time. The hon. Member who moved that the Bill should be read a second time on this day six months, entered into the previous history of this matter. He informed the House that a similar Bill was rejected in the last Parliament. Now, what took place was this: the Bill then introduced was thoroughly examined in the House of Lords, who, after hearing evidence, reported that the Preamble was proved. It then came down here on the eve of the General Election, and, on a Division, the second reading was rejected by a majority of 1—81 voting against and 80 for the Bill being read a second time. So that it may go before a Select Committee, which should hear evidence and examine into the circumstances of the case, I wish to lay before the House in a few words what appears to me to be the real ground for reading this Bill a second time. There is every reason to believe that the application of the Roads and Bridges Act of 1878 to the Orkney Islands was the result of an accident, and that it was not intended by the promoters of that Act to apply to such a county as Orkney. That Act applied to turnpike roads and cases where Statute labour existed. There are no turnpike roads in Orkney, and no Statute labour actually existed, although Statute labour existed in point of law. Some person seems to have found out that fact, although it was generally unknown to the inhabitants, and the result has been the application of this Act to the Islands of Orkney, although it was never intended to be so applied. Now, the result of the application of the Act to Orkney has been to commit an injustice which is so flagrant that it ought really not to remain unredressed. There are in the Orkneys some 22 islands, which are set out in the first Schedule of the Bill now before the House. In 16 of those islands there was no debt at all for roads at the time this Act came into operation. In five of them, there were debts ranging from £1,336 to £3,390. In one of them —the Mainland as it is called—there was a debt of upwards of £30,000. Those debts have been contracted for the local purposes of each island. Each island formed a district by itself. The inhabitants of one island get no benefit from the roads of another, and until this Act of 1878 came into force each island formed a district by itself, borrowed money for the purposes of its own road expenses, and neither contributed to, nor received help from, the other islands. The effect of the accidental application of the Roads Act of 1878 to the Orkney Islands was this—that these 16 islands which had no debt at all, and the other islands which had a small debt of their own, are called upon to contribute to the debt incurred for the roads on the mainland, with which they had absolutely no concern. A great deal has been stated about the proprietors who are promoting this measure being actuated by interested motives. The House will be glad to learn that it is not the proprietors of property in the other islands who are solely promoting this Bill; but that owners of property in the Mainland, imbued with a proper feeling of justice, are also supporting it. I apprehend, whether the assessments are paid by the proprietors or by the tenants, the object of this House is simply to do justice; and if the Act as it now stands is clearly doing an injustice and a wrong which was never intended when the Roads Act of 1878 was passed, it is only right that we should remedy it. These debts were incurred for local purposes in connection with particular islands, and there is no reason whatever why they should be thrown on other islands which have had nothing to do with them. The hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), in seconding the rejection of the Bill, stated that there are other places in Scotland where similar hardships exist, and he read extracts from the Report of the Crofters' Commission to show that the Commissioners had considered the hardship and recommended that it was one which ought to be dealt with by the Legislature. But I venture to say that this is a more flagrant case of hardship than can be found in the whole of Scotland. It is an injustice which never could have been perpetrated except by accident. The hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow says that the Act of 1878 was a public measure, and that if any injustice was committed by it, it ought also to be remedied by a public measure. If the hon. Member will forgive me this is a very similar case to that of Argyllshire, in regard to which he is fully aware that the clause originally inserted in the Bill was modified by this House upon proper representations being made to it, and on application being made for redress. If exceptional treatment was required in that case I maintain that it is much more urgently required in this, and I can see no reason why redress should be indefinitely postponed in the hope that hereafter some larger and more heroic measure may be passed by this House. I trust that the House will assent to the second reading of the Bill and send it to a Committee upstairs in the usual way, where its merits can be fairly considered and discussed.

MR. LYELL (Orkney and Shetland): I propose to say a few words only in reply to the remarks which have fallen from the hon. and gallant Member for Argyllshire (Colonel Malcolm), and the hon. and learned Member for Inverness (Mr. Finlay).

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that he is not entitled to a reply.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. COURTNEY) (Cornwall, Bodmin): Before the House goes to a Division, I hope I may be allowed to say a word in regard to this Bill. The Bill now under discussion is identical with that which was discussed in the month of June last year, which I then recommended the House to read a second time, and to send to a Committee in the ordinary way so that its provisions might be properly considered. The second reading, however, was rejected by a majority of one. It has now been introduced again, and having given further consideration to it, I may say that nothing I have heard to-day affects the opinion which I had formed in regard to it last year. I think the proper course for us to follow is the usual course of referring it to a Committee upstairs. There are two points, however, which have been raised to which I think reference ought to be made. It is stated that this is an attempt by a Private Bill to interfere with the provisions of a Public Act. Now, I have always entertained an opinion that it is highly improper to have the public law interfered with by a Private Bill, but in truth this is an interference with a transitory provision, and not with what is properly called public law. It does not in point of fact deal with the Roads and Bridges Act of 1878, but with pre-existing debts in the Orkney Islands, which are on all fours with the pre-existing debts in Argyllshire which were dealt with by the Roads and Bridges Act. It would appear that the debts of the Orkney Islands were not included by some oversight, and this is an attempt by a transitory provision to place the Orkneys in the same position as Argyllshire in regard to its pre-existing debts. The hon. Member who moved the rejection of the Bill laid some stress upon the effect which the measure would have upon the security of the creditors who have advanced money for the construction of roads. Now, those debts were contracted by each particular district concerned, and this Bill involves no interference whatever with the creditors. It is possible that some of the bonds may have come into the hands of other persons by transference and otherwise, without notice; but, if so, the security of the creditors could be perfectly safeguarded by provisions inserted in the Bill. Under these circumstances, I do not think there is any justification for the proposal to prevent the measure from going before a Committee upstairs, and I hope the House will consent to read it a second time.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 219; Noes 139: Majority 80.—(Div. List, No. 4.)

Main Question put.

Bill read a second time, and *committed*.

QUESTIONS.

——o——

SCOTLAND—THE SKYE CROFTERS.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) (for Mr. J. W. BARCLAY, Forfarshire), asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether he can state the amount of rates collected in Skye, from crofters paying less than £30 of rent, during the recent occupation of the island by Her Majesty's Marine Forces?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (MR. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): I told the hon. Gentleman the other day that I had not in my possession information which would enable me to distinguish between arrears of rate payable by one class of tenants and those paid by the other. I am afraid I cannot supplement that answer with any further useful information.

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)—ROBERT HUME, A MANIACAL PRISONER.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College), asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether it is true, as stated in the published Reports of the inquiry into the death of Robert Hume, an untried prisoner in Calton Gaol, Edinburgh, on the 2nd instant, that the prisoner in question, described as maniacal, confined on a charge of shooting, and at times requiring four men to hold him, was locked up for 48 hours in a cell with two other prisoners; whether, on the first night of his confinement, he was discovered "very violent" and "on top of the other prisoners;" whether, on the second evening, he was again found "very violent," and having torn the clothing off one of the other prisoners; whether, on the second night, he became "extremely violent," "shouting and bawling" from 12 till 4 in the morning, when he fell asleep, and that three hours later, his appearance having alarmed his fellow prisoners, he was discovered to be dead; whether there is an infirmary attached to the Calton Gaol; and, if so, why Hume was not sent there; whether the men shut up with Hume were untried prisoners; and, whether it is in accordance with the Prison Rules to expose prisoners to the dangers and annoyance incidental to confinement with violent and maniacal persons?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): I am inquiring into this matter, and have received a certain amount of information about it, but not enough to enable me to give the hon. Gentleman the information he desires. If he will put the Question down for another day, I will endeavour then to answer it.

DR. CAMERON said he would repeat the Question on Tuesday.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT—RETURN OF MEMBERS, 1880—INDEX OF NAMES.

MR. DIXON-HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge) asked the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, If the Return of Members of the Parliament of 1880, just laid upon the Table of the House, cannot be included in the Index, in course of preparation, of the Houses up to that date, so as to make the volume complete of all Parliaments to the last Reform Bill?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. STUART-WORTLEY) (Sheffield, Hallam): I have every hope of overcoming the difficulties of making the Index cover all the names.

ARMY—RIFLE RANGES.

MR. KING (Hull, Central) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether anything has been recently done by the Government to provide ranges for rifle practice of the Volunteers and Regular Forces, especially in the neighbourhood of London and other large towns; how much money has been spent in endeavouring to make Wormwood Scrubbs safe, and with what results; whether he has had his attention called to a system of safety sheds or screens which have been erected at Wormwood Scrubbs, Elford, and Walker-on-Tyne for 300-yard ranges, and in the Wellington Barracks, Windsor Barracks, and many other places for shorter ranges; whether he will lay upon the Table the official reports regarding this system, and the results of the experiments made with it; and, whether there are any objections to its general adoption?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): New rifle ranges have recently been provided for the Regular Forces at Aldershot, and at Strensall, near York, besides which additions and alterations to make them safe for practice with the Martini-Henry rifle have been made to the existing ranges at many stations. Volunteer Corps, as a rule, provide their own ranges out of the Capitation Grant; but when a range of the Regular Forces is convenient for a Volunteer Corps, and can be spared, the General Officer Commanding the District may allow them the use, on payment of £2 10*s.* per company yearly for each company actually using the range. Within the last three years £4,493 has been expended on Wormwood Scrubbs, with the result, it is believed, of rendering the butts safe. Safety screens have been erected for trial at Wormwood Scrubbs, and at Elford. At the latter range they have been favourably reported on; but the tests at Wormwood Scrubbs have not yet been sufficient for a conclusion to be arrived at. The only ranges at Wellington and Windsor Barracks are for the Morris tube barrels. These have been favourably reported upon as regards supplementary practice, and the system has been generally adopted for all large garrisons.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—MOONLIGHTERS AT MILL STREET, CO. CORK.

MR. SMITH-BARRY (Hunts, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, on 4th February, attacks were made by Moonlighters upon the houses of farmers, named Murphy, Philpott and Kelleher, living in the neighbourhood of Millstreet, in the County of Cork, the hair of daughters of these men was cut off by the Moonlighters; and, in the case of Murphy's daughters, tar was poured upon their heads; whether the alleged reason for these outrages was, that the girls had been seen speaking to policemen; and, whether his attention has been called to a speech made at or near Millstreet by the Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner) on 22nd January, and reported in *The Cork Daily Herald* of 25th January, in which he said—

> "He would be sorry to hear that a Millstreet man or woman spoke to an emergency man, and that any Millstreet man or woman spoke to a policeman; and he would ask fathers and brothers to see that girls did not speak to policemen in the district."

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) said that arising out of the Question of the hon. Member, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary whether the hon. Member for South Huntingdon was Chairman of the Cork Defence Union; and whether it was a fact that since the extraordinary number of the *employés* of that union and additional Royal Irish Constabulary had come to that district that the statistics of illegitimacy and immorality had enormously increased?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Sir, I do not think that the Question of the hon. Member is one that I could properly answer. With reference to the Question on the Paper, it is the fact that the house of a farmer named Murphy, residing in the neighbourhood of Millstreet, was attacked, and that his daughters were assaulted in the manner described, and warned not to speak to policemen again. It is also true that a meeting had been held in the vicinity a few days previously, and that *The Cork Daily Herald* of the 25th of January contains a report of the proceedings, attributing to the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner) the use of the words quoted in the Question; but I cannot say whether the report is accurate. [Dr. TANNER: It is accurate.] The police have no information as to the alleged attacks upon the other farmers named in the Question.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—SUB-POSTMASTER OF GURTEEN, CO. GALWAY.

DR. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is a fact that Thomas G. Griffin, of Gurteen, near Ballinasloe, county Galway, was appointed acting sub-postmaster in the village of Gurteen last May; whether the permanent appointment has been conferred upon a man named Thomas Carr; whether Carr ever applied for the appointment; whether Griffin's father held the position of sub-postmaster from the establishment of a branch until the appointment of his son G. Griffin; whether there is any post office at Gurteen, and what is the distance from the village to the nearest post town; and, whether he will provide for the alleged want?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): No appointment, either temporary or permanent, has been made to the Gurteen Post Office. The office became vacant in May last through the resignation of L. Griffin, who had held it since its establishment in 1877. The inhabitants were opposed to the appointment of any person but Griffin's son; but, as I did not consider him suitable for the position, I was compelled to close the office temporarily. It will be re-opened as soon as a suitable person can be found willing to take it. Gurteen is five miles from the nearest Post Office.

DR. TANNER said that the second paragraph had not been answered—namely, whether Carr had been appointed?

MR. RAIKES: The hon. Member is not correctly informed. The appointment has not been conferred upon Thomas Carr, not even temporarily. The facts, I believe, are that Carr was invited to say whether he would accept the appointment, and declined to do so.

NEWSPAPERS — POST OFFICE ACT, 1870 — NEWSPAPER LIBEL AND REGISTRATION ACT, 1881.

MR. KNOWLES (Salford, W.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether under section 6 of "The Post Office Act, 1870," which, in effect and so far as material, is that a publication composed "wholly or in great part" of news, with or without advertisements, is a newspaper, he requires the greater part of such a publication to be composed of news; and, if so, whether he will make regulations to reconcile that section with section 1 of "The Newspaper Libel and Registration Act, 1881," by which, so far as material, a newspaper may be composed "only or principally" of advertisements?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In the Act of 1870 the object of the Legislature was to give facilities, by means of an exceptional rate of postage, to the dissemination of news and the discussion of the current topics of the day; and the intention of the section to which the hon. Member refers was that, to be accepted as a newspaper, a publication must consist principally of news. The Act of 1881 (which has no reference whatever to the Post Office) was, of course, passed for quite a different purpose; and the definition of a newspaper was accordingly a different one. No regulations could be made by me for the reconcilement of provisions in different Acts of Parliament; but even if such a thing were within my power, it would be quite unjustifiable to give exceptional privileges to advertisements in the way which the hon. Member seems to indicate.

DRAINAGE OF LANDS — COMPENSATION TO RIPARIAN OWNERS.

MR. AINSLIE (Lancashire, N. Lonsdale) asked the President of the Local Government Board, If it is his intention to bring in a Bill to provide compensation to riparian owners of land who suffer from floods caused by drainage operations in lands situated higher up the course of streams drained into by such operations?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. RITCHIE) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I cannot hold out any hope that the Government will introduce such a Bill.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND) — THE CROSSMAGLEN PRISONERS.

MR. BLANE (Armagh, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Government would consent to the liberation of those prisoners sentenced to penal servitude for an alleged conspiracy at Crossmaglen, County Armagh, in 1882, having regard to the fact that no one was injured by any act of the prisoners, and their having already suffered more than five years' penal servitude?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Successive Viceroys have had before them the case of the convicts still in custody in this matter, and have felt themselves unable to interfere with the due course of the law. I cannot hold out any hopes of a different decision.

MR. BLANE: Has the case been considered by the present Government?

[No reply.]

AFRICA (WEST COAST)—REVIVAL OF THE SLAVE TRADE.

MR. M'ARTHUR (Leicester) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have received information from Madagascar that the Slave Trade on the West Coast has been re-opened; whether it is alleged that British subjects are implicated in the traffic; at what distance from the West Coast the nearest Consular authority resides; and, whether the Representatives of Her Majesty in Madagascar have judicial authority enabling them to deal with offenders against the law?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): Grave abuses are said to have occurred recently, practically a slave trade, in connection with the shipment of labourers from the West Coast of Madagascar to Réunion. It is alleged that British subjects, principally belonging to Mauritius, were implicated. Energetic steps have been taken, both by the British and French Governments, to check these abuses. The British Consul, who has judicial authority over British subjects, resides at present at Tamatave. A Vice-Consul is about to be appointed at Majunga, on the West Coast, with sufficient authority.

THE SEYCHELLES ISLANDS—THE CHIEF OFFICER OF POLICE.

COMMANDER BETHELL (York, E.R., Holderness) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If a communication has been received from a man lately serving in the police at Mahé Seychelles, whose name seems to be Midard Nahal, containing charges of a grave character against the Chief Officer of Police of that Island; and, if he proposes to order an inquiry to be made into the matter; and, if so, whether, taking into consideration the nature of the communications recently sent to the Colonial Office from a resident in the island, he will give special instructions as to the official charged with the inquiry?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead): Such a communication has been received, and instructions were sent to the Governor of Mauritius, by the mail of the 23rd of December, to despatch either the Inspector General or the Superintendent of Police to Seychelles by the earliest opportunity, to make a comprehensive inquiry into the condition and efficiency of the Seychelles police.

SOUTH AFRICA—AFFAIRS OF ZULULAND.

COMMANDER BETHELL (York, E.R., Holderness) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, When he will be able to lay upon the Table of the House further Papers relating to the affairs of Zululand?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (Hampstead), in reply, said, he hoped that the Papers on Zululand, which were laid on the Table on the 3rd instant, would be in the hands of hon. Members by the end of this week, or the beginning of next week. Further Papers were in preparation, and would be published shortly.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): Before putting the following Question, I desire to say that the bad grammar in it is not mine. The Question is—To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the right of the Crown in criminal cases to direct jurors to stand by is in England seldom or never exercised; and, that the only procedure by which particular jurors are in England excluded from the jury box by the Crown in any case can be equally availed of by the accused.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): By way of preface I may take the liberty of pointing out to the hon. Member that the Home Department is not a legal department of the Government; therefore, in answering Questions of law, I cannot undertake to be always correctly informed. I beg to say that the right of the Crown to which the hon. Member refers is practically exercised. The accused has a peremptory challenge to six jurors; whereas the Crown has no right to a peremptory challenge without showing cause. To any other challenges the accused must show cause; but need only state the grounds upon which he challenges the six jurors.

MR. R. T. REID (Dumfries, &c.) wished to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether he had ever known a case in England in which more than one or two of the same jury had been ordered to stand aside?

MR. J. E. REDMOND (Wexford, N.) inquired whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman was acquainted with the passage in Sir James Stephen's *History of the Criminal Law*, in which he said—

> "Practically speaking, this—the exercise of rights by the Crown—is a matter of hardly any importance at the present day in England. In the course of my experience I do not remember more than one or two occasions on which there have been any considerable number of challenges?"

MR. MATTHEWS: I have never read that passage.

MR. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.) asked whether the Home Secretary's reply referred also to cases of misdemeanour?

MR. MATTHEWS: I expressly said "in cases of felony." In cases of misdemeanour, as far as I know, nobody has a right of peremptory challenge—neither the Crown nor the accused.

MR. B. COLERIDGE (Sheffield, Attercliffe) wished to ask the Home Secretary whether he had read the law laid down in the case of "The Queen *v.* Blakeman?"——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned Member is now asking a Question which does not fairly arise upon the Question on the Paper.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS.

MR. MAHONY (Meath, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, on the last day on which evictions took place at Glenbeigh, the Sheriff, after handing over possession to Mr. Roe, retired with his bailiffs protected only by four police; and, whether, after he had gone a short distance, the District Inspector sent a sergeant to stop him, and made him remain for nearly an hour while the rest of the police were protecting Mr. Roe in his work of levelling the houses?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Sheriff did retire, accompanied by a small number of police. The other police remained to protect Mr. Roe. The District Inspector, after the Sheriff had gone a short distance, sent word to ask the Sheriff to allow some of his men to assist the police in providing for the crossing of a river, which detained them for about half an hour.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): Arising out of the Question, I would like to ask one further Question—whether the levelling and the burning of houses is part of the legal remedy which a landlord has a right to have executed by the Sheriff; and, if not——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is a Question which the hon. Gentleman must give Notice of in the usual way.

MR. CONYBEARE: I will give Notice.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES (IRELAND) ACT—NAVAN UNION.

MR. MAHONY (Meath, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether an inquiry was held in October last by Captain Fair, regarding the sites for 16 labourers' cottages in the Donaghpatrick Division of the Navan Union, but that as yet no report has been made by him; and, whether he will urge the Local Government Board to expedite proceedings, with a view to enabling the Board of Guardians to place the labourers in possession of the land in time to plant the potato crop of this year?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The cause of delay was that it had been found necessary to obtain additional information, and, in some instances, legal advice. The order confirming the scheme will be issued as soon as possible.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—THE GLENBEIGH EVICTIONS.

MR. MAHONY (Meath, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the requisition for police forwarded by the Sheriff before the Glenbeigh evictions, also a copy of the 10 days' notice giving the nature of the proceedings and the names of the tenants to be proceeded against?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): In this case the Sheriff had a personal interview with the Divisional Magistrate, and all the arrangements were then made as regards his protection during the eviction. I have no objection to lay on the Table a copy of the Sheriff's written requisition and notice, which are contained in one document.

MR. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.): Would the right hon. Baronet say whether it is true that in this case of serious eviction neither Sheriff nor Divisional Magistrate was present at all?

[No reply.]

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM — CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether Irish Crown Solicitors in directing jurors on Irish Criminal trials to "stand by" exercise their own discretion, or act under the instructions of the Attorney General, or the prosecuting counsel who represents him; whether the instructions contained in the printed Circular addressed to Crown Solicitors on this point, and recently communicated to the House, are supplemented by oral instructions given on the spot; and, whether it is the duty or the practice of the Crown Counsel to interfere in the selection of jurors; and, if so, in what manner and to what extent?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) (Liverpool, Walton) (who replied) said: The only instructions of any kind, oral or written, that have been given to Crown Solicitors as to directing jurors to stand by are those which have been communicated to the House by my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for

Ireland. It will be seen from these instructions that the Crown Solicitor is to consult the leading Crown counsel when there is time for him to do so.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—PETTY SESSION AT HOSPITAL, COUNTY LIMERICK.

Mr. FINUCANE (Limerick, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether at a Petty Sessions Court, Colonel Pearse, R.M., in the chair, was held at Hospital, County Limerick, on the 2nd instant; whether the Kilteely fife and drum band, when passing the Courthouse, was, without warning, attacked by a body of police under the command of District Inspector Greene, Bruffa; if their band instruments were broken, and three of the bandsmen seriously wounded; whether, during the attack on the bandsmen, Mr. Edmond Davoren complained to Colonel Pearse of the conduct of Inspector Greene, who only desisted from his attack on the people on a threat of bringing his conduct before Parliament; whether Colonel Pearse stated publicly in Court that the only order he gave was to clear the Court, and not to use any unnecessary violence; and, whether the Government will order an investigation into the conduct of Inspector Greene on this and previous similar occasions?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The band referred to was causing noise and disturbance, interfering with the business of the Court. The magistrate instructed the police to stop the band, and that was done. It is not a fact that anybody was seriously hurt. I see no grounds for the investigation.

Mr. M'CARTAN (Down, S.): Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman if this was the same District Inspector Greene recently removed from Belfast? [*Cries of* "Order, order!"]

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I really do not know, Sir. I meant to convey that, whoever the District Inspector may be, he simply acted under the orders of the magistrate.

Mr. W. ABRAHAM (Limerick, W.): May I be permitted to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether this District Inspector Greene is the same officer with reference to whom Colonel Forbes, R.M., of Belfast, gave evidence before the recent Royal Commission, to the effect that he persistently neglected his duty in not having his men in proper time to attend to their several duties?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I can only say that I think it is most unfair to District Inspector Greene, or to any officer of the police, to ask such a Question as that without giving Notice.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—INSANITARY STATE OF RATHDOWN WORKHOUSE.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin, Co., S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Local Government Board will take steps to compel the Guardians of the Rathdown Union to remedy the nuisance caused by the defective drainage of the Rathdown Workhouse, as the Guardians have hitherto failed to comply with the repeated requests of the ratepayers to have the matter efficiently attended to?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): I understand that there has been great delay, owing to the Guardians having been unable to obtain a certain engineer that they desired to employ. I think there was ground for the delay, but I have instructed the Local Government Board to see what can be done to remedy that.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—ASSAULT AT COOLGREANEY.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin, Co., S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is a fact that George Freeman, bailiff to Mr. George Brooke, and an emergency man named Woods, employed on the Brooke Estate, came into the village of Coolgreaney on the 5th instant and got drunk; if they then attacked a Mr. Doyle in his own shop; if, when turned out, Woods threatened to use his revolver on the crowd outside, and if Freeman presented a loaded gun at them, and was in the act of firing upon them when the police came up and disarmed him; if Woods and Freeman are to be prosecuted, and when; and, if Woods was ever prosecuted before for a similar offence, and where?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): I am informed that an altercation arose in a public-house on the occasion referred to. Charges are at present pending, and will be heard in a few days, against Freeman for being drunk in possession of firearms, and against Woods for being drunk and obstructing the police. I cannot say whether Woods has been proceeded against before.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Arising out of that Question, I wish to ask whether this Woods is the same man who presented a revolver at unarmed men in Woodford, and who was denounced by Chief Baron Palles for perjury in the Court at Sligo; and whether, under these circumstances, the licence which this man now holds will be withdrawn?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I really do not know whether Woods is the same man that the hon. Member alludes to or not. The question of the withdrawal of the licence would depend, of course, upon the evidence that was given.

ADMIRALTY—DEVONPORT DOCKYARD—THE PROPOSED IMPERIAL INSTITUTE.

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether his attention has been directed to the following statement in *The Western Daily Mercury* of the 8th instant:—

> "Rear Admiral H. D. Grant, C.B., Admiral Superintendent of Devonport Dockyard, yesterday notified by means of bills, which were distributed over the yards at Devonport and Keyham, that he was in receipt of a communication from the Prince of Wales, inviting his co-operation in the formation of the proposed Imperial Institute. As he (the Admiral) had no doubt that the officers and men desired to take part in this great work, he would have papers printed fully setting forth the objects of the Institute, derived from a circular which had been forwarded him. A week would be allowed for the consideration of the papers, after which it was his intention to convene a meeting of the officers of all grades, and leading men from each department, to assemble at a convenient date in the dining hall of Devonport Yard, for the purpose of electing officers and taking steps to collect subscriptions. The Admiral desires it to be clearly understood that whatever amount is raised will be remitted as from 'the officers and men of Her Majesty's Dockyards, Devonport and Keyham,' it being his intention to head the list as a Dockyard officer, and not to subscribe to any other branch having the same object in view;"

whether he is aware that the method employed to collect subscriptions has been as follows:—That the Admiral and Chief Officers of Departments cause lists to be made up of all the men under their control, opposite to which are columns ruled for £ *s. d.* That these lists are issued to the subordinate officers, who, pencil in hand, canvass their workmen for subscriptions, and marking off the names of those who subscribe, return the lists to the chiefs of the several departments, who are thus able to mark the men who have refused to subscribe; whether it is the fact that, on a former occasion, when a tablet, to the memory of the late Admiral Wilson, was proposed to be erected, the then Chief Constructor sent his own messenger around to the various offices to solicit contributions from each individual; and, whether it is a part of the public duties of the officers and officials of the Dockyards to busy themselves with the collecting of subscriptions either for memorial tablets or for the Prince of Wales' Imperial Institute; and, if not, whether he will take steps to prevent it for the future?

The FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON)(Middlesex, Ealing), in reply, said, the facts were as stated in the Question of the hon. Gentleman. There was, however, no foundation for the suggestion that any compulsion or undue influence of any kind was sought to be exercised with regard to the collection of subscriptions. He did not see anything in Admiral Grant's action to cause him to interfere.

FISHING BOATS AMENDMENT BILL—LEGISLATION.

Mr. HENEAGE (Great Grimsby) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, When the Fishing Boats Amendment Bill will be introduced; and, whether the Bill is in the same shape in which it passed through the House of Commons last Session?

The SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I propose to introduce the Bill referred to by the right hon. Gentleman on Monday. The Bill will be substantially the same as that which passed the House of Commons last Session.

INLAND REVENUE—STAMP DUTY ON RECEIPTS FROM INCOME TAX AND POOR RATES.

Mr. COX (Clare, E.) asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether in Ireland receipts for Income Tax and Poor Rates are exempt from Stamp

Duty; whether receipts for county cess, which in a great measure is applied to defraying the expenses of various charitable institutions and for Crown purposes, is not so exempt; and, if the Government will grant exemption to county cess receipts?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): Receipts for Income Tax and Poor Rates are exempt from Stamp Duty in Ireland. Duty is payable, however, upon receipts for county cess in Ireland, as upon receipts for poor rates and county rates in England; and it is not considered advisable to vary the practice in Ireland.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE MID-WINTER ASSIZES.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether he will state to the House in what respects the present Mid-Winter Assize arrangements are of more general public convenience than a system whereby the Judge would go circuit from county to county, or whereby fewer counties would be grouped; and, whether he can give any definite information as to the relative expense of a prosecution under the present system, as compared with cases in which prisoners are tried in their own county?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) (Liverpool, Walton) (who replied) said: The existing system enables some of the Judges to remain in Dublin to transact business there, and has been found generally satisfactory.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Is it for the convenience of jurors in the counties which are selected for the Winter Assize Courts?

[No reply.]

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—WINTER ASSIZES—RE-ARRANGEMENT OF CIRCUITS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the further observations in reference to English Winter Assize arrangements made by Mr. Justice Grantham at Hertford, and reported in Wednesday's *Standard;* whether it is the fact, as stated by the learned Judge, that there have been cases in which, owing to the transfer of prisoners and witnesses from one county to another, the prosecution of a petty larceny has cost as much as £100; whether other English Judges entertain, and have expressed, views similar to those of Mr. Justice Grantham; and, when the decision of the Lord Chancellor as to the re-arrangement of Circuits may be expected?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): I have seen, Sir, in the newspaper, the observations attributed to Mr. Justice Grantham. As to the second part of the Question, I am informed by the Examiner of Costs that he knows of no case in which the cost of a prosecution for a larceny has reached £100, and that the average cost of prosecutions at Assizes throughout the year is under £15. As to the third part of the Question, I have not been made acquainted with the views entertained by the other English Judges in reference to this subject. A Committee of Judges is considering the subject, and the Lord Chancellor hopes he may be able shortly to recommend a scheme for dealing with the subject.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Would the right hon. and learned Gentleman say what is the cost of prosecutions at Winter Assizes as compared with prosecutions at other Assizes?

MR. MATTHEWS: I cannot do so, Sir.

QUARRIES' REGULATION—LEGISLATION.

MR. T. E. ELLIS (Merionethshire) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will this Session introduce a Measure for the regulation and inspection of quarries, similar to or identical with that introduced by his Predecessor at the Home Office in a previous Session?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said, he understood the hon. Member for the Forest of Dean (Mr. T. Blake) had brought in a Bill dealing with this subject, on which he would take the opportunity of stating his own view.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS—ANNUAL EXPENDITURE ON THE PARKS.

COLONEL HUGHES (Woolwich) asked the First Commissioner of Works, What the average has been, for the last three years, of annual expenditure on Victoria Park, Battersea Park, Kennington Park, Bethnal Green, Westminster Bridge, and the Chelsea Embankment respectively, proposed to be transferred to the Metropolitan Board of Works; and, what is the amount of the unpaid debt on any of these Parks and Gardens?

Mr. WEBSTER (St. Pancras, E.) further asked, What is the annual income proposed to be transferred by the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works in aid of the maintenance of the Parks proposed to be transferred to the Metropolitan Board; and what balance, on the experience of the last three years, would have to be provided out of rates; also the annual interest on debts relating to the Parks; and the amount of debt; and, how he proposes the Metropolitan Board should raise the requisite sums?

The FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. Plunket) (Dublin University): The average annual expenditure during the last three years has been—on Victoria Park, £7,421; Battersea Park, £7,076; Kennington Park, £1,340; Bethnal Green Garden, £330; Westminster Bridge, £3,028; Chelsea Embankment, £64—total, £19,259. The only debt on the above is that on Battersea Park, which is—principal of loan by the Public Works Loan Commissioners, £100,000; arrears of simple interest on the above at 4 per cent, £73,000: total, £173,000. Towards meeting the charge on account of this debt there is available an income of £5,400 per annum, derived from the letting of land on building leases. This income is gradually increasing, and when all the surplus land has been let it may be expected to reach £6,800 a-year. There is also an income of about £140 a-year derived from grazings in Battersea and Victoria Parks.

JURIES (IRELAND) ACT, 1871—JURY PANEL AT SLIGO.

Dr. KENNY (Cork, S.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, as section 19 of Lord O'Hagan's Juries Act, 1871, prescribes that

> "if any Sheriff shall return the name of any person to serve as a juror contrary to the provisions for the returning of jurors in rotation hereinbefore in this section contained, the Court or Judge before whom such person is returned to serve as a juror, shall in every such case impose any fine not exceeding £5 upon the Sheriff,"

Can he say whether Chief Baron Palles, at Sligo, imposed any fine on the Sheriff in the case of jurors irregularly summoned on the quashed panel; and, if so, how much per juror illegally summoned; and, if not, can explanation be given why the law has not been carried out?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) (Liverpool, Walton) (who replied) said: The section of the Juries Act of 1871 contains the Proviso referred to in the Question. The entire panel was quashed by the Lord Chief Baron on the ground of irregularity after a previous finding by two triers on a challenge to the array, acquitting the Sheriff of any partiality, fraud, or wilful misconduct. This finding was approved of by the learned Judge. I am not aware that he imposed any fine, or that any suggestion was made on behalf of any juror or by the learned counsel for the prisoners that the Proviso applied to the case, or that a fine could or ought to have been imposed, and I see no reason for holding a different opinion.

Dr. KENNY: Might I ask, is not the clause mandatory on the Judge?

Mr. GIBSON: I have stated my opinion, Sir.

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.) asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether, in trials for misdemeanour in England, the defendant is allowed to object to jurors as they are called, without showing any cause, till the panel is exhausted (on its first calling); and, whether that practice has been approved by the decision in Reg. v. Blakeman, 3 C and K 97?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) (Isle of Wight): Before I answer this Question, I beg to submit to the House that it is not for the interest or furtherance of the convenience of this House, nor the public interest, that Questions of this kind should be addressed to the Law Officers of the Crown. I am perfectly willing to assist private Members to the utmost of my ability. I do not pretend to be infallible; but, of course, private Members can obtain advice on questions of pure law otherwise than from the Law Officers. While answering the Question, I respectfully protest against Questions of this kind being put upon the Paper. In reply to the hon. Member, I have to say that on trials for misdemeanour in England it is not the practice to allow the defendant to object to jurors, as they are called, without showing any cause, until the panel is exhausted. The defendant has no such right. The only practice of the kind is that if a prisoner, for reasonable cause, intimates to the prosecuting counsel that he has an objection to a particular juror, the prosecuting counsel does, as a rule, consent to the particular juror not being called, or directs the officer of the Court not to call him. This is not done in consequence of any right which exists in the defendant. The practice is a very rare occurrence; and I think I may say that at the Old Bailey it does not occur more than once or twice in some years.

Mr. CHANCE: I would direct the attention of the hon. and learned Gentleman to the fact that he has not answered the last paragraph of my Question.

Sir RICHARD WEBSTER: The practice followed in that case has not been followed in the Criminal Courts of this country.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM — CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. CHANCE (Kilkenny, S.) asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether, in trials for misdemeanour in Ireland, the prisoner is entitled to challenge without cause, or object to without showing any cause, any greater number of jurors than six?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) (Liverpool, Walton): The right of challenge in misdemeanour cases in Ireland is, as the hon. Member probably knows, regulated by statute. By the 10th section of the Juries Procedure Act, 1876, a person tried for misdemeanour has six peremptory challenges without cause assigned. This right was given for the first time in 1876, but does not interfere with or curtail the Common Law right of challenge for cause shown.

Mr. CHANCE: I wish to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether it is the practice in Ireland to permit a prisoner on trial for misdemeanour to object to any juror without showing cause on the first calling of the panel?

[No reply.]

EMIGRATION STATISTICS FOR 1886.

Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN (Denbighshire, E.) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, When the emigration statistics for the year 1886 will be circulated?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Return referred to by the right hon. and learned Gentleman is now in the course of preparation, and will be cirlated in about three weeks.

INDIA (BOMBAY)—ABSTINENCE FROM STRONG DRINK.

Mr. S. SMITH (Flintshire) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he is aware that there is a movement among the population of the Tannah and Colaba Collectorates of the Bombay Presidency in favour of total abstinence from strong drink; and that, for this end, the Natives propose to make abstinence a rule of their caste; and, if he is further aware that the Government, in order to stop this movement, have put eight of the leaders in prison, and have issued a proclamation that if anybody—

> "By threats of violence, or otherwise, endeavour to hinder others from purchasing or drinking liquors he will render himself liable to criminal prosecution;"

and, whether a notice has been distributed in the Colaba Collectorate which states that—

> "People have full liberty to drink spirits or not as they choose, and that whoever hinders them will be prosecuted criminally, and will be awarded the highest punishment laid down in the law?"

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir John Gorst) (Chatham): According to the official information received by the Secretary of State, the movement referred to was not one in favour of total abstinence, but a strike against the severe restrictions enforced on the tapping and sale of toddy, and the high price of liquor. The Secretary of State has not yet received any official information respecting the eight men alleged to have been imprisoned in December last, or the proclamation referred to; but I may observe that, even in the United Kingdom, persons who "by threats of violence endeavoured to hinder others from purchasing or drinking liquors," would "render themselves liable to criminal prosecution." A notice was issued by the Collector of Colaba in October last, which is probably that referred to in the Question. It did not commend itself to the Government of Bombay, and was, by their orders, withdrawn. The Secretary of State will make further inquiry into the matter.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—CONTRACTS FOR CARTRIDGES FOR QUEENSLAND.

Mr. HANBURY (Preston) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether Messrs. Latimer Clark, Muirhead, and Company, Limited, of Northumberland Works, Millwall, to whom a contract has been given for 500,000 cartridges, are not, as described in the Post Office London Commercial Directory for 1887—

> "Telegraph engineers and contractors, manufacturers of electrical instruments, iron poles, insulators, insulated wires, and all descriptions of telegraph, electric light, and torpedo apparatus;"

what appliances they possess, and how many mechanics they employ, for the special manufacture of the cartridges described in their contract; whether they have ever manufactured these or any other cartridges; whether they are not a commission house, and act as agents for Herr Lorenz, the cartridge manufacturer, of Carlsruhe; whether, in giving such contracts, the Department merely accepts the lowest tender, or takes into consideration the nature of the firm to which they are given; and, who is responsible for the contract in question?

The SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. Northcote) (Exeter): Messrs. Latimer Clark, Muirhead, and Co. are engineers who, as my hon. Friend states, have chiefly devoted their attention to telegraphic apparatus and torpedoes. They are, and have been for some years, contractors to the War Department. In 1886 they purchased the English rights in Lorenz's patents connected with solid-base cartridges, and the machinery for producing them, and applied to be placed upon the War Office list of contractors for cartridges. Here I may, perhaps, be permitted to correct a misapprehension which I am told has arisen from my former answer on this subject. The cartridges ordered for Queensland are of the Government pattern for Martini-Henry rifles, and there is no German patent involved in them. The patents to which I referred are in connection with the machinery for their production. In replying to the heads of the hon. Member's Question, which had specific reference to Messrs. Latimer Clark, Muirhead, and Co., the House will understand that for the facts I give I have, in a large degree, to rely upon statements furnished by the contractors themselves, the accuracy of which I have no reason to doubt. Several of the appliances which will be used were *in situ* in December; others will, it is stated, be set in motion very shortly. These appliances have been purchased from Herr Lorenz, the patentee, who has sent over three experts to superintend their erection. Immediately the machinery is ready these workmen will return to Germany. The contract provides that 120,000 cartridges are to be delivered by February 25; and the same number weekly until the whole are completed. The brass sheet has not arrived from Birmingham. As soon as it does, sufficient hands will be employed to insure the due execution of the contract. It is not a Government factory; and I have not felt it necessary to ask for a fuller assurance, as the contract contains a penalty clause. I am informed that Herr Lorenz has no interest in the firm of Latimer Clark, Muirhead, and Co., and that they are not in any sense his agents. The correspondence with the firm had been going on for some weeks before this particular demand arose. The premises, when empty, had been inspected by officers of the Royal Laboratory, and reported suitable for the manufacture of ammunition. With regard to the general system of making contracts, it is not the practice of the War Department to accept the lowest tender without inquiry. It is the duty of the Director of Contracts to develop competition; but new contractors, or contractors who take up a new line, are required to fulfil a trial order before they are trusted with an important contract. This contract for 500,000 rounds was a trial order, and was decided on in the ordinary course by the Director of Contracts.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) asked the hon. Gentleman, whether his attention had been called to the statement made by the hon. Member for Aston (Mr. Kynoch); and whether it was true, as stated by the hon. Member, that he sent in a tender for the contract which was given to this other firm?

MR. NORTHCOTE: Yes; a firm with which I believe the hon. Member has some connection did send in a tender. But this tender, which was accepted, was one sent in at a lower rate.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I desire, Sir, to ask the Attorney General, whether a Member of the House, in seeking a contract from the Government, did not thereby forfeit his seat?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) (Isle of Wight): I decline to answer that Question.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES—THE "QUEEN *v.* DILLON."

MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will cause a record to be kept of the number of jurors ordered to "stand by" or challenged by the Crown and traversers respectively in the trial, "Queen *v.* Dillon and others," now proceeding in Dublin, and a copy of such record to be laid upon the Table of the House?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) (Liverpool, Walton) (who replied) said: The course suggested would be without precedent, and open to misconstruction.

MR. J. E. ELLIS: Do I understand the hon. and learned Gentleman to say that no record will be kept?

MR. GIBSON: Yes, Sir.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES—THE "QUEEN *v.* DILLON, O'BRIEN, AND OTHERS."

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been drawn to the decision in the "Queen *v.* Dillon, O'Brien, and others," whereby it has been held that, although defendants' solicitor swore that the Grand Jury was irregularly and illegally empanelled, the Judge ruled that the alleged misconduct of the High Sheriff of county Dublin could not be questioned by a challenge to the array, a challenge to the poll, or an appeal to the judicial discretion of the Judge himself; and, whether the Government intend to propose any alteration of the Law on the subject?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) (Liverpool, Walton) (who replied) said: This Question appears to-day on the Paper for the first time. My only knowledge of the matters referred to in the Question is derived from the public newspapers. I have seen no copy of the affidavit mentioned. It does not appear that there was any finding or decision that the allegation of irregularity or misconduct against the Sheriff was sustained in fact. The learned Judge appears to have ruled that persons returned for trial against whom no bills were found could not, as a matter of law, challenge or remove Grand Jurors, there being no record. The learned counsel for the traversers insisted that they had such right, and their objections were noted by the learned Judge who received the challenges, so that they may have the benefit of them if their contention is well founded. The Government do not intend to propose an Amendment in the existing law. I have to protest against this Question being put to me. ["Order!" *from the Home Rule Members.*] I protest against Questions being put with regard to pending criminal prosecutions. ["Order!"]

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I rise to Order. I wish to ask you, Sir, as a matter of Order, whether a Member of this House is justified in entering into debatable matter in answer to a Question?

MR. SPEAKER: No; that would certainly be contrary to the Rule. What I understand the hon. and learned Gentleman to be doing is replying to the principle involved in a series of Questions on the Paper to-day, and laying the foundation for the determination on his part not to reply to Questions which involve legal proceedings now going on.

MR. GIBSON: I must protest against Questions being asked in this House with regard to pending prosecutions, as to matters of law which are likely to be raised in the course of the case, addressed to the prosecuting counsel by an hon.

and learned Gentleman who represents some of the traversers.

MR. T. M. HEALY: What the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor General for Ireland has said comes near, to some extent, an imputation upon myself; and I must ask you, Sir, to allow me to state a few words in reply. He refers to a pending matter, and complains of Questions being put upon a pending matter. But the matter to which I referred is closed, and cannot be re-opened; and, therefore, my reference to it refers to a final matter, not a pending matter. I would also ask to be allowed to state, with reference to the hon. and learned Gentleman's statement that he had not seen the affidavit in which the Sheriff was charged on the oath of the solicitor with fraud and partiality, that the affidavit was refused by the Judge to be allowed to be opened.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—"THE JURY SYSTEM—THE QUEEN *v.* JOHN DILLON, M.P."—RIGHT OF CHALLENGE.

MR. COBB (Warwick, S.E., Rugby) asked Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Whether, under the jury system in Ireland, the advisers of the Crown have the power, in the case of the "Queen *v.* John Dillon, M.P., and others," to select out of the 250 names on the panel such jury as they may think fit, subject only to the right of the prisoners to challenge six names out of the whole panel?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Liverpool, Walton): The Crown has the power, subject to the traversers' right of challenge, to direct any juror to stand by until the panel is gone through. Under the provisions of the Juries Act the names of all the jurors are put in a ballot-box and balloted for, and the jurors who are drawn and are present are called to the jury-box accordingly. The power of the Crown to stand by is exercised when the juror drawn in the ballot is called to be sworn, and is technically limited only by the condition that the inquest shall not remain untaken. In this respect there does not appear to be any difference between the English and Irish law, though there may be some in practice.

MR. T. C. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour): Arising out of the answer of the hon. and learned Gentleman, I desire to ask whether the power exercised by the Crown has been exercised in this case by the Crown Solicitor; and whether it was true——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE JURY SYSTEM—RIGHT OF CHALLENGE.

MR. COBB (Warwick, S.E., Rugby) asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether, according to the practice under the jury system in England, the Crown and prisoners have equal rights as to challenging jurors?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) (Isle of Wight): This Question has already been answered by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary, in answer to the Question of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Maurice Healy), and I have nothing to add to his answer.

BURMAH — MILITARY OPERATIONS — COST OF THE WAR.

MR. S. SMITH (Flintshire) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether he still adheres to his statement, made on 30th August, 1886, that the cost of the war in Upper Burmah would not exceed 100 lacs of rupees, say £1,000,000 sterling, according to the usual method of reckoning Indian accounts?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham), in reply, said, that next week, when he would answer the Question of the hon. Member for Merthyr (Mr. Richard), he would have to modify the statement he made last year on the subject.

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—EVICTIONS ON LORD ORMATHWAITE'S PROPERTY.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that, at the eviction of Mr. Trant on Lord Ormathwaite's property on Monday last, the police acted as described in *The Cork Examiner* of Wednesday; whether they broke in a door with hatchets and other weapons; whether, throughout the evictions, they acted as Sheriffs' bailiffs; whether, in the course of the eviction, they were ordered to load the guns with buckshot; and, if so, what justification there was for this order; and, whether the police in Ireland are now instructed to act as Sheriffs' bailiffs at evictions?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I have not yet received this Report, as the Question only appeared on the Notice Paper this morning. But it is not a fact that the police in Ireland are instructed to act as Sheriffs' bailiffs at evictions.

EGYPT—THE SOUDAN—THE DISASTER TO ITALIAN ARMS AT MASSOWAH.

MR. W. H. JAMES (Gateshead) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, in view of the recent disaster which has fallen upon the Italian arms at Massowah, Her Majesty's Government have offered any expression of sympathy to the Government of Italy as a friendly Power, or extended any offer of co-operation to them so far as circumstances may admit?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): Her Majesty's Government heard with regret that an Italian detachment has suffered great loss in an engagement with an overwhelming force of Abyssinians, and immediately authorized the offer of medical assistance from Egypt in case the medical resources of Massowah should be insufficient. The hospital at Suez has accordingly been placed at the disposal of General Gene by Sir Frederick Stephenson, with the sanction of the Secretary of State. It would be unsuitable to offer to a great Military Power an expression of sympathy on account of such an accident. We ourselves should not like, in similar circumstances, to have the loss of a detachment, which can easily be replaced, treated as a considerable disaster. The Italian Government, with whom we have so many interests in common, are well aware that they may count upon the friendly offices of Her Majesty's Government.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked whether, when the medical aid was offered to the Italians, Her Majesty's Government were at war with the Abyssinians?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON: Her Majesty's Government did not enter into hostilities with the Abyssinians by offering succour to the wounded Italians.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked whether the same aid as was extended to the Italians was extended to the Abyssinians?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON said, that he had no definite information upon the subject; but if there were any wounded Abyssinians at Massowah the surgeons would, doubtless, attend to them.

BULGARIA—PRINCE ALEXANDER OF BULGARIA.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether, when Despatch No. 285 (Turkey, No. 1, 1887), dated 6th September, 1886, from the Earl of Iddesleigh to Sir F. Lascelles, desiring the latter to urge upon Prince Alexander of Battenberg—

> "That he should remain and guide the country (Bulgaria) through the present crisis,"

left the Foreign Office, Her Majesty's Government were in possession of the fact that Prince Alexander had, on the 2nd of September, 1886, telegraphed to the Emperor of Russia—

> "Russia gave me my Crown, I am ready to return it into the hands of her Sovereign;"

and that, on the same day, the Emperor of Russia had replied, in a telegram to the Prince—

> "Cannot approve your return to Bulgaria, foreseeing disastrous consequences to the country, already so severely tried;"

and, whether, in view of the fact that, on 2nd of September, 1886, the Earl of Iddesleigh wrote to Her Majesty's Representatives at Vienna and Berlin, desiring them to inform the Governments to which they were respectively accredited, that—

> "It would be advisable that support should be given to His Highness in such a manner as will enable him to devote himself without anxiety to the task of governing the country over which he has been placed by Europe,"

he can give an assurance that no engagements with one or more European Governments, involving responsibility on the part of this country in regard to Bulgaria, will be taken by Her Majesty's Government, before this House has been informed of their nature, and has had an opportunity to express an opinion upon them?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): No doubt, Her Majesty's Government were aware that some such messages had passed between the Emperor of Russia and Prince Alexander when the Secretary of State directed Her Majesty's Agent in Bulgaria—

> "To urge upon His Highness that he should remain and guide the country through the present crisis;"

and the Earl of Iddesleigh based this advice upon a representation that—

> "The difficulties in which both Bulgaria and Europe would be involved through the abdication of Prince Alexander are of a serious nature."

The House is aware that the Earl of Iddesleigh's anticipation has been realized. With reference to the pledge which the hon. Member asks—

> "That no engagements with one or more European Governments, involving responsibility on the part of this country in regard to Bulgaria, will be taken by Her Majesty's Government before this House has been informed of their nature, and has had an opportunity to express an opinion upon them,"

no Administration in this country has ever undertaken such an obligation; and it would render the conduct of foreign affairs impossible were every important step to be made the subject of debate in Parliament in advance. The conduct of foreign affairs in this country is a matter of confidence in the Administration. But this House is left in no doubt as to the policy which guides Her Majesty's Government at the present time. It is to act in conformity with our public engagements; and the First Lord of the Treasury, on the first night of the present Session, defined this in the clearest terms, stating that our interference would be absolutely limited by the duties and interests of this country, and by our obligations under Treaties.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said, he should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, when the Government were using pressure on Prince Alexander to remain in Bulgaria as Prince of Bulgaria, they were acting in concert with any other Power, or absolutely alone?

[No reply.]

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR subsequently asked whether, in exerting pressure upon Prince Alexander with the object of inducing him to remain Ruler of Bulgaria, the Government were not taking isolated action in opposition to the other Powers?

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON: I am sure the House will excuse my not answering Questions on matters of such importance when proper Notice has not been given.

EMIGRATION (IRELAND)—PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS 1882-1883.

Captain COLOMB (Tower Hamlets, Bow, &c.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, What sum remains unexpended of the £100,000 granted by Parliament in 1882, as a free gift, to assist families in Ireland desiring to emigrate to do so; what sum remains unexpended of the further sum of £50,000, similarly granted for similar purposes to the Irish people in 1883; what sum remains unexpended of the £50,000 granted, in addition to the above sums, by Parliament for the purpose of paying for or assisting in the removal of persons or families from places in certain parts of Ireland to other parts of Ireland, and for their settlement there, or for other purposes incidental to such removal or settlement; and, whether Glenbeigh is situated in one of the districts to which such advantages were afforded?

The FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster), in reply, said, that the whole of the £100,000 had been expended. Of the further sum of £50,000 granted in 1883, £26,719 16*s*. 10*d*. had been expended, leaving a balance of £23,280 3*s*. 2*d*. No expenditure had been made by the Board of Works out of the £50,000 subsequently granted. Glenbeigh was situated in one of the districts referred to.

ARMY (SMALL ARMS)—DEFECTIVE SWORD BAYONETS—THE COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

Mr. HANBURY (Preston) asked the Secretary of State for War, with reference to a statement made in the other House by the Under Secretary, Where the Committee to be appointed to consider the subject of defective weapons would hold its sittings; whether evidence would be taken in public; and, whether it was intended to place any Members of that House upon the Committee, in order to insure independent inquiry?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. E. Stanhope) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): If my hon. Friend will not accept my assurance twice publicly made in this House, which constitutes a pledge from the responsible Minister to the House, that I contemplate an inquiry absolutely independent of the War Office, I can give him no other. With respect to the expression used by my noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) in "another place," I would say that I hope the Committee will conduct their inquiry in any place whatever calculated to assist their objects.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)— INTIMIDATION OF JURORS.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland a Question of which I have given him private Notice, Whether his attention has been called to the speech delivered by the hon. Member for North Wexford (Mr. J. E. Redmond) at the last meeting of the Central Branch of the National League, and reported in a daily paper, in which the following passage occurred:—

> "He did not believe that, pack how they may, the Government would be able to get a jury to convict the men who were accused of having committed a crime. He would say more, and it was this—that, in his opinion, far better it would be for a man to be condemned to penal servitude for the term of his natural life than to have formed one of the jury who would thus have outraged the sense of justice of the whole Irish people."

I beg, Sir, to ask, in view of that statement, whether the Government will protect the men who are exposed to such threats in the performance of a grave, unpleasant, and responsible duty cast upon them by the laws of their country?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I have not seen the report of this speech, but I have heard of it. The Government will take any necessary steps to protect jurors in the discharge of their duty.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [TWELFTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [7th February], proposed to the Question—[See page 84.]

And which Amendment was,

> At the end of the 8th paragraph, to insert the words, "But humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the relations between the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland have not been seriously disturbed in the cases of those owners who have granted to their tenants such abatements of rents as are called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce, and that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is not to be found in increased stringency of criminal procedure, or in the pursuit of such novel, doubtful, and unconstitutional measures as have recently been taken by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland, but in such a reform of the Law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people."—(*Mr. Parnell*).

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Debate *resumed.*

AGRARIAN AFFAIRS (IRELAND).

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): In intervening in this debate, Sir, as an Irish Nationalist, I am encouraged by the belief that I shall be followed in the discussion and, possibly, sustained by a Member of Her Majesty's Government—the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) — who within my memory and within my native county evoked the ringing cheers of an assembly of my countrymen by declaring that he not only represented the spirit, but he embodied the passion, of Irish nationality. I do not think, Sir, I need detain the House with any detailed references to the speech with which the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) concluded last night's discussion. The hon. and gallant Gentleman is nothing if not jocose; but jocosity, at its most, is but a poor substitute for argument. The comparison he drew between Samson and the Irish Party here suggested to me to say that if the weapon employed by Samson on a certain memorable occasion would not be called now-a-days a weapon of procedure, yet he did good execution with it, and finally Samson made his mark upon a certain House, the inhabitants of which had exercised too "much pressure within the law" upon him. Under the influence of the gentle discipline which the hon. and gallant Member says should be applied to us—which was nothing less than the Coercion gag—all would go right with his cause; but the cause must be bad indeed when a Gentleman of the intelligence of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh is obliged to endeavour to prop it up by pulling practically anonymous letters out of his pocket. I confess I feel little respect for the political understanding of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, who declares in one speech that the only true solution of the Irish Question must come from the Irish people, and in the very next speech affirms that the true way to deal with the Irish Question is to apply the gag to the Representatives whom the Irish people have sent to solve the question here. I scarcely recognized the hon. and gallant Gentleman last night in his new capacity of upholder of the law. We heard from him in this House last year, and those who have the benefit of frequently listening to him in Ireland have heard him many times, say that if his personal will should happen upon the question of the government of Ireland to come into conflict with the will of the three Estates of this Realm—who, I believe, are generally understood to be the makers of the law—he would advise his followers to resist the law and violate it. The hon. and gallant Member, therefore, has not an iota of moral justification to appear here as an upholder of the law; and when the hon. and gallant Gentleman lectures us on courage, I would remind him that it is but poor courage when it is reserved for a public leader—even though it is in courtesy only he is called a military gentleman—to urge his followers to charge in the direction of danger and strife, while he turns round himself and charges in an opposite direction. Unlike a certain famous Prince who never said a foolish thing and never did a wise one, the hon. and gallant Gentleman can be trusted not to do a foolish thing; but, with a common sense and wisdom of which I shall not deny him the credit, he reserves the entire stock of his political folly for his speeches. Sir, if the Royal Speech informs us that the relations between this country and Foreign Powers are friendly at the present moment, the Amendment of my hon. Friend sitting beside me, the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), brings home to the minds of all the deep conviction that this Realm has trouble at home. The outlook abroad is black, and it is hard to say how short a time may elapse before this country is plunged into a whirlpool of bloody strife. Five years ago, when you last proposed and carried a Coercion Act, you were obliged to sustain the Government in Ireland, as the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) in his later days deplored, by 30,000 bayonets. The number of bayonets you had in Ireland in 1882 was nearer to 50,000 than 30,000; and now that you are about to propose, and perhaps to carry, another Coercion Act, have you considered it will be necessary to place again 50,000 bayonets in Ireland? I have felt at times most astounded that a race of such capacity as yours, of such experience and such general success in the art of government, does not make a resolute effort to put an end to a state of affairs which is a disgrace to your country, and which obliges you to maintain in a small island of 5,000,000 of a population as large a standing Army as is necessary to secure you political rule in India, with its population of 300,000,000. If I were an Englishman, having the interest of England nearest to my heart, I should consider it my duty to use every effort of my own to energetically support every effort of my countrymen towards placing the government of Ireland upon the solid basis of the will of the Irish people, and put an end to a state of affairs which every thoughtful and patriotic Englishman must regard with profound regret. I venture to submit that every hon. Member of the House who desires that the House should have time for Business—and amongst those hon. Members I do not count the Members of Her Majesty's Government—should be thankful to the hon. Member for Cork for having fastened the attention of the House upon what is the only part of the Royal Speech that calls for immediate and practical attention. My hon. Friend (Mr. Parnell) has brought the House out of a general discussion without limit and without end into a debate which is concerned with matters of vital, practical, and urgent import—matters concerning the mutual relations betwee nGreat Britain and Ireland, and upon which the future happiness and peace of this Realm so much depends.

I have said, Sir, that the only practical paragraph in the Royal Speech was the paragraph which threatened Ireland with coercion. The Speech contains many paragraphs, in which are made many promises; but if the Government intend to introduce this Session any measure of reform, I think it must be confessed that they made excellent arrangements for not carrying that intention into effect. When we turn our minds to the course of Business that lies before this House, I do not consider it a matter of great importance that no legislation is promised upon the Report of Lord Cowper's Commission, because if such a promise was made it could not be accomplished, nor am I at all concerned that the interests of Ireland has the last place in the question of Local Self-Government, because it matters little whether it has got the first, second, or third place when even the first itself will be nowhere. I must express my regret that we are obliged to continue this debate, and bring it to an end, without the Report of Lord Cowper's Commission, or, at least, without the evidence that was taken before it. The whole policy of the Government at the present moment, whether you call it a policy of reform, a policy of prosecution, or a policy of coercion, hinges and revolves upon the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland. This, Sir, at the present time, whatever may have been the case in former years, is the Constitutional occasion for reviewing the policy of the Government in the recent past and in the immediate future; and as the vital question at issue is the relations between landlord and tenant, I must express my regret that the body of evidence collected by Her Majesty's Commission upon that subject has not been laid before us. Some months ago the Government despatched a special agent of great eminence to Kerry. Sir Redvers Buller was examined before the Royal Commission, and soon after his examination there appeared in the Irish papers a document which purported to be a letter from a Member of the Commission, addressed to a friend in London. The letter bore many marks of authenticity. It spoke in very vigorous phrases of Sir Redvers Buller as one of those emotional Englishmen who helped to send Ireland to the devil. It purported to give a *résumé* of the evidence of Sir Redvers Buller. And what was his evidence? That he found the tenants in Ireland over-rented; that he himself was obliged to intervene to save them from hardship at the hands of the landlords; that the National League was the saviour of the Irish people, and until the League arose the Irish people had no friend; that the law in Ireland was all upon the side of the landlords; and, in the interest of good government in Ireland, it was indispensably necessary to devise a plan to stop evictions. Sir Redvers Buller, being examined in the police court, declined to answer questions concerning his evidence before the Royal Commission; but he made the remarkable statement that, though several months had elapsed since the day of the examination, a print of the evidence had not as yet been supplied to him; and he added, further still, that a fortnight before he applied for the print, and that the print had not yet been supplied. Why was the print kept back? I maintain that in view of the radical change in the policy of the Government, which at the time that Sir Redvers Buller was examined before the Commission was a policy of inducing landlords to grant abatements, and not a policy of prosecuting their most successful rivals—in view of that change in policy, and the importance attached to the special mission of Sir Redvers Buller to Ireland, I say it is to be regretted, and even to be deplored, that, whatever may be the cause, the House is not supplied, in its discussion of the important question now before it, with the evidence of that material witness. Sir, although the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) appears to think that the phrase in the Queen's Speech only refers to the possibility or the probability of coercion, I wish to point out that coercion in Ireland is promised in the most expressed and positive terms. It says—

> "Our early attention will be called to proposals for reform in legal procedure."

Within my experience, and within my reading—which is upon Irish affairs not very limited—I am not aware of any case in the past where coercion for Ireland has been applied for except for one of two great causes. It was alleged by the Government applying for coercion, either the prevalence of grave crime in Ireland, or else the difficulty of inducing witnesses to give evidence or inducing jurors to convict. Coercion has been founded upon one or other of these great causes, and oftentimes upon both. We know in recent years how the Minister desirous of a coercive measure for Ireland came down to the Table, his stock-in-trade being a Blue Book filled with real or bogus outrages; but the Queen's Speech states that grave crimes are happily rare in Ireland—rarer than a year ago—when this Government did not propose to reform the criminal procedure in Ireland, or interfere with personal liberty, but only to attempt to suppress a public organization. Sir, the Munster Assizes are not long over. No observation was made by any Judge, no remark was made by prosecuting counsel, that there was any crime in Ireland requiring special legislation. I am entitled to say that if grave crime cannot be alleged in justification of coercion, then whatever is to be alleged in justification of it is mere political convenience. Did the Government plead a difficulty of procuring evidence, or a difficulty in getting juries to convict? Not a syllable to that effect had passed the lips of any Crown Prosecutor in Ireland. But we know by the records of the Winter Assizes that in Munster and Leinster, and Ulster and Connaught, whenever the Crown put into the box a Catholic, a Nationalist, or a friend of the tenant, they found nothing more easy, by the right of a stand aside, than to cram into the jury box 12 of those who differed from him in creed, in interest, and in politics, and who hated him so much that they thought it a gain to the country to put him in prison for any cause or no cause whatever. Such was the case in the Provinces of the South and West; and in the Northern Province, when a partizan of the Government came to stand his trial—the Crown Prosecutor said it was an Orangeman accused of riot or murder—yet the Crown Prosecutor found it perfectly easy to pack the box with 12 brothers and confederates of his order. If the object was to set him free, that object was attained; and therefore, Sir, I feel entitled to say that as the Crown where they desired a conviction found it easy to obtain it, and where they desired an acquittal or a disagreement found it facile of attainment, it passes my understanding at this moment to imagine for what reason they have cause to complain. Sir, no cause has been shown for the proposal for coercion, either upon the ground of the existence of crime or upon the ground of any difficulty, hindrance, or impediment in the way of the administration of justice, unless, indeed, the right hon. and learned Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) regards it as a hindrance to the administration of justice that a packed jury of 12 Connaught Protestants refused at the late Assizes to turn a Nationalist editor into a Whiteboy at his bidding. Well, Sir, what, then, is the cause for coercion? We are told that the relations between owners and occupiers of land have been seriously disturbed; and my hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork, in drawing up his Amendment, has, for greater convenience, followed the phrase in the Queen's Speech. I would ask the House to note—and it is fundamental to the proper understanding of the question of Irish land—that the phrase "owners or occupiers" does not fully or accurately express the legal position or the mutual relations to each other of the two classes of persons who share between them the proprietorship of the land of Ireland. Englishmen are very apt to be misled on this subject by insufficient knowledge. An English landlord is a landlord in fact as well as in name. An English tenant is a tenant merely. But, Sir, an Irish landlord is not a lord of the soil—an Irish landlord is now by law nothing more than a rent-charger—he is no more of an owner—often very much less of an owner — than an encumbrancer or a mortgagee. An Irish tenant, on the other hand, is an occupying owner. He is not only a tenant, but he has a legal right to his interest in his holding; he has a legal right to the proprietorship of his own improvements; and, therefore, it is perfectly misleading to draw any parallel between English landlords and English tenants on the one hand, and Irish landlords and Irish occupying owners on the other. This is admitted by all of you when you speak of a dual ownership; and, furthermore, when you say that the best settlement of the Irish Land Question is to extinguish dual ownership and substitute for it single ownership, what do you mean? You mean that the interest of the Irish landlord in the Irish land is a terminable interest, destined soon to disappear, and therefore the ownership of the Irish tenant in the Irish land should become absolute and sole. And, Sir, I wish to draw the attention of the House to another vital circumstance, in regard to the fixing of a rent, that twice within the last 12 months the Irish tenants, by their Representatives here, offered to place the fixing of a fair rent in the hands of the constituted Courts of the country. They offered upon the Land Purchase Bill of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian, in connection with the proposal for national settlement—they offered to place it in the hands of the Courts of the land to decide what should be a fair rent to serve as a basis for purchase; and later still, when my hon. Friend the Member for Cork introduced his Tenants' Relief Bill, the Irish tenants—by their Representatives in this House—expressed their willingness, in any effort necessary to meet the crisis which has occurred, that it should be confined to the constituted Courts of the country. The Irish tenants had exhausted themselves in proposals to the Government to meet the necessities of the case by reference to the constituted Courts, and I am entitled to say, Sir, that these efforts having been scorned and spurned by the legislative body of landlords in this Assembly; that the Irish tenants stand in an impregnable moral position when they are obliged to set their backs to the wall. There is no comparison, Sir, between the case of the Irish tenants and the case of the misleading analogy raised by the hon. and learned Attorney General for Ireland. The hon. and learned Gentleman spoke of the relations between the debtors of a bank and the shareholders, and he compared the endeavours of the Irish tenants to make their rents proportionate with the value of their holdings, and he likened it to the efforts on the part of the debtors of a bank to get rid of their debts to the establishment. Why, the true analogy is this—the effort on the part of the shareholders in a bank to apportion the losses which the bank has sustained between the different classes of the shareholders. The Queen's Speech declares that the cause for coercion is that—

> "Organized attempts have been made to incite the occupying class to combine against the fulfilment of their legal obligations."

Sir, lawyers in their Courts and lawyers in this House are mostly unwilling to think or talk of anything but law. But we are not all lawyers here, and our function here is wider—and let me say higher—than the function of upholding the law. We are not here merely as the upholders of the law; we are here also as law-makers. If this Parliament were to limit its vision to the question of the upholding existing law, why, Sir, there would be no need of a Parliament at all, because the Courts of the country and the Executive power could very well uphold the law between them. Our first and most sacred function is to discover in what respect the law is defective or oppressive, and having discovered where the law operates in mischief, or creates oppression, I say that our first duty is not to uphold existing law, but to abate or to remove, or altogether to repeal, the law that produces oppression. The language of the Queen's Speech is conceived in the dry and narrow spirit of the lawyers, the spirit which is the enemy of all reform and of all necessary progress; and I submit that my hon. Friend the Member for Cork in submitting to this House that a serious disturbance in the relations between classes in Ireland has not occurred where the necessary abatements have been granted —I submit that my hon. Friend in raising that proposition and submitting the proof of it, has approached a grave question before this House in the spirit and temper of a statesman. I desire to draw the attention of the House to a singular and curious fact. What is it that is condemned in Her Majesty's Speech from the Throne? Is it the combination of the Irish farmers to procure abatements in their rents? No, Sir; the combination itself is not condemned; it is the action of those who are said to have incited to combination. It appears to be illegal to advise a man to do a thing, but legal for a man to do it. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale suggested that the tenants are not prosecuted because the tenants are ignorant, and that the inciters are prosecuted because—I suppose—the inciters are educated; but, Sir, if there is anything upon which an Irish tenant is ignorant it is not upon the subject of the amount of rent he is able to pay. The poorest tenant in Connaught is perfectly competent to instruct the House of Commons upon that subject. I cannot, therefore, accept the theory of the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale. He can get a better reason. Sir, last winter the hon. and learned Attorney General for Ireland delivered himself of a famous opinion. A body of tenants in the County of Cork, having asked an abatement from their landlord, and the abatement having been refused, proceeded to deposit certain moneys in the hands of a private agent. The Cork Defence Union applied to a well-known divisional magistrate—Captain Plunkett. Captain Plunkett proceeded to set the Irish Government in motion. The Irish Government applied for light and leading to the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman delivered an opinion in which he declared that there was a mode by which the landlords might recover the money; but that was a matter for the landlords, not a matter for the Government, and that he did not see how the Executive Government could take any action in the matter. The question upon which the opinion was founded was this—whether, and if so, how the Government could lay hold of the money which the tenants of Mr. Ponsonby, without paying their rents, had deposited in the hands of a private agent. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland declared that the Government had no means of getting hold of it. When examined in the police court—and, let me say, that up to the time of the examination in the police court, the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland maintained an obstinate reserve on the matter, and it was a matter of curious speculation in Ireland why he should—

"Let concealment, like a worm i' the bud,
"Feed on his damask cheek."

In the police court he declined to say whether he had given an opinion; but, being pressed upon the matter, he went far beyond the bounds of the opinion, because he admitted, in reply to questions of counsel, not only that the Government have no legal power to take back money deposited by tenants in the hands of private agents; but that even if they could find the money, and had the power to recover it, that they had no legal power to hand it back to any landlord. That, Sir, I conclude, is the reason why the combination itself was not denounced in the Queen's Speech. It would be practically useless to denounce the combination, because the combination is beyond the reach of the law. The reason why the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland refused to acknowledge his opinion was, "If I gave this opinion," says he, "I gave it as Attorney General;" and the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach)—following the example of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland—when he was asked if he had read that opinion, replied, "I read that opinion — I read it confidentially." But since he came into this House, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland has declared that whatever privilege he may have in the police court he has no privilege in the House of Commons. He (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) is responsible to this House, and bound to answer to it—although we are in the happy position of being independent of his answer. Because we know that the opinion was given, and know that it has since been fortified, I think we may claim from him to give up the tactics of stealth which distinguished the Government in Ireland during the winter; and to give us, if he is capable, a complete, a full, and a frank avowal with respect to the opinion of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland upon the question of combination. I maintain that the combination in Ireland—so far as it exists—is a necessary combination, and that being a necessary combination it cannot be immoral. We have heard a good deal of tenants who could pay and of tenants who could not. Sir, I ask the House what is intended, what is meant, by a tenant who can pay? Do you mean by a tenant who can pay, a man who, upon the surplus value of his farm can pay the current rent in Ireland; if you mean that, I confidently reply that there are no such agricultural tenants in the country; but if, by a tenant who can pay you mean a man—a stray tenant here and there, who may have a few pounds of capital and expends it—if you mean a stray tenant here and there who may have credit, and who has not quite exhausted it—if you mean a stray tenant here and there who may have a little stock on his farm or some furniture in his house; and if you mean that by expending his capital, by exhausting his credit, by stripping his dwelling bare, or depriving his holding of his little stock, if he is obliged to do that in order to pay rent that his holding did not earn, I say I take issue with you, and I say, whatever may be your legal contention, that the tenant is not morally bound to do it. He is perfectly entitled to keep the furniture of his house and his stock upon his farm, and unite with the man whose house is burned for the purpose of procuring for both the merest and commonest justice; that is the justice which allows to the labourer a security in the fruits of his labour. The House has heard a great deal about bank deposits in Ireland. Suppose the inference desired to be drawn is that—that the farmers in Ireland have money in the bank, and are able to draw out that money this winter to pay the landlords the rents which their holdings did not earn—the total deposits in the joint stock banks of Ireland amount to £29,000,000; but there is one bank in London—London and County Bank—which has in deposits as much as all the joint stock banks in Ireland. A half of the £29,000,000 is held in the province in Ulster, and this £29,000,000 includes not only deposits, but current accounts. These current accounts include the credit balance of every merchant and every trader in every city and town in Ireland; and we all know that in Ireland there is scarcely a town, however small, where there is not a trader who has not £5,000 or £10,000 to his credit. I know a case in a midland town where a trader has a balance of over £20,000 at the bank—and we know that the money of the country is chiefly held by these traders, who often pursue two or three kinds of industry, who deal in stock and follow the avocations of a money-lender—we know that this £29,000,000 includes all the funds at the disposal of religious and charitable institutions of every denomination throughout the country. And although an occasional Irish farmer may have a deposit in the bank—I would ask the House to believe me—a current account and cheque book are not among the incidents of an Irish farmer. A remarkable fact came to my knowledge lately. The liquidators of the Munster Bank, which had £2,000,000 on deposit, agreed to pay off all the deposits of £20 and under. Now, £20 is a fortune to the small Irish farmers, and, if small Irish farmers had deposits in the bank, they would have been deposits of £20 and under. And a conclusive proof that the relation between the Irish farmer and banks in Ireland is not the relation of creditor, or the relation of debtor, is to be found in the fact that out of the £2,000,000 owed by the Munster Bank on deposit, the total of the whole amount in £20 and under was only £15,000. I am fairly convinced that, if all the deposits held by small farmers in banks in Ireland were drawn out to-morrow, and put into a common fund, they would not suffice to pay three months' rent. Sir, my hon. Friend the Member for Cork, in his Amendment, based his position for abatement in rent upon the fall of prices—the fall in prices is not now denied. The utmost you attempt is to minimize the extent of it. Why, Sir, the fall in prices is proved by many and overlapping proofs. The noble Marquess the Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury) has given heavy abatements to his own tenants—the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith) has given a reduction of 40 per cent to his tenants in the extreme East of England—the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach)—who sits next to him—has given 40 per cent to his tenants in the extreme West, and he has thousands and thousands of acres of land upon which he cannot find tenants upon any terms. [Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH dissented.] There is a conflict between the right hon. Gentleman and the Blue Books. The meaning of the right hon. Gentleman is doubtful to most of us in his reference to the Irish Question. The noble Marquess the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (the Marquess of Londonderry) has given an abatement of 15 per cent upon his estate in the North of Ireland, which the noble Marquess himself declares to be rented at so low a figure that he has obtained no income out of it for years. Why, Sir, there is not a landowning Member of Her Majesty's Government who does not feel by his bank account, at the present moment, the reality and pressure of the crisis caused by the prolonged and progressive fall in prices. May I refer a moment to the prices themselves? It is sometimes pretended that the Sub-Commissioners, in fixing the rents in Ireland, left a margin for the possible recurrence of low prices afterwards. Now, these men were not prophets, they were only Commissioners. They had not the faculty of an ancient Patriarch, to whom reference has been made in this debate, of predicting the occurrence of lean years and fat ones; and they fixed all rents on an average of prices. I have here an average of the prices for the six years ending 1884, and the prices for 1885; and the fall in the prices I find for staple articles of Irish produce—butter, beef, mutton, and pork—were, butter, 27 per cent; beef, 15; mutton, 18; and pork, 20. The average fall of prices was not less than 20 per cent, and, as the prices of the previous averages before 1884 were higher than those prices I have quoted, and those of 1886 were still lower in 1885, I am entitled to say—and the proof is undeniable—that the fall in prices in Ireland since the bulk of the judicial rents were fixed has been much greater than 20 per cent of rent all round. But, Sir, will the House consider for a moment what is the meaning of the fall of 20 per cent of the total of the whole produce? We are told that the cost of production consumes two-thirds of the total value of the produce; and if we all consider that the remaining two-fifths is divided equally between the tenant and the landlord—one-fifth to the landlord and one fifth to the tenant—and if this is a fall of 20 per cent on the total produce of the farm, it follows that, even if the landlord granted an abatement of 50 per cent, it would still be a loss to be equally divided between the tenant and the landlord. Now, I pass to the final consideration of the reductions given by the Courts—the reductions given by the Courts which are manned by a majority of landlords and land agents who are not friends to the tenants. What does the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale mean when he says there is no greater agrarian crisis prevailing this moment in Ireland than at any time within three or four years from the passing of the Land Act? Up to the end of 1885 the reductions given by the Land Courts in Ireland were less upon the average, and upon the whole than 20 per cent of the rental; the reductions given in the first four months of 1886 were 28 per cent of the rental—the reductions in the next six months were 31 per cent of the rentals; and the reductions the last month for which we have a return—the month of October 1886—were 50 per cent of the rentals; and, Sir, when I remind the House that the estates most heavily rack-rented went into Court in the earlier years, and that there are higher cases now being heard, it is obvious that the difference between the reductions given two or three years ago and the reductions given now is far greater than the apparent reduction here, far greater than 20 per cent, and that if the unfortunate tenants who went into Court in 1882, 1883, and 1884 were able to go into Court at the present moment, that the abatement of 20 per cent is no measure and no test of the abatement they would receive. I should say that the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale is doubtful of the utility of making landlords good by Act of Parliament. To that I shall only reply that for years and generations Acts of Parliament have enabled landlords to be cruel; and that the machinery which enabled them to be cruel might now be used to compel them to be just. Sir, upon the now famous Plan of Campaign I have to say it is nothing new. Ever since the depression of 1879 the Irish tenants have been in the habit of combining for reductions of rent, combining by estates. When abatements have been refused to them they have declined to pay rents. They have pledged themselves to stand by one another, and they have made the reinstatement of unjustly-evicted tenants a condition precedent to the settlement. The only point in which the Plan of Campaign contains any element that can be termed new, is in reference to the lodgment of monies by tenants in the hands of private agents; but that is the very point upon which the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland has declared the Plan is not liable to be legally attacked. And, Sir, when I cast about to endeavour to account to myself for the prosecutions undertaken by the present Government, I can only account for them in this way—that no previous Government ever attempted to compete with the public men of Ireland in procuring abatements from the landlords, and that the State prosecutions undertaken by the present Government are only to be accounted for by their ungovernable jealousy of their more successful rivals. My hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) and others are accused of exciting the tenants, and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House—who speaks out of the fulness of his knowledge of Ireland, acquired during a 12 hours' visit to that country, declares that the tenants on these estates have been incited to combine by people who had no concern with the place. Why, Sir, we might as well say the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House has no concern with Westminster. My hon. Friend the hon. Member for East Mayo beside me can say that his grandfather and great-grandfather were tenants upon the estate of Lord Dillon. He (Mr. Dillon) is now representing a Division upon which the estate of Lord Dillon is situate, and will anyone submit that the tenants on that estate, who are the people who have reclaimed and made the value of the holdings upon which they live, the labour of whose hands has put up their humble homes—will anyone tell me that when a deputation of these men came to him in his home in Dublin and requested him—implored him—besought him to come to their assistance; will anyone tell me that he committed a crime or an offence in yielding to their appeal? If he had refused he would have been false to his public duty. Sir, the influence of my hon. Friend and his fellow-traversers, as I well know, has been the influence of moderation. They have refused in some cases to give their sanction to the adoption to the Plan of Campaign; they have in all cases counselled moderate demands, they have in every instance recommended the tenants to meet half way any offer of a fair and reasonable settlement; and, Sir, instead of rushing blindly—like Captain Plunkett and other agents of the Government—into cases as to the merits of which they had not the slightest idea, my hon. Friend and his Colleagues did not interfere in any case under the Plan of Campaign until they satisfied themselves by personal examination and acute inquiry that its adoption was necessary and absolutely essential for the welfare and safety of the people. We are told that the Plan of Campaign has failed. Sir, if it had failed, we would hear very little now about it. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland spoke at Bristol three weeks after the promulgation of the Plan. Why did he not say a word about it then? Because, Sir, as he said in the Dublin Police Court, he thought it had fallen flat. Yes, Sir, and if it had fallen flat at the present time, he would be content to be silent about it now. The Plan of Campaign has been a remarkable success. It has achieved great results. If the evictions in the last quarter have been counted by hundreds instead of being counted by thousands, and if you are able to say at the present moment that grave crimes are happily rare in Ireland, I tell you it is not because of the working of your private plan—for the evicting landlords in Ireland are not the men to yield to official pressure within the law. It was due to the adoption of the public Plan, maintained by the Irish Members, and when I am able to say that landlords like Captain Massey and Lord Dunsandle, and owners like Mrs. Burnaby, have yielded and come to amicable and friendly relations with the tenants—when I can point, as an instance, to the case of Lord Dillon, where thousands of people have been saved in the occupation of their holdings and possession of their homes by the application of the Plan, I am entitled to point to it as an unqualified success—and if Lord Dillon was not a Peer of the Realm, and had a seat in this House, I should not be at all surprised if he were to tell the House that the Plan of Campaign had saved him from enormous law costs, from prolonged anxiety, from extreme trouble, from probable eventual loss, and that in his case, at any rate, it had proved to be a humane, benevolent, and kindly intervention between landlord and tenant. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale says if the Plan of Campaign is resorted to, the only remedy will be indiscriminate and total eviction. I am entitled to reply to the speculation of the noble Marquess by a reference to facts, and to point out to him that, although before the adoption of the Plan last winter, evictions—and harsh and cruel evictions—were impending upon some of these estates to the present moment, not one on which our Plan is in force has a single eviction been carried out. If the first duty of the Government is to protect the people, their duty is abrogated by the Government of Ireland; and the whole aim of their policy at the present moment is to substitute the performance of that duty by punishing those who raised their hands to save the people as if they had been guilty of a crime. I have said that the Plan of Campaign is necessary, and that, therefore, it is moral. We are asked if it is legal? I think the question is premature. We are told that Lord Fitzgerald some years ago delivered a judgment which enabled the Government to declare the Plan illegal. Lord Fitzgerald's judgment was practically set aside by the passing of the Land Act of 1881—for the Land Act of 1881 accomplished the object of the movement which was condemned by Lord Fitzgerald. The Land Act of 1881 gave reductions in the rents which, but for the disastrous fall in prices which has since occurred, would have been of material benefit, for, no doubt, the Land Act of 1881 accomplished most of the purposes of the agrarian movement by taking out of the hands of the landlord the power of fixing the rent. Moreover, Sir, that charge of Lord Fitzgerald's was never ratified, and was never put into operation by the jury. What do you do in England when a jury refuses to put into operation the charge delivered by the Judge? In England public conscience, as embodied in the jury, is regarded as the potential custodian and interpreter of the law. If the jurors in England refuse to give verdicts in reference to a law that is undoubted or asserted, what happens? In the case of a law that is undoubted you repeal it, or you have it up in the case of a law that is only asserted. You hear no more about it. And, Sir, I apprehend, and I venture to prophesy, that, in regard to the elaborate declarations of law on the Plan of Campaign, what usually happens in England when juries will not convict is what will presently happen in Ireland. Why, we have heard that two Judges in Ireland have declared the Plan illegal. But the Judges in Ireland are not independent of the Executive. The Judges in Ireland are promoted after they have reached the Bench. The Judges in Ireland are members of the Privy Council. The Privy Council is composed of 50 members, one half of which are Peers of the Realm and are *ex officio,* and who never attend the meetings; and the other half is composed of 20 Judges and half-a-dozen political outcasts, whom we have defeated at the polls, and whom the Irish have to feed and uphold. The policy of all these State prosecutions before it was resolved upon was debated in the Privy Council. What does the Privy Council do? The proclamations in Ireland are issued by and with the advice of the Privy Council. The Privy Council is the Cabinet of the Lord Lieutenant. The Lord Lieutenant, as a Constitutional Viceroy, must act on the advice of his Cabinet. Therefore, the policy of proceeding against the hon. Member for East Mayo and his Friends is practically adopted by the Judges themselves, since the Lord Lieutenant acts upon the advice of his Cabinet; and I say, Sir, that the declarations of the law which depend upon the words of Judges come to us in Ireland with defective authority, and claim from us scant respect when we know that a Judge is first in a position to advise the proceedings at the Privy Council, and is then in a position—mounting the Queen's Bench—to ratify by his judgment the advice he has already given. But, Sir, the gravamen of the charges against the promoters of the Plan of Campaign is the intention with which they act. It is said that they combined in order to injure owners of land, and to incite certain tenants not to pay the full amount of their legal rents. Suppose the Judge be, as you say, the sole exponent of the law, and suppose the jury are only judges of the application of the law to the facts before them, and suppose the jury hold that the promoters of the Plan of Campaign did not incite the tenants not to pay their full rents, but advised them to pay as much as they were able, what then becomes of all your law? Suppose the jury hold that the promoters of the Plan did not intend to injure owners of land, but intended only to protect and save the tenants, what then becomes of all your elaborate declarations of the law? Why, Sir, I have a return very carefully prepared of what were the operations of the Plan of Campaign. There are 9,000 landlords in Ireland—I should say there are 9,000 landlords of Ireland, because there are many of them who do not live in the country, and many of them who have never seen it. Upon how many estates, Sir, have any steps been taken with a view of putting the Plan of Campaign into operation? The total number is 40. If my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo and others intended—as the charge against them monstrously and fabulously declares—to injure owners of land, would they have limited their operations to 40 estates out of a total of 9,000? The Plan of Campaign has been put into complete operation upon only 20 estates. Only in four out of the whole 40 did the landlords agree to give any abatement upon the judicial rent. Only in eight other cases did they agree to give any abatement of any rent whatever, judicial, or unjudicial, and in 30 of the cases out of the 40 there was no abatement offered. Now, what has been the amount of the demands? I have shown by reference to prices, and to the reductions of the rents themselves, that an abatement of 50 per cent of the rent this year was still equally divided between the tenant and the landlord. What are the abatements that have been asked? The abatements on judicial rents have ranged from a minimum of 15 per cent to a maximum of 30 per cent. The abatements on unjudicial rents, except in the case of two or three singularly exceptional cases, ranged from a minimum of 25 per cent to a maximum of 40 per cent; and, Sir, I complete the case, and the justification of the Plan of Campaign, when I say that in every case in which the Plan has been put into operation abatements usually as large, and very often larger, have been given by the landlords upon the surrounding properties. May I prove this by reference to the case of Lord Dillon? Lord Dillon was asked an abatement of 25 per cent. In the immediate district The Macdermott gave 30 per cent; and 30 per cent was given by Mr. Walsh. I could show, by reference to other cases in this return, that the abatements of rent asked for by the tenants under the Plan have been in numerous cases exceeded by the landlords of the properties surrounding. I am willing to submit this return not merely to right hon. but to hon. Gentlemen. I am willing to submit it to everyone except a member of the Loyal and Patriotic Union; and I only except that distinguished body of fabulists because, in respect to the duty of testifying truth, they have suspended the standing orders of Christianity. I ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary (Mr. Matthews), as a lawyer, if he agrees with the reason given by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) why the Plan of Campaign should be declared illegal? I beg the attention of the right hon. Gentleman, who is learned also—although his modesty very often disclaims it—to the reasoning of the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale. Irrespective, said the noble Marquess, of the legality or the morality of the Plan of Campaign, why is that Plan to be condemned by the House? Because—said the noble Marquess—whatever it may have done up to the present time, it may cause inconvenience to the landlords hereafter. I can compare that to nothing but the decision say of a judge who having a man before him found guilty of no crime, decided that as the man might commit some crime or other by-and-bye it would be better to hang him off at once. It will be time enough to declare the illegality of the Plan of Campaign when its action is found and proved to be illegal; and in this great matter, concerning the lives and the fortunes of multitudes of the people of Ireland, I ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary to decline to countenance any declaration of the law by anticipation. The noble Marquess is very doubtful about the dispensing power. What proof, says he, has been given in this debate of the existence of a dispensing power? What proof has not been brought forward? I consider there has been a wonderful amount of proof considering that we have had to work in the dark, and that the proof which we have brought before the House has been obtained by us against the will and in spite of the utmost contrivances of the Government, who had in every way tried to hush the matter up. The doings of Judge Curran had been detailed in the House. Judge Curran, said the noble Marquess, exercised his equitable power. Judge Curran has no equitable power. Judge Curran has no power at all except to give a decree of the payment of a legal debt or of a stay of execution, and that only of a short period, and of cases that are defended. I do not speak with the book—I happen to be in the position of having an intimate knowledge of Judge

Curran. When I was in charge of the Land League he was my standing counsel, and I must say in justice to Judge Curran that as Mr. Curran I found him a most docile as well as a most vigorous gentleman. I found that no suggestion, however remote, was ever thrown away upon him. When I remember, Sir, that Judge Curran is a well known agent of special measures of State policy in Ireland, that he conducted the famous private inquiry of 1881 into the Phœnix Park murders—that he was sent to the Westmeath district when there was trouble there, I am at no loss to conclude that when Mr. O'Connor Morris was taken from Kerry and Judge Curran was sent there, he knew perfectly well that he was sent to Kerry for a special and particular purpose. Why, Sir, umbrage has been felt at the comparison of Judge Curran to an Oriental Cadi who dispenses justice under the shadow of a palm tree. I think it is uncomplimentary to the judicial habits of a Cadi, who makes and concludes his Court. I never heard of a Cadi who after he rose from the shadow of the palm tree, and after the parties had left, took upon himself to set about revising his own decrees. But Judge Curran, not satisfied with letter-writing all over the country to persons of various classes and grades on the subject of rents—not satisfied with arranging and suggesting and pressing a settlement between landlords and tenants, takes home a batch of decrees in his pocket to alter them comfortably after dinner. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale said nothing about the message to Mr. Gale. What does he think of that? Is that an example of the dispensing power? Mr. Gale, the sub-Sheriff, wrote asking the Government for four police, and he got a reply that he could not have them. He was told that "in future" he should give 10 days' notice. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland tells us that that was the old rule. If that was the old rule why was Mr. Gale told that he should give 10 days' notice "in future?" Because he had not been doing it in the past. For what purpose was the 10 days' notice to be given? To make police inquiries about what? Was it whether they had men enough to protect the Sheriff? The idea is absurd, for they had 12,000 police. The police inquiries were to discover whether the process of law was one in which the Government should intervene, and that is made abundantly clear by the further statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to Mr. Gale, that he would have to state the names of the persons for whom protection was required and the nature of the process to be enforced. That document alone is ample proof of the dispensing power. Sir Redvers Buller, of course, denied in the police court that he had intervened at all between landlord and tenant in Kerry, but before he left the box it was perfectly clear that during the three months he had spent in the County of Kerry he was doing nothing else. He was sent to Kerry—the noble Marquess the Marquess of Salisbury told us—because he had a fresh eye. He proved to have too fresh an eye for the convenience of the Government. They translated him to Dublin Castle, and when he gets rid of that fresh eye and cultivates the proper degree of official purblindness they will transport him as they transported Sir Robert Hamilton. Sir Redvers Buller made it clear before he left the box that he said he interfered between landlord and tenant. The noble Marquess stands up in this House and tells us that after carefully reading the correspondence between Sir Redvers Buller and Messrs. Darley and Roe, Sir Redvers Bullers acted in the interest of humanity. I ask the noble Marquess if he has read carefully or at all the letters of Sir Redvers Buller dated the 22nd November? Did the noble Marquess read these words—

> "I asked you in my former letter for Mr. Head's (that was the mortgagee and the real owner) address, because I wanted to obtain a proposition for him of the very class in the event of evictions which I find you have recommended, viz.—to level those houses which can be legally levelled in the event of the tenants being evicted."

Is that a sentence conceived in the spirit of humanity? Sir Redvers Buller was evidently afraid that the tenants would be forgotten, because he sent a further letter on the 17th December saying that perhaps the levelling of the houses might have a good effect on the others. I say that Sir Redvers Buller was responsible for the levelling of these houses, and, remembering that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland told this House last Session that

Sir Redvers Buller was directly responsible to himself, and remembering his oath at the police court, that he was kept fully and constantly informed of the proceedings of Sir Redvers Buller, I say it was impossible that a month should have elapsed—from the 22nd November to the 17th December—without his being aware of the inducement applied by Sir Redvers Buller to the agents for the levelling and burning of these houses; and I hold that the right hon. Gentleman is morally and directly as fully responsible for the atrocity as if he had wielded the crowbar and applied the writs himself. I refer for a moment to the case of Captain Plunkett, that the noble Marquess said there was only one story, and it was not substantiated. What was the story about Captain Plunkett in Limerick in writing to a firm of agents—Messrs. Guinness and Mahon—asking them to accept one year's rent in lieu of three and a-half, and accompanying this request with a broad hint that if evictions were carried out the peace of the district would be disturbed? After the letter he sought an interview, and does anyone think that in the comparative freedom of an interview he contented himself with the language of the letter? The agents complained in a letter to the London *Times* that Captain Plunkett not only asked them to accept one year's rent in lieu of three and a-half, but asked them to cancel £50 of law costs and to give a clear receipt, and threatened in the event of eviction being carried out that he would not supply police or give police protection to the caretaker who was to be put in charge. Captain Plunkett denied it, but what had not Captain Plunkett denied? He denied that he interfered between landlord and tenant at all; and he denied this after he had sworn to the hilt that he had interfered continually and constantly in these cases. He denied at first in *The Times* that he had threatened to withdraw police protection, but he denied nothing else. He did not deny that he had asked them to take one year's rent in lieu of three and a-half, to cancel the law costs, and to give a clear receipt. But in the police court his denials became so numerous and so complicated that the examining counsel was at last obliged to tell him that he only remembered what he had not said, and remembered nothing of what he had said. It was impossible to hear or to read the evidence of Captain Plunkett in the police court without coming to the conclusion that in the mental mechanism of the gallant Captain there is a screw loose, if there is not even a mainspring broken. The noble Marquess wants another story. I will give it to him. I have a letter here from a priest—not an anonymous priest, like that of the hon. Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson)—the Rev. Father Lacy, of Clonakilty. Does the right hon. Gentleman remember the name of Tim Hurley? I am astonished the right hon. Gentleman makes no sign of assent. [Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH assented.] I thought so. Well, Captain Plunkett visited Clonakilty twice, and this is the statement of Father Lacy—

> "To make inquiries regarding Mr. Bennett, the landlord, and Tim Hurley, the tenant. He also visited Tim's castle and farm. Tim lives in a castle. Captain Plunkett gave instructions in my presence and that of the County Inspector to write to the landlord, and ask him to meet Captain Plunkett. Mr. Carr did so, and the meeting came off. Captain Plunkett told Mr. Bennett that his rent was a rack-rent, and that he would have to give an abatement, or the police protection which Mr. Bennett had for some time enjoyed would be withdrawn, and no police would be given for the purpose of carrying out the eviction."

What does the noble Marquess say to that as an example of the dispensing power?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Will the hon. Member allow me to say that Captain Plunkett denies that? The events which since occurred prove that he is right. The landlord did not make an abatement; police protection has been given him; and Tim Hurley was evicted.

MR. SEXTON: The right hon. Gentleman would have done better to have awaited the conclusion of the letter—

> "Mr. Bennett took a week to consider, and at the expiration of the week he wrote declining to give the abatement, and the police escort was immediately withdrawn, and no police were given to aid in evicting Tim Hurley until six weeks afterwards, and only when Mr. Bennett threatened to bring an action against Mr. Smith-Barry, M.P., the High Sheriff of the County, who, it appears, is legally responsible for carrying out the law."

Father Lacy's letter is at the disposal of the right hon. Gentleman. The noble Marquess was not only satisfied that there had been no dispensing power, but I think was also satisfied there had been no un-Constitutional action. I shall respectfully take leave to put to him two or three questions. Has he heard the case of M'Nally, a Roscommon farmer, who was in his house one night with six or seven of his fellow tenants? Some police constables came spying about, put their ear to the keyhole of the back door, and heard Mr. M'Nally say, "We'll cripple the landlords yet, please God." The police burst into the house, seized M'Nally, emptied his pockets, presented a revolver at his head, and took them all before the landlord—Lord De Freyne—and whilst Lord De Freyne, his brother, the High Sheriff, and his other brother magistrates were endeavouring, in the darkness of the night, to fabricate a charge against M'Nally, these unfortunate farmers were kept waiting in the snow outside the landlord's door. Has the noble Marquess heard of what happened in the City of Cork, where a public meeting was held to protest in the case of Hurley; and whilst the public meeting was being peaceably addressed by a Member of this House, the police raided upon the people, and brutally batoned them? The Sub-Inspector of Police was committed for trial by the Local Bench; but the Crown refused to send up a Bill against him to the Grand Jury at the Winter Assizes. Has the noble Marquess heard of the Sligo meeting? Does he know that upon the night previous to the day of the proclaimed meeting the hon. Member for the Division, the Mayor of the town, a Magistrate of the County, and a number of the citizens were brutally beaten by the police, and the skull of an aged gentleman was fractured whilst they were waiting on the steps of the Town Hall to procure admission to their own municipal building, in order to hold a consultation? The police of Sligo took the same short cut which the noble Marquess took about the Phœnix Park tragedy. What right had the Government to proclaim the Sligo meeting? Reliance had been placed on a telegram from one gentleman. It would be a strange condition of Constitutional right if any gentleman, by choosing to write a telegram, could cancel the right of public meeting. The notice of the meeting I convened stated that the Land Question would be discussed, and also the conduct of the Sheriff of Sligo for forming an illegal panel. Am I to be told, in presence of the fact that at the trial it was found that the panel was prepared with great irregularities, that the Judge had the panel quashed, and said that, if the law had been obeyed, not one of the names would have appeared on that panel which actually appeared upon it—am I to be told that the citizens of Sligo have not a right to assemble in public meeting, and to discuss these matters? We are told that a Liberal Government, some years ago, proclaimed a similar meeting. Many things have happened since then; and I, for my part, deny the justice of debiting Liberal Statesmen in their wise maturity with the errors of their early days. Is the noble Marquess aware of what happened at Glenbeigh—that the Sheriff — the functionary of the law —was not allowed to confine himself to the execution of the law, but after he had completed his duties and called upon the police to accompany him to the scene of the next eviction, the police — the paid servants of the Imperial taxpayer — had to stand to arms and remain upon the spot, and to postpone the execution of the Imperial law until the execution of private vengeance and ferocity was completed. My hon. Friend the Member for Cork did not make himself clear to the noble Marquess, because he said that the exercise by the Government of the dispensing power was demoralizing, and at the same time the best that could have been done. Both are true. Nothing can be more demoralizing from the point of view of law than to find the agents and Executive of the law endeavouring to do by private, unconfessed, and stealthy means, which they are ashamed or afraid to avow, what they had no opportunity of doing by the open and justifiable force of law. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary began in the wrong way. If there was a necessity for saving the tenants of Ireland, the proper way to do it was by accepting the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork. He began too late. He should have begun before the brood of evicting landlords had commenced to pile up law costs against the tenants. He ended too soon. He ended just at the time when pressure became essential upon that class of landlords whom he himself denounced at Bristol. I say if the right hon. Gentleman were dealing with Englishmen instead of Irishmen, if, having carried out a policy informally himself, he attacked the liberties of other public men, from having attempted to carry out that policy in public, he would run an excellent chance of impeachment. If he would save himself from the gravest imputations, he ought to be frank with this House. It will not do to say that he exercised only argument and persuasion; that is beside the question. We want to know what arguments he employed—what persuasions he used—and by the time the right hon. Gentleman has informed the House what arrangements he used, what agents he employed, and against what landlords his pressure was directed—then, and only then, will the House be in a position to judge the proper comparison to be made, whether from a legal or a moral point of view, between the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo. We are told that the remedies for the ills of Ireland are the employment of the people and emigration. It will be time enough to talk about the special employment of the people when you condescend to make such laws as will allow the people of Ireland security for the fruits of their labour in their natural employment on the land. As for emigration, in the course of a generation your policy has depleted the population of Ireland in a manner unparalleled in modern times. You have decimated the people in a manner for which there is no parallel in the records of famine, of pestilence, or of war. The Irish people will not hear of emigration until the resources of Ireland have been fully developed, are intelligently applied, and fully taken advantage of. The noble Marquess may talk of your Colonial and Imperial relations; but I tell him that any attempt, upon any pretext, to emigrate the people of Ireland from their native homes will be met, on their part, with a most passionate and most fierce opposition. We are asked what is our remedy? Does anyone doubt our remedy? We have asked you to pass a Bill to save the tenants in their homes, by enabling the constituted Courts to stay evictions on payment of half the rent, and you refused. Since the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork was rejected, the rents of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Winchester (Colonel Tottenham) have been reduced by 58 per cent. I am reminded that although a landlord cannot be made good by Act of Parliament, the Duke of Devonshire has lately assented to a very large reduction in the rents of his estate, so that although the operation of the Land Act in producing virtue in that case was slow, it was sure. Well, Sir, since the rejection of the hon. Member's Bill, the rents of many tenants in Ireland have been reduced by 75 per cent; and what will hon. Gentlemen think who were misled by condemnations of my hon. Friend for only requiring an initial deposit of 50 per cent of the rent, when I tell them that if the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for the Isle of Thanet (Colonel King-Harman)—[Cries of "Order!"]—I am quite in Order. I am speaking of an Irish landlord—[Cries of "Order!" and an hon. MEMBER: "Try it!"] What will they think when I tell them that if that hon. and gallant Gentleman had received 50 per cent of his rent under that Bill, he would have obtained 4 per cent over the total amount of his present legal rents? The hon. and gallant Gentleman theMember for Winchester (Colonel Tottenham) would have received 8 per cent more than the total amount many of his present legal rents, and tenants whom I could name would, if the Bill had been passed into law, have deposited as an initial sum to secure themselves from eviction exactly double the amount of their existing legal rents. Pass the Bill of my hon. Friend the Member for Cork, give the tenants security in their homes, allow them to go into the Land Courts and have their rents fixed upon the basis of the actual value of the produce. When that is done, proceed as soon as you like to extinguish the dual ownership. When you have placed the question of the basis of a fair and practical rent, then, as soon as you like, extinguish the interest of the landlord; but do not attempt to do it on the basis of a purchase price which will be oppressive to the Irish occupier and perilous to the Treasury of Great Britain. In this great transaction of the settlement of the Irish land it is true to say that, however perfect may be the scheme devised, you cannot take up the position of making the British Treasury the individual creditor and rent collector of 500,000 tenants—you never can make the settlement at all unless you avail yourselves of the co-operation and the credit and authority, which cannot be afforded to you by anything but a native Legislature in Ireland. For the settlement of the Land Question, as for the settlement of every other Question in connection with Ireland, a native Legislature is indispensable. We are asked why we do not debate the Home Rule Question. Because, Sir, Time—the great teacher—is debating effectively for us. Every day that passes, every incident that occurs, proves more and more the impossibility of any fitting and successful government of Ireland except by the Irish people; and this Ministry, though we may desire its death—I fear its death will be rather premature—gives us reason to rejoice in its existence, for every day of that existence proves it leading characteristic to be gross ignorance of Ireland, amazing incompetence, and the most absurd and grotesque presumption. We are told by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale, who occupies substantially a position of Leader of the House—who, I must say, looks and talks a great deal more like a Leader than anybody opposite, and who occupies towards the Prime Minister a position somewhat analagous to that which, in the decline of a certain French monarchy, was occupied by the Mayor of the Palace—we are told by him with one breath that we have not properly debated Home Rule; and in the next that it is useless to apply to this House, because the majority was elected for the purpose of resisting Home Rule. I do not cherish the hope that the majority of this Assembly will concede the Irish demands; but, Sir, Houses pass away and the people still remain, and from the majority here I turn with hope and confidence to the enfranchised masses of the British people. They did not create the misgovernment of Ireland; they did not continue it; they did not understand it; they did not profit by it. I believe from my soul that they will not suffer it to continue. Guided by him whom you all acknowledge to be the greatest of your statesmen, the people of this country cannot fail to come to a just and wise conclusion. They have been long misled by selfish classes and by interested factions; but, despite the multitudinous falsehoods of the time, they are at last happily coming to understand, and, what is better, to feel the wrongs and rights of the case of Ireland. They were not responsible in the least for the guilt and shame of the misgovernment of my hapless country—they will not now incur that guilt or shame. They never had power before. They have it now. They have learned that the misery of the Irish people does not advance the well-being of Britain, however it may advance the interests of faction or increase the fortunes of a class. They have learned that the subjection of Ireland does not increase the freedom of Britain. They have learned that the political convulsions of Ireland do not promote their own tranquillity. And, Sir, out of the depth of this deep conviction I believe that the common sense of the British people, recognizing the justice of the Irish cause, and acting upon their sense of justice, will add one other free system of domestic rule to the many which adorn and strengthen their great Empire, and will thereby bind together in union for the first time—in a true union, the only real union, that of common interest and of mutual regard—two peoples meant by nature to be a help and not a hindrance to each other—two peoples nobly qualified by their gifts of intellect, and by the qualities of their nature, to sustain and to aid each other in maintaining, for all future time, a foremost place among the free and prosperous nations of the world.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): Mr. Speaker, I could wish that the whole of the hon. Member's speech had been like its conclusion. I should be the last man in the House to quarrel with the tone and spirit of the latter part of the hon. Member's speech. I may almost express a wish that the whole of his speech had been couched in an equally generous and elevated vein. When the hon. Gentleman expresses a wish for a union of heart and feeling—when he says that the people who inhabit both these countries are made to walk together in amity and friendship along the path of progress, hon. Members on this side of the

House will, I am sure, heartily agree with him. But when he comes to apply these very generous sentiments in practice, how very different the tone of the hon. Gentleman; for he has announced that every effort made by the Government, however well meant, for the benefit of his country, will be met by his countrymen with passionate and fierce resistance. [*Home Rule cries of* "No, no!" *and* "Withdraw!"]

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I said that any scheme of emigration would be so met.

MR. MATTHEWS: The hon. Gentleman said that whether we proposed any scheme for removing by emigration the overcrowded multitudes who cannot find the means of sustaining life in Ireland, or whether we endeavoured to provide employment by the expenditure of British money for those who are now toiling in vain, both would be alike rejected. ["No, no!"] Moreover, throughout his speech—which was not one minute too long, and to which the House listened with that interest which is always accorded to the hon. Gentleman—there was not one step taken by any Government which preceded the present Government, or by the present Government itself, which had not been subjected by the hon. Member to criticism of the most embittered kind. There was not a calumny uttered upon any public man, although refuted or denied both in public and private, by word of mouth and by oath, which the hon. Gentleman did not so reiterate. I do not propose to follow the hon. Gentleman into the voluminous mass of details through which he has travelled, nor in his criticisms of Judge Curran or Captain Plunkett. Those names sound to me somewhat racy of the soil to which the hon. Member is attached; but to say that either Judge Curran or Captain Plunkett were inefficient officers does not seem to me to be a very great compliment to pay to his countrymen. I do not think that details of the private conduct of well-meaning officials are very pertinent to the subject before the House. We are here debating the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork, which has now been discussed for many evenings. That Amendment is based on two propositions—one, as was pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Mr. John Morley), censuring the Government for not having proposed to the House a measure in the direction of Home Rule; and the other, blaming and censuring the Government for its administration of Ireland during the last few months. I will, with the permission of the House, deal with these various matters as briefly as I can. Now, I trust that I shall be excused for not addressing myself on this occasion to the question of Home Rule. This Government and this House stand here pledged and commissioned to resist Home Rule. It is a matter that has been discussed on 100 platforms, and debated over and over again during the existence of this present Parliament; and, therefore, it seems to me a mere waste of time on my part if we were to enter into a discussion of the Home Rule theory and proposals in this House. The hon. Member for the City of Cork is, of course, from his point of view, strictly entitled to formulate his propositions for Home Rule; but we stand upon a totally different footing, and we are altogether outside of that question, inasmuch as Home Rule was absolutely rejected by the country at the last General Election, and therefore we cannot entertain for a moment any proposal that tends in that direction. Setting aside, therefore, the question of Home Rule, I wish to apply myself to dealing with the criticism which hon. Members opposite have passed upon the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in their administration of Ireland during the last few months, marked, as it has been, by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), by "novel, doubtful, and un-Constitutional measures." We are by this time, unfortunately, only too painfully aware of what is the nature of the charges which hon. Members opposite have brought against us—the House has heard them so often. Hon. Members opposite below the Gangway allege that the Government have done wrong in almost every step they have taken—they have done wrong in having the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) bound over to be of good behaviour—and in bringing him to trial in the County of Dublin for conspiracy. They have done wrong in sending General Buller and Judge Curran to County Kerry; they have done wrong in supporting the officers of the law who directed the evictions at Glenbeigh; they have done wrong in attacking the Plan of Campaign; and they have done wrong in regard to the Sligo meetings. Many of these charges have been exhaustively dealt with by my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland, and I do not propose to go again over the ground which he has so satisfactorily covered. I will, however, with the permission of the House, deal with a few of the charges which have been made against us by the hon. Member for the City of Cork. One of the most important and material of those charges, which was endorsed by the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) was that which relates to the pending trial of certain persons, including some hon. Members of this House. I do not pretend to have the experience of the right hon. Member in this House. I am not as good a judge as he is of the character of the attack or of the censure which it is becoming to direct in this House against public constituted bodies; but I must say that I heard with grief and pain a right hon. Gentleman in his position make an attack by anticipation upon a jury which is not yet empanelled or summoned; and asserting beforehand that the trial about to be heard was not, and could not be, a fair or a proper one. I should have thought that in political controversy the right hon. Gentleman would have shrunk from what is termed in military warfare poisoning the wells, and that he would, at all events, have waited until the jury were empanelled before he attacked them, and would have refrained from denouncing the trial as unfair until it had been brought to a conclusion. Instead of that, the right hon. Gentleman has thought fit to quote certain expressions made use of in the Lobby, and remarks made in conversation outside of this House; and upon those expressions and remarks he has based his allegation that this trial is likely to be an unfair one. The hon. Member for the City of Cork is perfectly right, from his particular point of view, in challenging the probable action of the jury and of the constituted authorities—he has always done so, and we naturally expect that he will do it again. But we had no right to anticipate them, and we ought not to be exposed to them from a man like the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who is learned in the law, who has had experience of government, and who knows what the practice of a Government is in matters of this sort. If the right hon. Gentleman, occupying the position he does, stands forward, and, upon the foundation of Lobby gossip, and of conversation outside, announces to this House and the country that this trial—which is not without its importance, although I think that its importance has been somewhat exaggerated—will not, in the impression of his friends, and, I gather, of himself, be a fair one, I ask him in reply why his friends did not make good that charge upon oath in the Court of Queen's Bench in Ireland, when they had the opportunity of doing so? When the traversers applied to have the trial removed from the Court of Queen's Bench to a trial at bar, why did they not present affidavits alleging that they believed that they would not have a fair trial?

Mr. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): They refused to let us see the books.

Mr. MATTHEWS: They could have made an allegation, and they made no allegation of the sort; and it is doubtless very convenient for hon. and right hon. Gentleman to get up in this House and, sheltered by their Parliamentary privilege, to quote the gossip of the Lobby; but they shrink from making similar statements upon oath in a Court of Justice, when their truth can be tried and tested. I protest it is hardly dealing fairly with the constituted authorities of the country when the traversers themselves, who had abundant opportunity of making objection, abstained from doing so—that we should have that charge uttered in the House without a slight foundation. ["Oh, oh!"] The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Henry H. Fowler) says the Government had recourse to a device in indicting these people in Dublin instead of Galway. Nobody knows better than the right hon. Gentleman that the place where the conspiracy is hatched is the proper place for the trial to take place. It is only the exception that a trial for conspiracy is held in a place other than that in which it is hatched and formed.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): But you chose the County of Dublin instead of the City.

Mr. MATTHEWS: The right hon. Gentleman is in too great a hurry. I must take the counts of the indictment one by one. It was the duty of the Government to prefer the indictment in Dublin, and not in Galway. "But oh," says the right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt), "you have preferred the indictment in the county, and not in the city." In England, it is a matter of common law and practice with prisoners to be tried in places that are both counties and cities to change the venue to the county in order to get a wider range of juries and a larger panel. [*Ironical cheers.*] I hope that hon. Gentlemen who cheer in that way do not mean to say by that, that the more Irishmen we have to try cases the greater is the danger of a miscarriage of justice. Do they mean to tell the Government, who have been described as ignorant, incompetent, and presumptuous people, that the County of Dublin did not contain material for a fair panel? ["Order!"] I, of course, expected to hear attacks made upon Irish juries by the hon. Member for the City of Cork, because it is his practice to make such attacks in all cases where his friends are concerned. The hon. Member has described the jurors of his country as a wretched set of people, who are not to be trusted. He speaks in the most disparaging terms of jurors of the City of Dublin. Not very long since, in the course of the Maamtrasna debate, the hon. Member said that the prisoners were tried in Dublin by a packed jury, and that the jurors of the City of Dublin were a set of shopkeepers, who were mostly dependent upon patronage of the Castle for their living. These were the terms in which the hon. Member spoke of a mixed jury.

Mr. PARNELL (Cork): It was a special jury.

Mr. MATTHEWS: Quite true; but the point is that it was a jury of the City of Dublin, and the hon. Member had attacked that jury according to his wont as he has attacked every other. But I hope the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Henry H. Fowler) will take to heart the words of his Colleague (Sir William Harcourt), who, on the occasion I have referred to, warmly defended Irish juries. The right hon. Gentleman finds fault with the numbers on the jury panel. Does he know how many are on the panel at the Old Bailey?

Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said, he heard the Solicitor General state that the usual custom in Dublin was to put 80 upon the panel, but that 250 were put on for this special trial.

Mr. MATTHEWS: The Solicitor General said from 80 to 100 was the number usually put upon the panel for an Irish county.

Mr. HENRY H. FOWLER: For the County of Dublin.

Mr. MATTHEWS: The Attorney General reminds me that 100 is the usual number when a couple of pickpockets are to be tried. [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"] In a case of some importance, and one in which, from the circumstances of Ireland, absentee jurymen are likely to be numerous, a greater panel is required. Hon. Members are aware that the Press of Ireland contains articles which make it necessary that men should have no common nerve and firmness to discharge the duties of jurymen, and the Sheriff—for it is he, and not the Crown, who has done this—may think it prudent and desirable to put a good number of extra names upon the panel. Then complaint is made that the Government have not prosecuted any of the tenants who have entered into the Plan of Campaign. It was the bounden duty of the Government to prosecute, at any rate, in the first place the chief authors, and the most prominent promoters of the Plan of Campaign, for this reason—that in their judgment the Plan of Campaign was illegal; that it was mischievous as well as illegal; and I think it is unnecessary for me to add—because I am not at all sure that that ought to enter into the consideration of the Government of the day—that it was immoral. Of course I do not expect hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway opposite to agree with us in that proposition; but I should have thought that right hon. Gentlemen on the opposite Front Bench might have found the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench for Ireland a sufficiently authoritative exposition of the law for the Government to be bound to act upon it. [An hon. Member: It was no decision.] There has been no decision upon the point, says an hon. Gentleman below the Gangway; but the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) was brought before the Court on the ground that he had excited people to join an illegal conspiracy, and for that he was ordered to be bound over to be of good behaviour. The ground upon which the hon. Member was condemned was that it was an illegal conspiracy. What other authority could the Government proceed upon than that of the Court of Queen's Bench? I do not quarrel with the hon. Member for the City of Cork, who says that I should disregard this judgment altogether. That is perfectly intelligible and justifiable on his part. The hon. Member says—"I do not care what the verdict will be, for it is a verdict obtained by a mean trick." He will not accept the judgment of the Queen's Bench, because he says it is nothing; and he tells us beforehand that the verdict will have no weight with him. I would ask hon. Members if, according to the view of the hon. Member for the City of Cork, it is possible for the law to be satisfactorily administered? But do right hon. Gentlemen opposite maintain that the judgment of the highest Criminal Court in Ireland is not a sufficient exposition of what is illegal to enable the Government to act? I shall be surprised to hear that from any responsible politician on the other side. Then the right hon. Gentleman said that this Parliament was not bound by law; that it was the function of Parliament to redress all bad laws. That is entirely the function of Parliament, and therefore it is not going too far to say that this Plan of Campaign is mischievous and immoral. The hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton), somewhat unguardedly speaking about Irish landlords, said that their interest in the land was soon to disappear. But while it exists, before it disappears, even the hon. Gentleman himself admits that the landlord is a rent-charger; and, therefore, I suppose the hon. Gentleman will admit, is entitled to his rent. On what ground was the Land Act passed? On the ground that the tenant was not able to protect himself; that he was not a free agent; and that, owing to the pressure of competition, he was obliged to submit to any terms that the landlord chose to put upon him. Parliament interfered, and said that the rent should be fixed, and should be paid by the tenant, or otherwise he should go out. Is that a bargain or a contract, or is it not? Can anybody, in spite of the subtleties we have heard in this debate, chiefly from Edinburgh and Shoreditch, according to the common sense of man, legitimately hold that one of two parties to a contract can keep all he benefits and gains under it, and, claiming to be the judge in his own cause, to alter, at his pleasure and discretion, the burden of the contract, can retain all or a part of what is due under the contract to the other party? No sophistry will ever satisfy the people of this country that that is a moral action. It is a theory that would destroy the whole fabric of social life to hold that, because one party to a contract finds the price he has to pay is exorbitant, unreasonable, or excessive, he is to reap all the benefits of the contract, and, at the same time, to repudiate his own share of the bargain. If I bought goods at a price which turned out to be excessive, should I not be told it was dishonest to keep the goods—as the Irish tenant claims to keep his farm—and tender the vendor what I choose for the price, and if he did not accept it to turn round upon him and cover him with every sort of abuse, and call him a "Cromwellian scoundrel?" The real merit of the Plan of Campaign is that it can be used to coerce the landlord, so that he will get no rent at all if he evicts a single tenant. But it also coerces the tenants by getting hold of their money as a pledge. That is made perfectly plain by the utterances of hon. Gentlemen themselves. What did the hon. Member for East Mayo say at Woodford? He said—

> "But, if you mean to fight really, you must put the money aside for two reasons—first of all because you want means to support the men who are hit first; and, secondly, because you want to prohibit traitors going behind your back. There is no way to deal with a traitor except to get his money under lock and key; and if you find that he pays his rent and betrays the organization, what will you do with him? I will tell you what to do with him? Close upon his money, and use it for the organization. I have always opposed outrages. This is a legal plan, and it is ten times more effective. You make the man lodge his rent with the trustees; and if he betrays you, you can pin him to the extent of the money he has lodged, and use it to help the men who are evicted."

United Ireland, an authority which hon. Members will hardly dispute, in an article, says—

> "The tenantry upon a rack-rented estate give the best of all hostages of their sincerity to each other and to the landlord by lodging their refused rents in an estate fund which

garnishee orders cannot capture, and which will be available for the support of those whom the landlord may pick out to make examples of."

Then it says—

"The landlord will have the consolation of knowing that the more examples he makes, the deeper he will be eating into the fund which represents his own rents. Not a pound of the money will be, under the terms of the trust, available for law costs, which are in any shape simply a war indemnity to the landlords. The fund will be wholly an insurance fund against eviction."

The hon. Member for the Harbour Division of Dublin (Mr. T. C. Harrington) used expressions even more fervid than those I have just been quoting. He said a plan was before the country by which the tenants could fight the landlords with the landlords' money. Those extracts show, as plainly as it is possible anything could show, that those Members who suppose that this trust fund ever going to be paid to the landlords are under a delusion. It is a fund which is as it has been called, an insurance fund against evictions by which the landlords are to be fought; and it is said in some of the speeches addressed to the tenants that they will be better off if evicted than they would be upon their farms, and the salt of this is that they would be living out of the landlords' money. Then there is the other aspect of this—the traitors who pay their rents behind the backs of their fellow-conspirators. There is that ingrained sense of honesty in the Irish tenants that makes it necessary to coerce them against following their honest instincts and paying their debts. Hon. Members were not content with the device of "closing upon the moneys," as the hon. Member for East Mayo said. Language of a more cautiously persuasive kind was used by the hon. Member for West Kerry (Mr. E. Harrington). He said—

"When they found what was a reasonable offer for them to make they should do that and stand shoulder to shoulder, and they should not spare, so far as execration and avoiding him went, the man who broke the ring; he was a traitor to his kind, but they need not hurt his life or limb. He himself"—

That is, the hon. Member for West Kerry—

"would not soil his hands with the man's blood; but he did not believe they would have such among them when once they stood together. When once they gave proof that they were determined, they would have very few scoundrels among them."

MR. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.): I think the right hon. and learned Gentleman must be wandering in a maze of I.L.P.U. literature. I never used those words.

MR. J. E. REDMOND (Wexford, N.): Read the shorthand notes.

MR. MATTHEWS: I have not got the shorthand notes of the words.

MR. J. E. REDMOND: Your Government has.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! order!

MR. MATTHEWS: Might I by possibility have made a confusion between the hon. Member for West Kerry and his brother, the hon. Member for the Harbour Division of Dublin?

MR. E. HARRINGTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman allow me to say that I am not my brother's keeper! and I again deny that I used those words, or any which could by possibility be mistaken for them. ["Withdraw, withdraw!"]

MR. MATTHEWS: I accept at once the statement of the hon. Member for West Kerry that he did not use the language I have attributed to him. I am sorry I cannot give the authority on which the quotation is founded. I think it is a convenient publication which has been put into my hands.

MR. T. C. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour) (who had just entered the House): I understand the right hon. and learned Gentleman has quoted words which I am alleged to have spoken. Perhaps he will do me the justice to repeat the words?

MR. MATTHEWS: I will, with pleasure. [The right hon. Gentleman having again read the quotation.]

MR. T. C. HARRINGTON: I beg to say that not one word of that have I ever uttered. There is not the shadow of a foundation for the allegation that I made any speech which can possibly bear any resemblance as to that quoted, nor did I speak on the subject referred to in it.

MR. MATTHEWS: I am extremely glad that both hon. Members have been able to deny having used the words. I must confess it would not have added to their reputations if they had used them. I am perfectly ready to accept the disclaimers; but the other quotations which I have read, the correctness of which is not disputed, show distinctly that it is part and parcel of this Plan of Campaign, that by getting hold of the money of the tenant the so-called trustee may exercise such an amount of pressure upon the tenant as will prevent him paying his rent. That seems to me to be an immoral ingredient of this Plan of Campaign. The hon. Member for the City of Cork is chiefly responsible for having introduced into the public life of Ireland those singular comments in which the plainest obligations of every-day life are treated as no longer binding, because they are hard to fulfil. Sir, I was charged by the hon. Member for Belfast with having uttered words of a poetic kind, of which I am now, and always was—even in my younger days—quite incapable. I have always thought—and I think now—that the Irish rebel who levies war on Her Majesty the Queen is a perfectly intelligible person historically. I think there are reasons in the history of Ireland which may well account for such a character; he is an anachronism in my judgment; but he is a respectable anachronism. But, Sir, for those petty pilferers of the Plan of Campaign who run away with money which admittedly belongs to the landlords, even by the partial and biassed decision of the tenant himself; and which, according to the statement of the authors of the Plan, is the last farthing the tenant can afford to pay—to run away with that money, and leave the tenant still liable for his debts—for conduct such as that I have the most determined opposition, with no respect and no pity at all. I protest against the authors of this Plan of Campaign being called our political enemies, and I assert that about those prosecutions against them there is nothing political. Those persons are, if I may use popular language, engaged in a "ring" in which it was attempted to "bear" the land; they mean to reduce rents slice by slice, as we were told, in the noted quotation which has not been denied, and this is simply to call it by its proper name—a conspiracy to defraud. Do not let us be told about political opponents. Politics have nothing to do with it; this is simply a question of honesty in common life. Sir, it is not only those points to which I have drawn the attention of the House upon which I base this proposition; it struck me that through every speech from every hon. Member below the Gangway there ran this assumption—namely, that in Ireland rights of property in land and the ordinary rights of property are criminal; that is the assumption which runs through every speech of theirs. When the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), for instance, addressed the House, he told us that it was a disgrace for an English soldier to assist in evictions. What is the assumption that lies at the bottom of all such statements? The hon. Member for the City of Cork himself said that all Irish title to land was based on conspiracy and illegality; but will right hon. and hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench endorse any such a declaration and doctrine as that? Are they prepared to say that land in Ireland is held by a title so vicious that anybody is entitled to resist that title and dispossess the landlord? Will they go on to say that inveterate and hopeless pauperism—total inability to pay rent or to satisfy their legal obligations—gives a title to the tenants, and that you are not to disturb them because they cannot pay? It was most melancholy, to my mind, when the hon. Member for East Mayo told us how very poor was the population, and how deserted were the districts he described. But did the hon. Member ever take the trouble to consider to what extent those districts had become rich because they were depopulated; and how far the others remained poor because the unhappy peasants, with whom we sympathize as much as you, found the land could not support them? Do you suppose that we Englishmen have not got hearts as completely open as yours are to the sufferings of the Irish tenants? Do you think we do not sympathize with the victims of those cruel economical and physical laws which have passed over so many unhappy villages in Ireland just as a harrow passes over a field, crushing it as it goes? Do you not think that the tears you shed so copiously are somewhat venomous tears? You indulge your hatreds under the cover of humanity. We do not follow your example in that. I claim on behalf of the Government, and on behalf of hon. Members on this side of the House, that it is not want of sympathy with the impoverished tenant in Ireland, who is reduced to a condition in which he cannot pay his rent nor fulfil his obligations—it is not want of sympathy that makes us say that it is impossible to give him, in these circumstances, a greater right as against the landlords than he now possesses; and that it is impossible for him to hold property when he can fulfil none of the obligations belonging to it. The attitude of the hon. Member for the City of Cork and his friends is intelligible, but the attitude of right hon. Gentlemen opposite is much more interesting. We have had from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) not much guidance in the course of this debate. He would express no opinion about the Plan of Campaign, except that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had caused it. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), in the massive and masculine speech which he delivered last night, gave the true ring, and a sound about which there is no mistake. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) took refuge in the statement that he would not defend the Plan of Campaign. I commend this to the notice of hon. Members below the Gangway opposite. Do they not know that right hon. Gentlemen opposite, while using this soft and mild language—[An hon. MEMBER: "Soft soap!"]—in their hearts detested the principles and abhorred the practices of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway. They will not say so, for reasons explained by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale last night; but let hon. Members below the Gangway draw the inevitable conclusion from these lame apologies—if apologies they can be called—for the Plan of Campaign. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) has recourse to a *tu quoque*. It is not, however, the *tu quoque* of the hon. Member for Cork, who went back to the confiscations of Cromwell and William III. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle fell foul of the hon. Member for East Belfast (Mr. De Cobain), who had written an incitement to some crime; and, consequently, that absolved the right hon. Gentleman from the necessity of condemning the Plan of Campaign. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) has still to enlighten us. I know that from him we shall have an emphatic condemnation of the scheme—not a halting apology, but an emphatic condemnation of a scheme and system in Ireland which runs counter to every opinion which he has ever proclaimed in this House. I do not suppose the right hon. Gentleman will say that the Plan of Campaign is the Apostolic successor of any preceding attempt in Ireland, for you cannot connect the Apostles with anything so discreditable. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) also has not told us—in this House at least—his view of the Plan of Campaign. Both his admirers and his opponents have felt a little uneasy about that right hon. Gentleman of late. But he appears to us to resemble that lady who, "while saying she would ne'er consent, consented;" and we do not know whether, under the blandishments of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, his consent will not be given. I myself believe that he will, upon all this Irish Question, be perfectly sound and true to the principles he has always maintained. I do not think we make allowance enough for the fact that he has got his contingent below the Gangway to deal with also. Upon this subject of the Plan of Campaign he also has given the true ring, and has condemned it most emphatically. If this be so, on what grounds are hon. Members opposite going to vote for the Amendment? If they vote for it they will be adopting the doctrines of the Plan of Campaign. They will be adopting the doctrine that landlordism is a crime; they will be adopting the doctrine that pauperism gives a title to property; they will be adopting the doctrine that it is fair to combine in order to induce men to neglect and evade their legal obligations; and they will also be adopting the doctrine that legal rights are not to be enforced by the Government except on their discretion, and that the Government can pick and choose the cases and the occasions when it is estimable and praiseworthy to enforce legal rights. I shall be very much surprised to hear from the responsible Members of the Opposition such doctrines as those. I maintain that it would be the gravest dereliction of duty on the part of the Government if, because it detests the conduct of a particular man as being cruel and unjust, it should take upon itself to say—"We will not enforce the law in your case.

To do a great right we will do a little wrong. Although the law has awarded you a right, yet because we think your conduct has been harsh and cruel, we will not assist you in getting that which the law entitles you to." If the Government were capable of such conduct as that, we should deserve impeachment. Therefore, I implore the House not to censure us for doing that which we were bound in duty to do—not to censure us for enforcing rights which we were bound to enforce, and which we could not help enforcing. At any rate, our course is clear. We have striven, and we shall continue to strive, to prevent the spread and success of this organized combination to defeat the law. I think we have not been wholly unsuccessful already. I believe that the present conduct of the Government, in meeting this Plan of Campaign at once by all the resources which the law affords us, has been successful in checking its growth. And I believe that if we persevere in that course the House will support us, and we shall succeed still more completely. That the House will support us I feel very little doubt, for the House of Commons will know that law and order, and the enforcement of established rights, are the only foundations of civilized society, and that it will not be deterred from taking that course because the harsh name of "coercion" is used. It never is coercion to punish and redress crime; still less will the House be deterred by the Amendment of the hon. Member for the City of Cork from entering on the stern path of duty, in order to maintain law and order in every part of this country.

Colonel NOLAN (Galway, N.): The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary (Mr. Matthews) spoke with his usual eloquence on the subject of the Amendment; but I think that he hardly sufficiently dwelt on the extremely mild character of my hon. Friend's (Mr. Parnell) proposition, the chief object of which is to point out that in those districts of Ireland where reasonable reductions have been made in rents by the landlords, there is less trouble than usual to contend against, and that nothing whatever has been done there which calls for repressive measures on the part of the Government such as those they are contemplating at the present moment. I may instance my own constituency as one example of this. The constituency forms a very large portion of the County of Galway, which is now, and has been lately, so much before the public. We have no serious crime there, and a good many of the landlords have made some reductions, although I cannot say that they are very large ones. The district at the present moment may fairly, I think, congratulate itself on being at least sufficiently peaceable not to call for any of those extreme measures which the Government are now contemplating, and which the Home Secretary has defended. I must congratulate one Member of the Government—I do not know whether it is the First Lord of the Treasury, or the Secretary to the Treasury, but there is always supposed to be one Member of the Government who arranges the Ministerial speakers—I must congratulate that Gentleman upon having conceived the capital notion of putting up the Home Secretary. As a great deal turned upon the question of challenging practically the whole of the Catholic jurors at Sligo, it was a capital idea to put up a Catholic. The Government, therefore, put up the Catholic Home Secretary, who was prepared to "go the whole hog." The right hon. and learned Gentleman only omitted one point. He should have justified the language of the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson), who last night compared the Catholic Primate of Ireland to Friar Tuck. I think the right hon. and learned Gentleman would have shown how completely he goes with the Government in these matters, if he had defended that comparison on the part of the hon. and gallant Member. However, even the right hon. and learned Gentleman's eloquence will hardly induce the House, after the magnificent speech we had last night from the right hon. Gentleman the late Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Henry H. Fowler), to think that it is a perfectly right thing in a Catholic county to exercise the practically unlimited power of challenge which the Crown possesses in such a way as to strike off in most of the cases tried all the Catholic jurors. The reason why we object to the proceedings of the Crown in reference to the trial which is to take place in Dublin next week is, that we are almost afraid that, with some slight exceptions, the course followed in Sligo will be pursued in Dublin. I say some slight exceptions, because there will be a few Catholics so identified in interest with the Government that they will be safe men; and the reason why we complain of the trial having been transferred to Dublin County is that the prosecuting counsel will go through the panel in the same way as was done at Sligo; but will leave upon the jury a few Catholics who are closely identified by property with the governing class. I speak on this subject with some experience. When I was first returned for my county, I was criminally prosecuted on a charge of having intimidated the voters at the election. The allegation was, of course, that I had obtained votes by intimidation. Several clergymen and others were prosecuted at the same time. Well, our whole fear was that the prosecuting counsel would strike all the Catholics off the panel. We knew we were perfectly innocent; and we said that as long as they left some of the Catholics on the jury, as long as we had a fair trial, we did not care. We knew that with a fair jury we had a good case, and we were prepared to go on the merits. On the other hand, we felt that if the Crown went through the panel and struck out all the men except those who were known to be hostile to everything popular, we were, to a certain extent, in a doubtful position. I refer to this matter merely to show the House why we are so anxious to have a fair jury struck in Dublin next week. We do not ask that there should be no challenges whatever; but that there should only be challenges where the men on the jury list are identified in any particular way with one side or the other. Well, Sir, I do not intend to deal with the whole of the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman; but I regard this question of the course of procedure in Dublin next week as of great importance; the more so, because I was once in a position in which the principles now involved applied to myself. There is one point on which I should like to set the right hon. and learned Gentleman right. I am sure he knows a great deal about affairs in Dublin, and a great deal about the law; but he knows very little about the soil of Ireland. The right hon. and learned Gentleman asked the House whether it was not the case that the soil of Ireland was poor on account of the congested population in some districts, and because the people were crowded upon the land. That is, however, absolutely the reverse of the fact. The lands which have been depopulated are not rich because they have been so dealt with. It is notorious that Meath and other counties which are practically depopulated at the present moment, have always possessed the richest soils in Ireland; whereas in Kerry and other counties which are over-populated, the land has always been poor, and it owes any richness, such as it is, which it possesses to the exertions of the population residing upon it. As I have said, Sir, it is not my intention to go at any length into the speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman. I rose chiefly on account of some observations which were made about my conduct respecting some evictions many years ago by the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Captain McCalmont). I think, Sir, it would be better in these cases if the ordinary courtesies of the House were observed, and that some notice should be given when a statement respecting the personal conduct of a Member, and which that Member cannot possibly expect, is to be made. I could not have expected that the observations I refer to would have been made, because the whole of the events to which they related were so well known, and were freely discussed years ago. It would have been as well, under the circumstances, that the hon. and gallant Gentleman should have given me some intimation that he intended to make an attack upon me. I have given the hon. and gallant Gentleman notice that I intended to refer to the subject this evening. I may say that it is very easy to distort charges, and to make false ones appear like true, in the absence of the person attacked, and it is easy to make it very difficult for his friends to be able, on the spur of the moment, to give a categorical denial to a statement in which there is some truth, but which is made in such a way as to convey a totally false impression to the House. The hon. and gallant Member charged me with having made certain evictions on a townland. I do not think he gave the name of the townland, but I am speaking in his hearing and I will give it. The name is thoroughly well-known throughout the whole of Ireland. It is

Portcarn. From the way in which the hon. and gallant Gentleman put the case, the occurrence might have taken place only a few years ago. As a matter of fact, however, the whole of the circumstances were practically closed 15 years ago. I cannot go into the whole of the facts of the case, but I will put the matter in this way to the House. The case was written about more than anything else for six months in Ireland. Hundreds of leading articles were published in the newspapers on both sides, and the placards issued against me were sworn to number over 100,000. Of course, there was a contested election going on at the time, and the case was thoroughly threshed out. The result was that I had four-fifths of the landlords of the county against me; and at the poll I had, at the very least, four-fifths of the tenants—probably five-sixths—with me. The hon. and gallant Gentleman made a serious of statements every one of which was calculated to convey a false impression. I do not deny that there were evictions on the townland, but every one of the tenants evicted was put back again—not on the same land, but on other land not far away. I may say that every fact which the hon. and gallant Gentleman stated was not absolutely false, but was as false as any statement I have ever heard made in the House of Commons. I was, in the first instance, at a loss to account for the attack which the hon. and gallant Gentleman made upon me, and I thought that he was simply attacking me as a Member of a particular Party. I did not know the hon. and gallant Member, and I had no idea how it was he knew anything about me, for Antrim is a long way from Galway. But by chance I took up *The Parliamentary Companion*, and what did I find? I discovered that the owner of an estate situated quite close to this townland was Mr. James Martin, of Ross, the hon. and gallant Gentleman's grandfather, and a most bitter opponent of mine during the election to which I have alluded. I will do Mr. James Martin the justice to say that he opposed me at the election because he thought I was doing too much for the tenants and putting false notions into their heads. I may say that I do not, as a rule, attack men about the management of their property. I have done a good deal towards bringing about changes in the law and giving justice to the tenants, but the means I have adopted have not involved attacks upon neighbouring landlords. But when the grandson of a neighbouring owner comes forward in this House and makes statements which contain just enough colour to deceive hon. Members as to the real facts, I think I am entitled to reply. I say, then, that, without exception, Mr. James Martin was looked upon as the hardest landlord in the county, and as over-renting his tenants very largely. Since the time I have been speaking of, he has had the most unhappy contests with his tenants, and the property has been a most miserable one. His grandson now comes forward and attacks me. I shall not say anything more on the subject. I would never pose in this House as a good landlord, and do not pretend to be better than my class. I do not profess to be a bit better than an ordinary landlord. I have always said to my constituents, "Do not return me, because I may be a good landlord; return me for my political opinions." Well, Sir, the Government are prosecuting my Friends, because it is said they have held up landlords to execration. That is just what the hon. and gallant Member opposite (Captain McCalmont) has done to me; but he will not be tried, because he can claim the privilege of the House of Commons. The hon. and gallant Member says that all the landlords in Antrim are agreed about Nationalism except one, and he attacks that one as an extremely bad landlord. The hon. and gallant Member talks of rents having been raised 40 per cent. Why, Sir, in some parts of Ireland they would laugh at that. I do not suppose that the hon. and gallant Gentleman's grandfather contented himself with a rise of 40 per cent; perhaps 200 per cent would be nearer the mark. Well, I have given my answer to the attack made upon me. I hope that people in Ireland will remember that I have never attempted to pose as a good landlord, although I do not think I am worse than ordinary landlords. The hon. and gallant Gentleman says I am much worse. Well, the people have elected me five times in my present constituency, and that is a tolerably good answer to such a statement, for there are not so many good landlords to elect.

I hope it will be remembered that if I have brought the name of a property-owner before the House of Commons, I have only done so because I have been attacked by that Gentleman's near relative. I have only replied to what has been said about me, and I would warn the hon. and gallant Member that he had better look at home and try to defend his immediate relatives than make attacks upon others.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): If all the speeches which proceed from hon. Members sitting below the Gangway opposite were as moderate as the one to which we have just listened, I think, Sir, that a much deeper effect would be made by them upon the House. We have, however, this evening heard language of a very different character—language constituting a violent attack upon the Government, from the lips of the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton). I will attempt to deal with one or two of the arguments which that hon. Member used to the House in support of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). The hon. Member for West Belfast said that the law was defective and oppressive, and that it was the duty of Members of the House of Commons to obtain its repeal. I thoroughly agree on that point with the hon. Member. It is the duty of everyone who thinks a law is oppressive to do his best to obtain its repeal. But I ask hon. Gentlemen opposite, do they think that the proper course to pursue, in order to obtain the repeal of a law, is to break the law? Ought they not to try and carry out their intentions by lawful methods? I think that Gentlemen who follow the lead of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) are hardly sufficiently indoctrinated with the principles of the National League to approve of any other principle. The hon. Member for West Belfast went on to say that the Plan of Campaign was necessary, and therefore it was not immoral. That was a very extraordinary argument to advance, and we have only to apply it to one or two cases which occur in daily life, to see how absurd it is. I have the privilege of belonging to a very honourable profession, but it is not very well paid, and its members find it difficult, in early life, to obtain briefs. It is part of our practice, and very necessary for success, to take Chambers in the Temple, and these are rather expensive. If we follow the reasoning of the hon. Member for West Belfast, as chambers are necessary to us, and we cannot at the beginning of our professional life earn enough money to pay the rents of them; we shall be justified in refusing to pay those rents, and we shall have the support of the hon. Member for West Belfast if we act upon his arguments and pursue that illegal course. Referring to the Dillon estate, the hon. Member (Mr. Sexton) said that thousands of people had been saved by the action of the Plan of Campaign. I think that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) referred to the same matter in introducing this Amendment, and I believe that reference has been made to the same alleged action of the Plan of Campaign by other speakers. This would lead the House to believe that if the Plan of Campaign had not been carried out on the Dillon estate, terrible suffering would have ensued there and unexampled horrors would have been perpetrated. I have it, however, on an authority upon which I can implicitly rely—the authority of the agent of the estate—that before the arrival of the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) and Mr. O'Brien upon the property, several hundreds of the very poorest of the tenants had paid all their rents without any pressure and without any abatement. Will hon. Gentlemen opposite rise in their places now to support the action of the Plan of Campaign. [*A cry of* "Yes" *from the Home Rule Benches.*] And will they support the language used by the hon. Member for East Mayo, when he said he had not interfered in any case whatever, unless he had satisfied himself of the justice of that case? [An hon. MEMBER: "I do not believe one word."] Well, there are some Gentlemen with whom, I regret to say, it is impossible to argue. The hon. Member for West Belfast went on to speak of the question of the Joint Stock Banks in Ireland, and he referred to the extreme poverty of Ireland, as contrasted with the riches we possess in England. I know perfectly well that to our misdirected policy in the past much of the misery of Ireland is to be traced; but I will put some figures before the House which will show that during the years between 1881 and

1885 there has been some increase in the material prosperity of the country. While there was a decrease of £60,320 in the deposits in Trustee Savings Banks in Ireland during those years, the deposits in the Post Office Savings Banks increased by £669,000, and the deposits in the Bank of Ireland and Joint Stock Banks showed an increase of £951,780. Thus there was a total increase of the deposits in Irish banks, between 1881 and 1885, amounting to £1,560,460. I now turn to some other figures, and I find that the Irish tenants in the same period received something like £1,100,000 in the sweeping away of arrears, and that reductions of rent were granted amounting to £511,000. It is a curious fact that if hon. Gentlemen will put these figures together, they will find that the sum received by the tenants during the period I have mentioned in reductions of rent and the sweeping away of arrears amounted to within a very few thousand pounds of the sum they deposited in the banks of Ireland. Let me state one other fact, to show how the material prosperity of the country has increased in recent years. There is, I believe, nothing that shows us more plainly the increase or decrease in the material prosperity of a nation than the state of the houses in the country. In 1841 the Census Commissioners took a Census of the inhabited houses in Ireland. They divided them into four classes; the 1st, consisting of the better-class houses in the towns; the 2nd, of good farmhouses; the 3rd, of mud cabins with three or four rooms and windows; and the 4th, of mud cabins with no windows and only one room. Well, I find that whilst between 1871 and 1881 there was a total decrease of over 47,000 in the number of the inhabited houses in Ireland, the whole of that decrease was in the 4th, or lowest class of all. The figures were these. In the 4th class there was a decrease of 115,110, but in the 3rd class there was an increase of 27,349; in the 2nd class there was an increase of 34,581, and the 1st class an increase of 5,808. I think that any hon. Gentlemen who are acquainted with the economical aspect of the country will agree with me that such an increase as that in the number of better-class houses shows a considerable improvement in the material prosperity of the people. I do not think that there is any other point in connection with the speech of the hon. Member for West Belfast that I need deal with except one, and that is in reference to the alleged great fall in prices. We all of us agree, and we all deplore, that there has been a great and unexampled fall in prices. As long ago as the General Election of 1885, in the address I issued to my constituents, I remarked upon the dreadful depression which had fallen upon the agricultural interests of England and Ireland. We all recognize the existence of that depression. But hon. Gentlemen bring these cases before us, and they do not put them in a fair light. The hon. Member for West Belfast based his case upon four articles of consumption only—namely, butter, pork, beef and mutton, which have all fallen in price. He said nothing, however, about oats, or about barley, or about flax, or about potatoes. Were we to form our judgment as to the condition of agriculture in England solely upon the fall in the price of wheat, we should be guilty of no greater absurdity than the hon. Member stands convicted of in basing it in Ireland merely upon the prices of butter, beef, pork, and mutton. But there is another point to be considered. In regard to the question of butter, how is it that at the present moment Irish butter fetches a lower price than Dutch, Danish, or Normandy, or any other butter in the market? I ask hon. Gentlemen opposite what is the reason for it. They know perfectly well that it is because the Irish farmer will not take the trouble to make good butter, and because he sends over what he does make very badly packed to this country. It is, as a rule, packed so badly, that when it arrives in England it is in a very poor condition, and cannot fetch a high price. Let the Irish farmer take a lesson from the foreigners, and learn their methods of butter-making and butter-packing, and I think we shall soon see that important branch of Irish industry exhibiting great improvement. The same thing applies to the state of agriculture generally in Ireland. Take the case of cattle. In Ireland, stock has deteriorated in quality to an almost unprecedented extent. Why is that? Is it not the fact that the Irish landlord, who has been in the habit of providing good sires for improving the stock of the country, does not now, whatever the reason, provide that means of improving the stock? In regard to farming generally, is it not well known that the system in use in Ireland is of the most primitive character? Has a farmer in Ireland any knowledge of the rotation of crops, or of the best methods of improving the soil? Not one atom of attention does the Irish farmer bestow on either. Then, Sir, have those who come here and ask us to hand over to them the government of Ireland, held out any encouragement or any inducement to the Irish tenants to practise industry and thrift and to improve their system of farming? No; not one. I have searched their speeches, and not one instance of such advice do I find. If I am not wearying the House, I should like to refer for one moment to the speech delivered in this debate by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley). The right hon. Gentleman told us that we on this side of the House had been guilty of sermonizing and of lecturing the Irish Members, and that he considered this was a course which, in the future, we should not pursue. Then he went on to say that there was something in the temper and the frame of mind of Irish tenants which prevented them buying their holdings. It is perfectly evident to me that the right hon. Gentlemen cannot have bestowed that amount of attention on the utterances made by hon. Members below the Gangway opposite, as a Gentleman holding his distinguished position, and one who is regarded as an authority upon the Irish Question, ought to have done. Had he done so, the right hon. Gentleman would have found in those speeches a very good reason why hon. Members on this side of the House should censure the followers of the hon. Member for Cork, and why the tenants in Ireland will not buy their holdings. Let me just read one passage. In order to save hon. Gentlemen opposite from any anxiety, I will give the name of the paper from which I took it, and the date. The speech was quoted in *The Freeman's Journal* of the 15th of November. This is what the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) told the tenantry of Ireland—

"The National League intended to lay down a law, wherever it had power, that no estate shall be bought on which tenants have been evicted, until every tenant evicted since 1879 had been put back in his holding. On the estates where the rents were rack-rents, they should allow no man to sell his interest; for the man who sold his interest in a rack-rented estate, and allowed a man of means, a man of trade, to come in, was one of the tenants' greatest enemies."

Well, Sir, I should have thought that to have a man of means on an estate would have been an advantage to it; but hon. Gentlemen opposite have such extraordinary ideas of political economy that it is always impossible to know what views they will next express. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle was delivered in such funereal tones, and couched in such a melancholy strain, that it reminded me of a poem of Edgar Poe, and I thought of the lines—

"Is there—*is* there balm in Gilead?—tell me—
truly, I implore!"
Quoth the Raven, "Nevermore."

The right hon. Gentleman asked if it was not possible for politicians to rise above the exigencies of Party. The right hon. Gentleman had only to turn to his left to find out whether this was possible, for there sat within a few feet of him a distinguished statesman (the Marquess of Hartington) who has shown to all the world that it is possible for a man to prefer his Country to his Party. I think the House will agree with me when I describe him in the words of Horace as—

"*Justum et tenacem propositi virum*
Non civium ardor prava jubentium
Non vultus instantis tyranni
Mente quatit solida."

The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. John Morley) on his arrival the other day in Newcastle, where he felt himself, I suppose, like the familiar barn-door fowl, on his own particular spot, indulged in a lusty crow. He asked—"Where is the Unionist Party? Their alliance is crumbling away." I think the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale has shown us that their alliance is stronger than ever, and is being more firmly cemented day by day. The hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) said, in those eloquent terms which we all of us admire, that time was on the side of those who are with him. Yes, time, perhaps, is on your side, but we have education upon ours. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen laugh at that which is the most educated city in the whole of the world? Is it not London? What is the most educated spot in the whole of London? St. George's. [*Renewed laughter.*] I would advise hon. Gentlemen who laugh to improve their historical knowledge, and to study Macaulay. Yes, education is on our side, and as time goes on, time gives way to education. Education gains upon time, and the more the masses are educated to understand the question of Home Rule, the more firmly will they be rivetted in their opposition to that fatal step. Sir, I have trespassed on the House at far too great length. I will only say, in conclusion, that we will allow hon. Gentlemen who follow the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) no monopoly in wishing good things for Ireland. We echo the words used by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). We desire the removal of grievances in Ireland; we desire the amelioration of the condition of the people, and in due course, if hon. Gentlemen from Ireland will only enter on a Constitutional plan of action, we will extend to them that which we believe to be the proper form of government—namely, Local Government. The point on which hon. Gentlemen opposite and we on this side of the House differ is as to the form that government shall take. They say Home Rule; we say Local Government. With regard to the condition of Ireland we are both at one. We are both heartily working for the same cause. I appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite—will they not abandon the fatal path they are now pursuing, and adopt the path of Constitutional agitation in its place? If they will do that, instead of rivetting the grievances of Ireland round her neck, they will be removing them. I will only say this one word more. Through good report and evil report we will maintain the cause we were sent here to advocate; but we hope that, by pursuing a course of justice to Ireland—justice in its highest and purest sense—we shall before long bring about such a state of things in Ireland that before the sunshine of returning prosperity will for ever disappear the "winter of her discontent."

MR. C. S. PARKER (Perth): Sir, it is refreshing to hear a young Member enlivening the debate by quoting Horace, and I have listened with interest to his statistics of improvement in Ireland. But I have only risen for the purpose of saying what view I take of the Amendment now before the House. It appears to me that the Amendment raises two chief issues—one, a question of fact; and the other, a question of policy, but involving also a censure upon the Government. On the question of fact, the issue is not a very broad one, and to a certain extent, the language of the Amendment and that of the Address agree. We are told in Her Majesty's Speech that the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland are seriously disturbed, but only in certain districts. The Amendment acknowledges that there are these disturbed relations, and that they are confined to certain districts. But we are further invited to say that they are limited to the estates of certain landlords—namely, those landlords who have refused what the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) calls "suitable concessions," and what the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) terms "necessary abatements of rent." Now, has that been established to the satisfaction of the House, or not? What are suitable or necessary abatements of rent? In other words, what, under the present circumstances, is a fair rent? On the one hand, there is the extreme view of some landowners, who maintain that the fair rent judicially ascertained and fixed by the Act of 1881, is a fair rent still, because that Act gives the tenants 15 years' tenure, and, had prices risen instead of falling, no one would have proposed to increase the rent. Now, that I call one extreme view. There is another extreme view, which the advocates of the tenants take—namely, that a fair rent would be the rent under present circumstances, or under any circumstances, on which a tenant can live and thrive. And inasmuch as it is held by high authorities, that throughout a large number of the small holdings in Ireland economic rent has ceased, therefore in all these cases if the principle of live and thrive be accepted, fair rent in present circumstances would be no rent. But neither of these extreme views is in question. It is agreed, between Her Majesty's Government on the one hand, and the hon. Member for Cork on the other, that the fall of prices has been so serious and the distress of the tenants so great, as to demand very considerable abatements of rent. The first question we have to decide on matters of fact is this—are we in a position to say what should be the per-centage of that abatement? And, then, there is a further question—namely, as to the legitimacy of certain means of pressure which have been brought to bear upon the landlords. I think it is a very difficult matter for the House to pronounce a decided opinion to what should be the abatement. I can imagine a landowner approaching the question in this way. He might say "The Court has fixed an absolutely fair judicial rent, and therefore I shall not consent to remit more than 10 per cent." But he then meets Captain Plunkett or Sir Redvers Buller, or is in some way brought under the influence of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and under those influences he is induced to go a step further, and to make an abatement of 15, 20, or even 25 per cent. The tenants, an organized body, say—"Go 5 per cent further or you will get no rent at all." [*Cries of* "Oh!"] Some hon. Member appears to intimate dissent. I do not know whether he means that the tenants themselves are not allowed to take that course, but that it is the result of the interposition of those who are conducting the Plan of Campaign—that they fix an abatement such as they think fair to the tenants. However this may be, I can quite conceive, from the figures put before us, that 30 or even 40 per cent might be a proper abatement in some cases; but I do not see how I can subscribe to the proposition that in all cases where there have been serious disturbances, the landlord, and not the tenant, has been to blame. As to the organized attempt to dictate terms of reduction, the conclusion I have come to is this—We are asked two questions about it: Is it legal, and is it moral? For a Legislative Assembly to undertake to settle the question whether it is legal or not, when next week that question is coming before the highest Law Court in Ireland, is impossible; and I understand that the hon. Member for Cork has no desire that we should settle that question here. As to the moral question, I think the language of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary, in denouncing the leaders of the movement, went somewhat beyond what was reasonable. I was sorry to hear him say of an hon. Member so much respected as the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), that he regarded him, when he would have to stand next week before a legal tribunal, with no pity whatever. I am satisfied that hon. Members generally do not share that feeling. Everyone who knows the hon. Member for East Mayo knows him to be a sincere man, a man acting under strong convictions, and those who think him mistaken might have some feeling of sympathy for him now that he is about to be placed upon his trial. I think we shall be in a better position to judge both as to the legal and moral aspect of the question after that trial has taken place. There remains the question of policy. There are placed before us two policies, one of which is strongly condemned—and the other strongly recommended. The policy of the Government is condemned in the Amendment, and in the speech of the hon. Member for Cork he attacked their policy, both past and future. When I first read the Amendment, I supposed that by "novel, doubtful, and un-Constitutional" means the hon. Member meant the pressure which has been brought to bear by the Government upon some of the landlords to abate their claim for rent. I am glad to find that that is not so, and that the hon. Member does not disapprove of the action of the Government in that respect. But there were many other things which the hon. Member for Cork censured, and especially the prosecution which is to commence on Monday next. Of that we shall be better able to judge when we know what it is, and how it has been conducted. As to the Sligo meeting, if it had been what the hon. Member has described it to be, I should have been disposed to go with him in denouncing the proclamation of it, because I attach the highest importance to the freedom of public meetings. The difficulty I feel in this case is that one of the principal placards calling the meeting clearly showed that it was held for the express purpose of influencing a jury. I cannot cast censure upon the Government for proclaiming a meeting that was intended to interfere directly with the free action of a jury. I do not propose to detain the House with any remarks upon jury-packing further than this—that in Ireland the selection of a jury is an extremely delicate matter, and one upon which it is impossible to be too careful. If men are chosen almost entirely of one political creed and of one religion, such action will be certain to create a feeling of distrust, and no confidence will be felt in a verdict so obtained. I have said that we have two policies before us, and the chief contrast between the two policies is a contrast for the future. What has been said of the Government policy is this: The hon. Member for Cork says—

> "We are face to face with a Front Bench which has no plan of reform for Ireland, no plan of amelioration for the tenants, no plan for easing the relations between landlord and tenant, except this novel plan of bringing pressure to bear upon the landlords."

I agree very much with that criticism of the hon. Member upon the policy of Her Majesty's Government, and I fail to see, in the Royal Speech, any promise of satisfactory legislation or change of the law in Ireland which will meet the wants and wishes of the Irish people. Indeed, I think we are justified in employing again the expression which was used last year—that the policy of the Government is a policy of nothing but Royal Commissions. I do not condemn such inquiry into questions affecting Ireland, because I think it may possibly lead to good results. But I would willingly vote for the last part of the Amendment, if it stood alone. I would willingly vote for "such a reform of the law and system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people." Those are somewhat general words, but they may well be accepted by the Liberal Party generally, and even by that section who call themselves Unionists. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) who is the Leader of the Unionist Party, remarked that they pointed only to the confidence of the Irish people, and said nothing about the confidence of the British people. That may be a fair verbal criticism, but it would not deter me from voting. It is for other other reasons that I cannot support the Amendment—first, because it invites me to pronounce a verdict upon matters of fact, and to say that, in all cases where there have been disturbances, the landlords, and not the tenants, are to blame; and, secondly, because it invites me to pass censure on the Government for almost all its recent policy, for the efforts it is making to secure law and order, and especially for acts on which I can only form a judgment when the trial of the traversers comes on next week. But I shall be prepared, as the Session goes on, to give the hon. Member for Cork and his Party substantial help in obtaining such reforms of the law and the system of government in Ireland, so long as they are not in themselves unjust or objectionable, as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people.

Mr. COWLEY LAMBERT (Islington, E.): Sir, I ask for that indulgence which is usually extended to a Member who rises to address the House for the first time. Although I am a Metropolitan Member, and have no particular connection with Ireland, still I have frequently visited that country, and have made myself familiar with the people. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) desires to represent to Her Majesty that—

> "The remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is not to be found in increased stringency of criminal procedure, or in the pursuit of such novel, doubtful, and un-Constitutional measures as have recently been taken by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland, but in such a reform of the law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people."

Now, Sir, what are the needs of the Irish people? The hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork, the other night, inveighed against any attempt on the part of the Government to make the administration of justice in Ireland more certain; but he offered us no policy in place of that which he is so anxious to dispense with—his speech being simply a tirade against the enforcement of law, and a cataract of bombastic cautions—he objected to them being called threats—as to what was likely to happen to the English people, their public buildings, and their Ministers if they dared to carry out what they conceived to be their duty. He says he is anxious to satisfy the wants of the Irish people. But what, I say again, are the wants of the Irish people? I think we are sometimes inclined to forget that the term, "Irish people," is not synonymous with the term, "National League;" and that, while hon. Members below the Gangway opposite represent that portion of the Irish people which is comparatively under the thumb of the National League, there is a very large part of the Irish nation which is law-abiding, who, unfortunately, except in the northern part of the country, have no direct representation in this House. Now, Sir, there was no argument used at the last Election that carried more weight than the argument used against handing over the loyal population of Ireland to the agitators. Speaking as the Representative of a working-class constituency in the north of London, I can say that there was no point the working men of this country were more anxious to listen to, and upon which they made up their minds so firmly, as that I refer to, of handing over the loyal minority to the agitators. It showed to me the truth of the remark of my hon. and learned Friend who spoke last from this side of the House (Mr. Yerburgh), as to where the great intelligence of the country rests; and I must say, Sir, that next to St. George's, Hanover Square, the electors of East Islington show as much intelligence as any other constituency in the Metropolis. I do not wish to make a personal matter of this; but on referring to the statistics of the General Election, I find that in the constituency I have the honour to represent—East Islington—out of a vote of 6,558, I am sorry to say there were as many as 29 illiterates. When, however, we compare that with the condition of the Irish electorate, we find a remarkable difference. In Mid Cork, for instance, we see that out of 5,241 votes polled, there were 2,083 illiterates. I am not an Irish landlord, thank goodness; therefore, I can venture, I think, to take a perfectly independent view of the subject before the House. But we have heard so much from the other side about the misery and wretchedness of the starving tenants, and the cruelties and horrors practised on them by the landlords, that I think it would not be altogether out of place if, instead of taking part in an academic discussion, an English Member made a practical appeal on behalf of the loyal landlords and tenants in Ireland. I rise to call the attention of the House to certain facts regarding a very well-known estate in the South of Ireland. The landlord was born and bred on the estate, and had lived on it all his life, as his father and grandfather had done before him. This gentleman, like his predecessors, has always endeared himself to his tenants and neighbours by acts of kindness and charity, and up to a short time ago his rents were paid punctually and willingly. Though I will not go so far as the hon. Member for the Camborne Division of Cornwall (Mr. Conybeare), and say that the police had to be called in to keep order amongst the tenants, owing to their frantic desire to pay their rents—and, as the hon. Member spoke, I could not help thinking, from that and other remarks that fell from him, that some of the Irish people must have heard of the advent of their simple-minded Cornish champion, and in their love of practical joking must have prepared a few travellers' tales for his special edification. However, though no police were required to keep order, the tenants on the estate to which I refer always paid their rents cheerfully and willingly. The landlord investigated many cases of distress, and gave fair reductions of rent wherever they were needed. But, not long ago, a branch of the National League was established, not amongst the tenantry, but in a little town close by, amongst the "village tyrants and dissolute ruffians." It soon got to work, and endeavoured to ruin the man who had spent his whole life amongst the tenantry as a friend and neighbour. They boycotted and threatened him; sent him rough drawings of an oblong box, supposed to represent the useful but undesirable coffin; and made themselves so disagreeable to himself and his family that, consulting the safety of those who were dear to him, he shut up his house and left his old home for a more civilized country, where outrage and moonlighting is not known, and where people who wish to live in peace and quiet are protected by the strong arm of the law. To my own knowledge, the poor people who live round about there have never ceased to lament the good times that have gone. They always looked upon this landlord as their best friend, because they always found in him a sympathizer both in their sorrows and in their joys; and remembering the cause of their trouble, now I myself have heard them day and night cursing the National League as the cause of all their misfortunes. Well, Sir, the Plan of Campaign, of which we have heard so much, has not yet been introduced into this particular district, but nobody knows how soon it may not be brought there. I remember the hon. Gentleman the Member for Galway (Mr. Pinkerton) saying the other night that the order of the Plan of Campaign was not a harum-scarum, slap-dash kind of order. The hon. Member was perfectly right. It is a more quiet, hole-in-the-corner, back-door sort of proceeding. I read in the paper, not very long ago, of the Plan of Campaign being put into operation in a certain district. The leaders who had to do the rent-collecting took up their positions in good time, but they were followed by the police, whose object was to prevent them from carrying out their design. We can imagine what occurred—we can imagine the police drawn up in front of the inn to catch the rent collectors, while the hon. Member for Mid Cork (Dr. Tanner), with his pleasant face and jaunty air, was making off through the back window under cover of night in order to carry the development of the conspiracy in which he was engaged to some other scene, like a conspirator in some transpontine drama. Though the Plan of Campaign is not yet put in force on the estate to which I have alluded, yet from all I have heard the people are not very happy in their minds. It seems that quite lately they had a new High Sheriff appointed—a well-known Nationalist Member of this House, whose first act, I believe, was—and I mention it subject to correction—to dismiss the sub-Sheriff, who has acted in that capacity for some years, as his father did before him, and put in his place a Nationalist solicitor from Tipperary. I have no sympathy whatever with hard and unjust landlords, but I do think we ought to have some sympathy for those men who have always treated their tenants fairly and have spent their whole lives among them. It seems to me very odd to notice that during this debate which has occupied the past few days, nothing appears to annoy the patriots more than the suggestion that the agents of the Government have used what power they had to bring about a settlement between the landlords and tenants. It was not until the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley) gave his approval of this act of mercy between the two parties, that any hon. Members below the Gangway opposite followed suit. I appeal, however, to hon. Gentlemen above the Gangway to support the Government in its endeavours to carry out the law of the land against the law of the League. I do not believe, from what I have seen, that it is much use appealing to hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway, for they have shown themselves, by their speeches, the representatives of the National League, and not of the Irish nation. I might as soon appeal to a Bengal tiger to have mercy on its victim, as ask a Nationalist to have mercy upon a landlord. I appeal to the fairer-minded Members on behalf of those in Ireland who for so long have been manfully fighting against the National League, and who, like the garrison of Lucknow, cry out continually, "When will help come?" I was very glad yesterday to hear in the admirable speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Bath (Mr. Wodehouse) that we have the support of the Liberal Unionists on the other side of the House. I know what they have done for the country. No one knows it better than I; for it certainly is not entirely owing to my own exertions that in the district I represent a minority was converted into a majority of 1,400. No doubt, that change was effected partly by Liberal Unionists' votes; and I am glad to think that they will go on as they began at the last Election. Well, Sir, I wish, before this debate closes, to appeal to hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House on behalf of those—whether andlords or tenants — who are only anxious to carry out the law, and to live, as their fathers did before them, in peace and good-will with their neighbours. I appeal, Sir, on behalf of those who measure their patriotism by their love of law and their country, rather than of those who, like hon. Gentlemen opposite, measure their patriotism by their love for the immortal dollar.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): Sir, My noble Friend the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) made some observations at the commencement of his speech upon the course of this debate, and upon the practice of lengthened discussion upon the Address. Now, I very much agree with him; and I prefer the older practice, where the discussions on the Address were much more limited than they are at present; but I must disclaim for hon. Gentlemen who sit on this side of the House the responsibility for the introduction of the modern practice. Lengthened and protracted debates upon the Address, extending to 11 days, were the invention of the Opposition of 1880, and, therefore, it is they who must bear the responsibility of a bad practice. It is much easier to inaugurate a bad practice than to put an end to it, either in the House of Commons or elsewhere; but there is another feature in the conduct of this debate to which I wish to call attention. I never recollect a case in which, upon a specific Amendment, where the administration and the policy of the Government were challenged, five days were allowed to elapse before any responsible Minister had the courage to rise up and reply. To whom has the defence of the Administration been left? Why, to one lawyer after another. We have had the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes), the Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), the Solicitor General for England (Sir Edward Clarke), and to-night we have had—well, the Home Secretary (Mr. Matthews); but he is not so familiar with the duties of his new Office as to have forgotten his ancient profession; and I must say I thought that the defence of the Government which we have heard from him to-night was much more professional than political. There are few men more distinguished in his own walk than the right hon. and learned Gentleman. There is no man who has a more sincere respect for his great abilities than I have; but to-night he held a very bad brief, extremely ill-drawn up. If I might venture to give the right hon. and learned Gentleman advice, it would be that the next time he has a case to defend, he should not be instructed by the Loyal and Patriotic Union; because it may happen to him again, as it has happened to-night, to make charges which are entirely baseless, and to state facts altogether unfounded. There was one sentence of the right hon. and learned Gentleman with which I am able entirely to concur—namely, the sentence in which praises are lavished upon the massive speech of my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale. Yes, if the Government want massive defences, they must come to this side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer—the Liberal Member of a Tory Administration—told us, a few weeks ago, that Lord Salisbury was in Office, but Lord Hartington was in power. He told us, at the same time—a sentiment from which he seems rather to have departed—

> "That it is a vulgar notion to suppose that, if any cause is victorious, that cause must be celebrated by its Leader being put into Ministerial uniform."

He told us at the same time as he told us at Liverpool, that he is the "champion of his country," and the representative and the exponent of the great historical and traditional Liberal Party; but this has not prevented him from putting on the Conservative Ministerial uniform. Not long ago, as I said before, he told us that Lord Salisbury was in Office, but that Lord Hartington was in power. He has left the Party who are in power to join the Party who are in Office—he who is the true exponent of the traditional Liberal Party. Well, Sir, in common, I am sure, with the rest of the House, I am very glad to see a man of his eminent character and ability again among us. [*Cries of* "Question!"] I do not desire to depart from the Question, or to say anything disagreeable to the right hon. Gentleman. We are all glad to see him here, and we are glad to see him in his right place. But I only referred to the right hon. Gentleman in connection with the remarkable speech of the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale. It was, no doubt, quite right that the noble Marquess, who has "the power," should make the official defence of the Government who carry out the policy which he prescribes. That is the situation, and that is, I suppose, the explanation why we have departed from the ordinary practice that, on occasions of this kind, the Minister responsible for the government of Ireland should naturally rise, at the earliest moment, to defend the Government, and to state, not only what has been the policy in the past, but what policy towards Ireland it intends to pursue. Well, in spite of all that has been said about thrusting aside the question of Ireland, and going to other business, the question of Ireland still forces itself upon the attention of Parliament, and upon the attention of the country. A great deal has been said in this debate about the Plan of Campaign. My noble Friend the Member for Rossendale was quite right when he said that the Amendment does not specifically raise the question of the Plan of Campaign at all. But the course taken by the Government and their friends in regard to the Plan of Campaign is very curious. First of all, they put up the Irish Law Officers to deliver what have very properly been called speeches in support of the indictment which is to be tried next week. When the Law Officers, however, are asked inconvenient questions, they say, "Oh, we must not say anything at all, for the case is '*sub judice*';" and having appealed, Sir, to you to support their refusal to answer because the case is still *sub judice*, hon. Gentlemen opposite, nevertheless, demand that we shall express decisively our opinion as to the legality of the Plan of Campaign. That is altogether inconsistent; but I shall not shrink from expressing my opinion on the Plan of Campaign. I have been appealed to to do so both in the course of the present debate, and by my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bury (Sir Henry James) in his speech at Manchester; but I shall ask leave, before I come to that, to make some remarks of a more general character. It is a habit of unskilful medical practitioners, when dealing with some deep-seated disease of long standing, to fix on some particular symptom, and to look only at that, and not at the general constitutional condition of the patient from which that symptom arises. But if you are to treat a disease with any scientific knowledge, you must make a broader diagnosis. Let us ask about this Plan of Campaign—whence does it proceed? I must complain, although they have appeared before us in full force, that the legal Advisers of the Government had not a previous consultation before they addressed the House. The consequence is that they do not agree amongst themselves or tell the same story. The hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland said that this Plan of Campaign was a political movement. That was flatly contradicted an hour or two ago by the Home Secretary. I prefer to take the authority of the Solicitor General for Ireland. I think he has got up the Irish brief better than the Home Secretary, whose knowledge of Ireland is a little out of date. I shall speak of the Plan of Campaign as a political movement, and not merely as one of an agrarian character. I am not going to weary the House by travelling again over the ground of the fall of prices and the ratio of rents, and so forth. I am willing to take the assertion of the Solicitor General for Ireland—that this is not a mere agrarian device, but that it is part of that great problem which you have to deal with, springing from the fact that the people of Ireland are unconquerably averse to the system of Government under which they live. It is upon that footing that I propose to deal with the Plan of Campaign. This is not a new problem. We have had to deal with it ourselves before in other times; we have had to deal with it in the history of our Constitution; and we may have recourse to the teaching of past times, and to the great political masters of former days. I remember reading a great speech of Mr. Burke in reference to America, in which he repudiated Old Bailey methods of discussion, and recommended to the British Government the old maxim of the Roman Catholic Church—*sursum corda*—that they should lift up their hearts and enlarge their minds in dealing with questions of this nature. At all events, that is our duty on this side of the House. In judging of a system of government, we know no test by which to distinguish good government from bad, except this—that good government is government which is conducted and founded upon the assent and consent of the governed. If a Government is alien to the sympathies, the wishes, and the wants of a people, that Government breeds discontent, and of that discontent there is inevitably born illegal conduct and illegitimate proceedings. These are truths which are taught to us by experience, and are to be found on every page of history. Well, Sir, tried by this test, I am going to say a strong thing, but I say a thing of which I am deeply convinced—that, at this moment, the government of Ireland by England is the worst government in the world. There have been times when there were governments as bad in Europe. My right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) some time ago compared the government of Ireland to the government of Austria in Italy, and of Russia in Poland. But the government of Austria in Italy has ceased, and the government of Austria, disliked and rejected by Hungary, has been replaced by self-government in Hungary, and therefore the record of Austria in Europe is now clear. Whether the government of Russia in Poland is more or less disliked than the government of Ireland I cannot say. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the facts; but it remains true, as was said the other day by my right hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley), that your government of Ireland is a government of pure force. You have in Ireland a *corps d'armée* of about 30,000 men—nearly the same number which fought at the Alma, and equal to the British Infantry at Waterloo. You must keep them there, and you must keep them there, because without them your whole system of government and your social system would disappear. That is a fact that cannot be denied. I remember, a few years ago, when there was some difficulty about finding troops to go abroad that, being at the Home Office, I received a communication from my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale, who was then at the head of the War Department, and I said to him—"If you want troops, you may take every regiment from England or from Scotland. I want no troops to preserve the peace of England or of Scotland." Could you say that of Ireland at this moment or at any moment? We have heard a great deal about economy of late; indeed, there is a domestic controversy on the other side of the House on that point between the Government and their former Leader in this House. We are spending £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 a-year on military and police—which might be saved in Ireland—because you have there a thoroughly discontented and disaffected people. Well, Sir, is this denied? How are you to judge of it? Are the people of Ireland contented or discontented? Are they well affected or disaffected towards the Gvernment under which they live? Will you, upon this point, accept the voice of their Constitutional Representatives? [*Cries of* "No!"] No; then do not be surprised if you get some other—[*Cries of* "Oh!"] You, the Conservative Party, shout "Oh" in derision, when I ask whether you will take the voice of the Constitutional Representatives of the Irish people. My hon. and gallant Friend—he always allows me to call him so—the Member for North Armagh (Colonel Saunderson) spoke with great contempt of our respect for great battalions. But without the help of the great battalions which sit on that side of the House he and his Colleagues would have no power at all. Is it not by the great battalions of England that his Orange Lodges exist? [Colonel SAUNDERSON: No.] Is it by the power of his own big battalions that he undertakes to answer for the peace of Belfast? Will you refuse to regard the opinion of the Constitutional Representatives of Ireland? If they express discontent you vote them down, as you will vote them down to-night. You complain of the expression of their discontent here, and you are preparing to suppress the expression of their discontent elsewhere. You treat them, not only as a body of opinion to be neglected, but as a fact to be put down. Well, it is a very difficult thing in this world to put down facts, and I doubt whether you can put down the fact of the disaffection of the Irish people to the Government under which they live. The hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh scoffs at the idea of anyone paying regard to the fact that about 85 per cent of the Irish Representatives are here to express the dissatisfaction of the people with the existing form of government under which they live. We, however, on this side of the House cannot—we do not—neglect the voice of the Constitutional Representatives of Ireland. We cannot afford to treat it as an insignificant and unimportant fact. On the contrary, we regard it as a most important fact. [*Cries of* "Oh!" *and laughter.*] You may jeer at that statement. But, in my opinion, we are bound, by the principles of the Party to which we belong, to have some respect for it. [*Laughter.*] I know that you have no respect for it. It belongs to the principles of hon. Members opposite to disregard it. I do not wonder at Tories holding that opinion; but I do wonder that anyone calling himself a Liberal should hold such a view. A curious specimen of that was given the other night by the hon. Member for Bath (Mr. Wodehouse). The hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hanbury) made a speech which was very remarkable as coming from the Benches opposite, and which greatly shocked our Unionist Friends on this side of the House. He spoke with sympathy for the Irish people, and he recommended very liberal measures for Ireland. But the hon. Member for Bath could not understand a man who sits on the Benches opposite expressing any sympathy with the Irish cause, and he said—"Oh! it is because he has Irish constituents," as if he really thinks that the fact of a man having Irish constituents disables his judgment, and ought to condemn his sentiment on the Irish Question. Now, that is the true secret and root of Liberal Unionism. They have adopted, as their fundamental principle, that Irish opinions, Irish wishes, and Irish demands shall not only be neglected, but denied. The hon. Member for Bath thought it a sufficient answer to the speech of the hon. Member for Preston to say—"He has Irish constituents, and therefore pay no attention to what he says." It is not in that way, at least, that we have learnt the Liberal creed. I will not trouble the House with extracts; but I should like to read what is our view of the subject, in language far better than any I can command, and I should like to ask the attention of the Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer to it. It is the teaching of the greatest master of the Liberal Party upon this very question, under circumstances which I conceive were very similar to the present. It was written at a moment in the great controversy we had with our American Colonies at a moment when America was in flagrant rebellion, when she was in arms against the Crown, and when she had already concluded her alliance with France. This is what Mr. Burke said—

> "These were the considerations which led me early to think that in the comprehensive dominion which the Divine Providence had put into our hands, instead of troubling our understandings with speculations concerning the unity of empire, and the identity or distinction of legislative powers"—

I ask my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bury to mark this—

> "and inflaming our passions with the heat and pride of controversy, it was our duty in all soberness to conform our Government to the character and circumstances of the several people who compose this mighty and strangely-diversified mass"—

Remember he was speaking to a people who were in arms against the Crown—

> "I never was wild enough to conceive that one method would serve for the whole; that the natives of Hindostan and those of Virginia could be ordered in the same manner, or that the Cutchery Court and the Grand Jury of Salem could be regulated on a similar plan. I was persuaded that government was a practical thing, made for the happiness of mankind, and not to furnish out a spectacle of uniformity to gratify the schemes of visionary politicians. . , . . If there be one fact in the world perfectly clear it is this—that the disposition of the people of America is wholly averse to any other than a free Government, and this is indication enough to any honest statesman how he ought to adapt whatever power he finds in his hands to their case."

Let me commend this to the attention of hon. Gentlemen who, I trust, whatever else they are, are honest men—

> "If anyone asked me what a free Government is, I answer that for any practical purpose it is what the people think so; and that they, and not I, are the natural, lawful, and competent judges of this matter."—*Letter to Sheriffs of Bristol*, 1777.

Now, I ask whether the views of the Liberal Party, or of hon. Gentlemen who call themselves Liberal Unionists, most nearly conform to the great teaching of the Liberal Leader which I have ventured to read? We think the voice of the Constitutional Representatives of Ireland is a main and a leading element in this question. We understand their demand to be that they should have a Legislature regulated by Parliament for the conduct of their own affairs, and an Executive dependent upon that Legislature. We consider that to be a fair and a just demand, and whether we are in a majority or a minority we shall always support it. That was the principle set forth by my right hon. Friend the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone)—that was the principle set forth by the Conference at Leeds in these words—

> "An Irish Legislative Body for the management of what Parliament should decide to be distinctly Irish affairs."

The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary, with that discretion he always exercises, has made an attack to-night upon my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham. I do not wonder at it, because my right hon. Friend said at Hawick that with the principle I have stated he is entirely agreed. And these sentiments of my right hon. Friend seem to have filled with distrust the soul of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary to-night. I am sorry that the Members for Birmingham, whom I believed to be a united family, should distrust one another. I regret this discord in the Unionist Party. The Government and the Party opposite reject our demand. They have rejected it, and they say that they have been elected and placed in their present position in order to maintain that rejection. One of the consequences of that rejection is that you find discontent in Ireland, and out of discontent in any country in the world have always arisen illegitimate combination and unlawful action. That is deplorable; but it is not new. It happened in former times, and it happens now; and I venture to think it will always happen. We pride ourselves upon being a law-abiding people. [*A laugh.*] The hon. Member opposite laughs; but, if I have read history aright, when the English people did not have a form of government that suited them, they did a great many very irregular things. From the time of Charles I. down to the present day I think it may be found that they have done many things, under these circumstances, which lawyers would find it extremely difficult to defend. I shall like to hear the legal argument by which my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bury would defend certain proceedings in Westminster Hall and at the Banqueting Chamber at Whitehall. I should like to know the principles upon which he justifies the landing at Torbay. Well, now I come to the Plan of Campaign. Let us consider what the nature of this Agrarian Question is. It contains a double question, which has been discussed, but not settled, in this House. Some people say—I have heard it said by Members from Ireland on the other side—that the landlords are hated in Ireland on account of British rule; and I have also heard it said that British rule is hated on account of the landlords. I do not wish to decide between those two propositions, because I think both are true. Until lately, British rule existed in Ireland mainly for two objects—first, to secure the predominance of the religion of a minority; and, secondly, to preserve the privileges of a limited class. Of late years something has been done by a Liberal policy to mitigate the character of that British rule; but still it is perfectly true that the landlords could not remain without the British Forces there.

Colonel WARING (Down, N.): They could. [*Laughter.*]

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Hon. Gentlemen laugh. Then, why are they so anxious to have the landlords bought out? Will the hon. and gallant Member for North Down tell me that the landlords could remain there without the British Forces? Will the hon. and gallant Member consent that the British Forces should be withdrawn, and also British rule?

Colonel WARING: Certainly.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: The hon. and gallant Gentleman is a convert from Nazareth. I do not find the same ready assent from the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, who sits by him. I have not heard him yet propose, in the interests of the landlords, to withdraw the British Forces or British rule. Well, British Forces and British rule have had a very evil effect, for which Irish landlords are not altogether responsible, on the Land Question. Feeling that they could rely, and did rely, upon the British Forces, and, not like the landlords in England, upon the opinion of their countrymen, they have done in past times what, in England, landlords would never have dreamt of doing—they have been demoralized by the system of protection under which they lived. Now, the Plan of Campaign, as I look at it, is partly a political and partly an agrarian question. It represents not only a suffering people, but a disaffected nation. You have examples of lawless acts arising out of discontent with the Government. You always have had. Go back to the origin of the Liberal Party. I should like to see what has been the conduct of the Liberal Party upon questions of this character in past times. At the very origin of the Liberal Party in England there was a most illegal Plan of Campaign, and a most lawless and illegitimate act committed by a man named John Hampden, when he refused to pay ship money. Did not the Courts of Law determine that ship money was a perfectly legal tax? Of course they did. Will Liberal lawyers, like my right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bury, go down to Manchester and denounce John Hampden for not paying ship money? Then, how can you deny that discontent has led to lawlessness? I give you that as an example how, out of discontent, lawless acts have arisen. I will give another example how the Liberal Party, later on, conducted themselves under similar circumstances. There was another transaction—a most irregular and most lawless transaction, I have no hesitation in saying—and my right hon. and learned Friend will agree with me. It took place in this wise. One fine day a number of people—I am sorry to say they were mostly respectable Nonconformists — disguised themselves as Indians, boarded a number of vessels in the Bay of Boston, and took out of the ships cases of tea and threw them into the sea. That was a perfectly unlawful transaction; it was a lawless dealing with private rights. It deprived the consigners and consignees of their property—it was a defiance of the Crown, a refusal to pay just taxes. There was no element of lawlessness wanting in that transaction; it was sternly to be condemned, and I condemn it, although, I am sorry to say, I possess some of the tea cups made in celebration of the centenary of that same Boston tea party. But how was that dealt with by the English Government? Oh, there was a Unionist Party in England in those days, and there was a great Leader of the Unionist Party. George III. was a man who acted as Lord Salisbury talks. He was a "massive Leader," and he had very obedient Ministers. I sometimes wonder whether the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith), who has the same amiable qualities and the same courteous manner, is not destined, at the close of this century, to be the Lord North of the Tory Party. A man who had the best intentions in the world was the cause of an almost infinity of mischief. Well, how did they meet those acts of violence? First of all, they blocked the port of Boston, then they took away the Charter of Massachusetts, then they employed foreign troops to cut the throats of the Colonists. That was a real resolute Government. At last they employed savages to tomahawk the Colonists, and to burn down villages. They were the "Emergency men" of those days. But what was the conduct of the Liberal Party under those circumstances? They kept up a continual protest against the action of this Government in spite of great and overwhelming majorities in this House and in the country—far greater majorities even than those you now command. They represented to the Government that the course they were taking, with the object of putting down these unlawful proceedings on the part of the Colonists, was the worst course they could take, and would lead to disaster, and they were not deterred from taking their stand in the matter by the charges brought against them that they were encouraging rebellion. They said—"No; we see that you are taking a wrong course, and we think that you ought to take exactly the opposite course, and should give the American Colonists what they demand." And had their advice been listened to, America would have been saved to the English Crown. I turn now to another and happier example in later times, when something similar occurred in regard to Canada. There was a Unionist Party in those days who denounced the idea of betraying what they called the Canadian loyalists, and I am sure that my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham will appreciate my reference to the Canadian precedent. But this country had been taught wisdom by the previous examples, and the Liberal Government of that day determined to give self-government to Canada. They were, of course, opposed by the Tory Party and the Liberal Unionists. I have recently read a speech of the great Liberal Unionist of the day—the late Lord Derby, then Lord Stanley—in which he declared that if we gave the Canadians self-government we should have, in a few months or years, a Canadian Republic. We did give the Canadians self-government, but we have not got a Canadian Republic, because the policy of the Liberal Party prevailed, and that of the Tory Party was rejected. You reject our policy now; but what is your method of dealing with Ireland? I will say nothing on the head of the conduct of the Executive in Ireland; that is not the point which I desire to argue. Indeed, I very much agree with the satisfaction which has been expressed at the moderate, the wise, and, I think, the humane conduct of the right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). I think that his practice has been a great deal better than the theories which he and his Party have put forward. There is one thing which I have heard in the course of this debate with great regret, and that was the language which was used by the right hon. and learned Attorney General for Ireland on the subject of the constitution of juries in Ireland. I feel the responsibility of saying anything on the subject at this moment. But this I will say — that if the jury system is fairly dealt with in Ireland, nothing could have been more unfortunate than the language employed by the Attorney General for Ireland. What was the charge which was made? I am not speaking of the trial now pending, because I am averse to refer to that; but I am speaking of a transaction which has passed—the Sligo case. The charge which had been brought against Her Majesty's Government was that the Crown in the trial of Catholic prisoners had, in some cases at least, deliberately excluded Catholics from the juries. I think every Englishman expected that that charge would have been met by an indignant denial; but, instead of denying it, the Attorney General for Ireland used this most significant phrase—that it was the duty of the Crown to see that "men of independent thought" were placed upon the juries. The necessity of placing men of independent thought upon the juries means, apparently, in the view of the Attorney General for Ireland, the exclusion of Catholics from taking part in the trials. That is the right hon. and learned Gentleman's answer to the charge. He has not denied the fact that Catholics were excluded, and the reason he gives for it amounts to an administrative repeal of the Catholic Emancipation Act. I will go further. Has any man formed a belief as to what trial by jury means? If he has, let him reconcile to himself the notion of the Crown picking out "men of independent thought." How are the Crown authorities to arrive at a conclusion that a particular man is a man of independent thought? Placing men of independent thought upon juries means that the Crown selected the individuals who were to try the cases, and satisfied themselves previously of the state of their minds. Well, Sir, I say that a more dangerous and a more mischievous statement by a Gentleman occupying the responsible position of Attorney General for Ireland I have never heard. Such a statement shakes the foundation of all confidence in the administration of justice; and, in my opinion, the action of the Government in this matter has done more to undermine the respect for law in Ireland than 20 years of resolute government will ever repair. I, however, venture to express a hope that this was a mere accidental indiscretion on the part of the Attorney General for Ireland in expressing himself in the heat of debate; but an Attorney General, especially an Irish Attorney General, should be a little more careful in his expressions. With regard to the approaching trials, I think every man ought to abstain from saying what will in any way prejudice them, either one way or the other; yet they have been discussed on the opposite Benches night after night, and hon. Members have been occupied in demonstrating the guilt of the untried prisoners. Oh, if you want men of independent thought upon the juries in these trials, you will find plenty of them upon the Benches opposite, and you would have no difficulty in forming your panel, who have made up their minds long before they have heard the evidence. I do not think it would be necessary for the Government to challenge any one of them. I think, however, that in the approaching trials the Government ought to be very careful that there shall be no exceptional treatment. It ought to follow the ordinary and regular course which would take place in any other criminal trial. But what were we told to-night by the Home Secretary, who has got up his brief so imperfectly that when he was told it was an unusual panel he at first denied it; but when he was corrected said—"Oh, yes; the panel may be only 60 or 100, if it be for the trial of pickpockets; but this is not the trial of pickpockets, and the panel has been made 250." What does that mean? If it means anything at all, it means that the usual course has been departed from—a most unwise and most dangerous thing. Then the Home Secretary, after wisely declineing earlier in the evening to answer a question of law, adventured himself upon a legal statement, upon which I will have the hardihood to differ from him. In answer to the challenge of my right hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. Henry H. Fowler), he said that everyone knows that in an indictment for conspiracy the venue must be laid where the conspiracy took place. That is not the law. I am astonished that the Home Secretary, after so short an absence from the Profession, should have made such a statement, for it is common learning that on an indictment for a conspiracy the venue may be laid either where the conspiracy was formed, or where the overt act took place. The right hon. and learned Gentleman says that the Government could not act until some overt act took place. The natural conclusion from that would be that the trial would take place where the overt act was committed. [Mr. MATTHEWS: No.] What is the excuse of the Government for not laying the venue where the overt act took place? I should not blame them for changing the venue to Dublin. I am only challenging the statement of the Home Secretary that the venue was necessarily laid in Dublin. I say that is not the case. With respect to trying the case in the County of Dublin I express no opinion; but this I do say—that if it has been usual to try criminal cases in the City of Dublin, it is most unfortunate that the usual practice should be departed from. What you should endeavour to do in this case, and what I hope you will do, is to give everybody the impression that you are administering the ordinary law in the usual manner, and that you are not departing from the established practice in order to secure a conviction. You are taking credit to yourselves for administering the ordinary law, and you should take care to administer the law in the ordinary way. Then you would give confidence to everyone that the law was being administered justly, and that all the proceedings were conducted in a fair manner. Now, Sir, with regard to the Plan of Campaign, subject to what I have said with regard to the discontent of the people with the Government under which they live, I have no hesitation in saying that if any body of men have incited any other body of men to abstain from fulfilling their legal obligations, I think that is an unlawful act, and ought to be condemned. I have no hesitation in stating that I condemn it, as I would condemn resistance to a lawful tax like ship money, as I would object to throwing other people's tea into the sea—a most irregular and improper act. I will say no more on the subject of the Executive Government in Ireland, and I will not go into the question of Glenbeigh. But, whatever be the rights or the wrongs of the people at Glenbeigh—this I will say, that none of you can deny that the scenes recently enacted there have left a very painful impression, not only in Ireland, but in England. I will use better words than my own to express my sentiments on this unhappy subject. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) said a few days ago—

> "For these tenants themselves, whatever errors they have committed, I say our pity, and, more than that, redress and immediate remedy, are needed."

I hope he is prepared to propound some scheme of "redress and of immediate remedy." And he added words which I think are well deserving of attention, namely—

> "I say that any law which permits any man to turn out the aged and the sick shelterless and foodless on the bleak hill-side in this inclement weather is a bad law, and ought to be abrogated."

I hope my right hon. Friend will introduce a measure for abrogating that law. Well, but have you on that side of the House no curative and no remedial measures? I should be unjust to you if I said you had not. What is your first plan? You have the assent of the Master of the Cabinet to buy out the Irish landlords. Now, that is a most singular view, especially coming from the other side of the House. They say the first thing that must be done to bring peace to Ireland, and to reconcile the Irish people to British rule, is to get rid of the Irish landlords—of course, on handsome terms, very handsome terms. In their view, the root of the Irish evil is the existence in Ireland of the present race of landlords—they are an insuperable obstacle to the restoration of good-will between England and Ireland. That is not a very flattering or complimentary view of the character of the Irish landlords. I myself have never been very much enamoured of these Land Purchase schemes; but if it is necessary to make great sacrifices in order to get the landlords out of Ireland, and so to secure peace in that country, I should not be unwilling to consent to them. I entirely agree, however, with my right hon. Friend the Member for West Birmingham that it ought not to be at the expense, or at the risk, of the English Exchequer. My right hon. Friend laid down that principle most distinctly, and I was glad to see it, at Hawick. He said, and the phrase is a valuable one—"The risk must remain where it is now." I was also very glad to see the strong condemnation which he passed upon Lord Ashbourne's Act, and upon any proposal to extend it. Well, that is your first plan for Ireland. The second plan, which is favoured by the Government, and by my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), is emigration. True to your fixed principle, that what you are to do for Ireland is not what Ireland and the Irish wish, but exactly what they do not wish, you propose to refuse them self-government, but offer them emigration. What, then, is your double remedy for the evils of Ireland? You propose, first of all, to expropriate her aristocracy, and then to deport her people. That is your cure for the woes of Ireland. Oh, what profound statesmanship! What would you think of a bee master, who, having killed off the drones, then smoked out the working bees. What would become of the hive; what sort of a crop of honey would you gather? If you cannot do better than that for Ireland, do not you think you had better let Ireland try what she can do for herself? Just cast your eyes over the Empire of the Queen at this time, when we are going to celebrate the Jubilee of the 50th anniversary of her auspicious reign. What will you see? You will see in every quarter of the globe populations that have increased in prosperity and in strength, small provinces which have grown into nations, all thriving and teeming with loyal and contented people, who rejoice with us when we rejoice, and who mourn when we mourn. That is the story of the reign of Victoria. I said "everywhere;" but that is not true. There is one black spot—our disaster and our shame. I need not name it, for it lies at our door. Where is the only place in the Empire of the Queen where you have a disaffected population, where you have a dwindling people, where you have diminished resources, where you have distress and misery on every hand? Why is it that part of the United Kingdom which is under our own immediate, our domestic legislation, and which is denied that self-government which we have given to those other populations? Since the accession of the Queen, Ireland has been depleted of fully one-third of her population. [*Cries of* "Half!"] I believe it is nearly one-half; and what is your remedy? Ireland has a fever which she has always had; the fever continues, the weakness increases, she has reached the stage of delirium; but you wretched apothecaries on your Sangrado system have no remedy but to let more blood. Are these your remedies for the discontent and lawlessness in Ireland? Can you not—

> "Minister unto a mind diseas'd;
> Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow;
> Raze out the written troubles of the brain;
> And with some sweet oblivious antidote
> Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of the perilous stuff
> Which weighs upon the heart?"

If you cannot do that, then I think we will cast your physic to the dogs. The Irish people will have none of it. What is it you say to them on this emigration policy? I remember the terrible sentence in Malthus—"There is no cover laid for you at the table of Nature." The policy by which you hope to cure the evils of Ireland is the expatriation of a still greater proportion of her people. Well, but before you apply these curative remedies you are going to use the knife. You have told us already that we are to have—I care not what you call it, but I will follow the example of the hon. Member for Bath (Mr. Wodehouse) and use the popular term—we are going to have a policy of coercion. You are a resolute Government. No; I beg your pardon; you are some day going to be a resolute Government—for yours is a sort of *paulo post futurum* resolution. You never are, but always mean to be, resolute. It is true that my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale, in his massive speech, invited you to be a little more resolute. He appea rsto play the part of Lady Macbeth—

"But screw your courage to the sticking place
And we'll not fail."

I am sorry that as my noble Friend urges this policy he does not take the responsibility of it. I do not blame you, mind you, for your irresolution. I rejoice at it. I think that when you once begin to be resolute you will get into a greater mess than ever. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland—I have a profound compassion for him—seems to me to be in the situation of a man who is going to take a bath in water which is very cold; he puts one foot in and then takes it out, then he puts the other foot in and takes that one out also, and can never screw himself up for a plunge. Well, we have told you our plan. You say it is a new one. So it is, and, in my opinion, when we consider what has been the result of the old plan for Ireland, it is high time there should be a new one. You say—and you think it is a sufficient argument to apply to us—that we once did the same thing that you are going to do. It is perfectly true we did; and it is because we have tried that system to the uttermost and we have found it fail that we are determined not to try it again. We got great powers of coercion, and we used them. I believe that under the government of Lord Spencer that system was tried with firmness and to the uttermost, and as well as it ever can be executed. ["No!"] I hear several voices—there are not many of them now; but there were a great many such voices 18 months ago, when the Party on those Benches denounced Lord Spencer and disavowed his policy. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary had the courage to-night to refer to the Maamtrasna debate. He said he was not in the House at the time; if he had been I think his words would have stuck in his throat. But, Sir, there are men sitting on that Bench who are responsible for that transaction. Yes, Sir, when the Tory Government denounced Lord Spencer and disavowed his policy the right hon. Gentleman the present Chief Secretary for Ireland was the Leader of the House. The hon. Member for Bath has said—"Why cannot we go back to the situation we were in then?" Why, it is the nature of history that you cannot go back upon transactions of that kind; and when the Tory Government denounced the policy of coercion as a condition of taking Office, I, for one, made up my mind that never again would I be a party to a policy of coercion, and I never will. My noble Friend the Member for Rossendale knows it well, because, when it was my happiness to be acting with him, I told him so over and over again. That this was our view is proved by the fact that when we next came into Office, after the Maamtrasna debate, we proposed a measure of Home Rule. Well, you are going to tread the old paths. We know them well. You have got the majority. You have the power to take that road. It is a road, like the caravan track of the desert, which is strewn with the carcases of many defeated Administrations and baffled policies. My belief is that your bones will, before long, whiten the same sands. But for us our course is clear. To a policy of coercion, whether we are in a majority or a minority, we will oppose a policy of conciliation and self-government; and when you have failed, as fail you will, and fail you must, it will be the privilege of the Liberal Party, in accordance with its great traditions, to give to distracted Ireland the blessings of contentment and peace.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) has said many dangerous things in the speech which he has just addressed to the House; but he said nothing so dangerous as when he informed the House that never again would he revert to a policy he had abandoned. The right hon. Gentleman told us that the Government of Ireland by England is, at this moment, in his opinion, the worst Government in the world. He found that out just a year ago. He has taken so complete a bath in Parnellite juice this evening, that he has not only changed his principles, but he has absolutely forgotten those which he formerly professed. I should like to know, Sir, since when it has not belonged to the Liberal creed to disregard the claim of the great majority of the Irish Representatives to Home Rule? I should like to know how long has that been contrary to Liberal principles? How long has it been an accepted maxim of the creed of the Liberal Party, that if hon. Members below the Gangway make what they consider, I suppose, a just demand, the Liberal Party shall always support it, and how long and how far are the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues going in that direction. Sir, in our minds, and in the minds of the majority of this House, and of the country, there is something to be considered in these great questions besides the opinion of the majority of the Irish Representatives. We would like to see something done to enable such matters as can safely be entrusted to Local Government to be administered in Ireland; but, Sir, when we come to deal with the functions of Government properly so called, when we come to deal with matters of legislation, and with the preservation of law and order in Ireland, then we say that the people of the United Kingdom have a right to be considered, as well as the people of Ireland, and that in these things the will of the majority must prevail, even though it be contrary to the wishes of the majority of the people of Ireland. Sir, I can quite understand the Vote of Censure, for, of course, it is nothing else, which the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) has proposed against Her Majesty's Government in moving this Amendment to the Address. In his view, and in the opinion of those who follow him, nothing that we can do is right. They have not been content with criticizing our actions, and with bringing charges against us once in this House; but when those actions have been explained, and when those charges have been refuted and denied, they have brought them over and over again. They will not accept or believe in our explanations. I shall not take the trouble, under the circumstances, to repeat what I have said on previous occasions; but I have just this one comforting reflection—that many of those charges contradict each other. What is the position of the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken and those who sit around him? Why is it that they support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork? They do not find fault—they have gone out of their way to tell us so—with the actions of Her Majesty's Government in Ireland. They do not quite accept the Plan of Campaign. The right hon. Gentleman told us that he was going to say a good deal about the Plan of Campaign, and we listened to him with attention and expectation; but he did not keep his word. He told us certainly that, if such and such things were so, he should condemn them; but how should he condemn them? He should condemn them like the action of Hampden, or like the action of the North American Colonists who threw the tea into Boston Harbour. He apologized for the Plan of Campaign. Now, I appeal—I do not use the words offensively—from Philip drunk to Philip sober. Shall I tell the right hon. Gentleman what is his mature opinion of the Plan of Campaign? What did the right hon. Gentleman say, when he had to express an opinion as a responsible Member of the Government upon a very similar scheme? Speaking in 1881, as a responsible Member of Her Majesty's Government, the right hon. Gentleman used these words—

> "Mr. Parnell wishes to get rid of the landlords in order that he may get rid of the English Government, and for this object every kind of intimidation has been employed to deter honest men from doing their duty and fulfilling their obligations. The Liberal Party"—at that time—"will have nothing to do with attacks upon the property any more than upon the persons of our fellow-citizens. A landowner has just as good a right to fair rent as you or I. Whenever the Liberal Party has allied itself with anti-social ideas—whenever it has followed some of those misty philosophies which have destroyed the safety of society, it has come to grief."

Now that, I have no doubt, if it had not been for the inconvenient circumstances of the present moment, would have been the opinion which the right hon. Gentleman would have expressed to-night about the Plan of Campaign. Therefore, I think I am justified in saying that it is not on account of any approval of the Plan of Campaign that the right hon. Gentleman is about to give his support to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork. Well, Sir, does he want to turn us out of Office? [Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Not yet.] On that point he reiterates the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton (Mr. Henry H. Fowler). He does not want to turn us out of Office. [Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: Not yet.] Then, why does he support this Amendment to the Address? The right hon. Gentleman gives it, I know, a very half-hearted approval; and it has been said, but I do not know with what truth, that no regular summons has been addressed to Members of the Separatist Liberal Party to attend here to-night. One thing is certain, that a greater man than the right hon. Gentleman — the Leader of his Party — has not thought it worth his while to come and take part in this debate. No, Sir; the action of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt) and his Colleagues is not prompted by any wish to turn the present Government out of Office; it is simply prompted by the spirit which animated his whole speech —a wish to embarrass Her Majesty's Government; a wish to render impossible as difficult a task as ever fell to the lot of any Government. The Plan of Campaign has been presented to this House in the course of this debate in a very charming aspect. We have been told that it is a sort of charitable scheme for enabling tenants who cannot pay the full rents of exacting landlords to tide over the winter; and the right hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley), who is pretty acute in matters of this kind, was so deceived by the way in which the Plan was presented to the House, that he actually asserted that, as far as he knew, no substantial injustice had been done by the Plan of Campaign. But I wish, if I may detain the House for a short time, to present to the House another aspect of this question. I should like to place before the House my theory as to the origin and intention of the Plan of Campaign. The House will remember that we assumed Office in August last under circumstances which will be admitted by all to have been of very considerable difficulty in Ireland. The country had been very much disquieted by the proposals for the government of Ireland made by our Predecessors. There were riots, due to those proposals, of a most serious nature in Belfast. The County of Kerry was as disturbed as any Irish county has been at the worst periods of Irish history within our memory. Those were matters in themselves of no slight difficulty. But, beyond that, agricultural prices were undoubtedly low, and we were pressed to accept, on that account, a Bill proposed by the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), with a view to make a very grave alteration in the law of land tenure in Ireland. We felt it to be our duty to advise this House to reject that measure. We thought that it went beyond the necessities or justice of the case, and the result has shown that we were right; for whereas the Bill would have enabled any tenant in Ireland, holding under a judicial rent, to get off for a time, if not permanently, by paying half the rent due, it is a matter of fact that, during the last few months, landlords and tenants throughout Ireland have largely settled with each other on terms very much more favourable to the landlord than those which were proposed in the Bill of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). That Bill was rejected, and our action in rejecting it was misrepresented at the time by right hon. Gentlemen opposite, but especially by hon. Members from Ireland. I have here a document which the hon. Member for Cork sent over to America, expressing his opinion on September 28. He said—

> "The rejection of the Tenants' Relief Bill, the scarcely veiled threats of the Irish Secretary, and the alarming increase in the number of evictions, clearly indicate the commencement of a combined movement of extermination against the tenant farmers of Ireland by the English Government and the Irish landlords. I lose no time in advising you of the imminence of a crisis and peril which have seldom been equalled even in the history of Ireland. I know it will be the highest duty of my countrymen in America to do whatever in them lies to frustrate the attempt of those who would assassinate our nation, and to alleviate the numerous victims of the social war which has been preached by the powerful Government of England against our people."

We preached no social war. What did that appeal produce? If it produced anything, I should very much like to know whether the hon. Member for Cork felt it to be his duty to return it to the subscribers; because it certainly was obtained, if it was obtained at all, under false pretences. Why, one of the stock arguments of the hon. Members below the Gangway against Her Majesty's Government has been that we changed that policy of social war directly Parliament rose. Our policy when we rejected the Bill of the hon. Member was precisely the same as that which we carried out subsequently in Ireland. Speaking in this House in August or September last, I earnestly deprecated more than once, on behalf of my Colleagues and myself, any harsh action on the part of Irish landlords in pressing their rights to the utmost; and I pointed out that there was every reason to anticipate that any difficulty which might arise from the inability of tenants to pay rent would be met generously by landlords in the coming autumn and winter. Well, what followed? Why, this followed. In the first place, landlords voluntarily made very large and generous reductions of rent. I can remember a meeting held by the landlords of the County of Cork, called, I think, by the hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald), in which they enforced the views expressed in this House by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) and myself as to the duty of Irish landlords to have regard to the fall in prices of farm produce in Ireland. That advice was taken largely and generously throughout Ireland by the landlords. The result was that considerable reductions of rent were made, rents were freely paid, evictions decreased, crime decreased, and a better feeling prevailed throughout the country in October between landlords and tenants than had prevailed for many years past. But that did not suit hon. Members below the Gangway. Ireland must be shown to be ungovernable. That is, I think, part of the policy even of right hon. Gentlemen opposite. The growing confidence had to be destroyed. The desire of Irish tenants to purchase their farms had, in some way, to be stopped. Why was this? I will quote a few words from a speech made by the hon. Member for North Wexford (Mr. J. E. Redmond) on the 11th of December, which satisfactorily explains it. He said—

> "If the Tories had been able to rule Ireland with the ordinary law, the result would have been, in England and Scotland, to throw back our cause, perhaps for a generation, and to give the lie direct to the prophecy of Mr. Gladstone—that the people of England had to choose between Coercion on the one hand and Home Rule on the other."

And, therefore, the Plan of Campaign was started; and by all the powers at the command of the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon), and some of his most active Colleagues, the reluctant tenants of Ireland were stirred up to its adoption. Meetings were held and speeches were made increasing in violence, and throughout November and December exaggerated accounts were spread abroad as to the number of estates on which the Plan of Campaign had to be adopted. Inventions were circulated as to the hesitation or refusal of Her Majesty's Government to enforce the law, and as to the opinion of the Law Advisers of the Crown on the legality of the Plan of Campaign. The hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) asked me a Question this evening about an opinion which appeared in *United Ireland*, and which has been attributed to my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes). Well, Sir, my right hon. and learned Friend informs me that the interpretation to be placed upon that is simply this—the opinion was given to the Government—that although there may be a mode by which a landlord himself might recover the money that had been paid by the tenants to third persons, the Government has no power by which they can recover it for the landlord. And that is all that the opinion amounts to. Why, Sir, as a matter of fact, before that opinion was written, the Law Officers had given the Government a distinct opinion that the persons engaged in carrying out the Plan of Campaign were guilty of a criminal conspiracy; and evidence was actually being collected on which prosecutions might be founded. More than that, the Plan of Campaign was pressed forward by threats used by the hon. Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) at a meeting at Castlerea, to the bailiffs, the police, and the officers of the law of the loss they would incur if they did not take the popular side. All these things were done to further the Plan of Campaign—I believe with the object which I have stated to the House. Although the Plan of Campaign may only have been adopted on 30 or 40 estates, the result, no doubt, has been a widespread change in that good feeling which prevailed in October, a considerable cessation in the payment of rent, and a great increase of lawlessness in the districts to which this stumping process has extended. I do not wish to enter further into the legality or otherwise of the Plan of Campaign; but the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby has said something to the House this evening upon the question of the appointment of the jury by whom the traversers are to be tried in Dublin. I heard what fell from him with much astonishment, as coming from one who, I remember, denounced me on the occasion to which he himself alluded for throwing over Judges and juries in Ireland, because I did not go out of my way to uphold the finding of a jury in a case about which I knew nothing at all. The right hon. Gentleman asked us to secure a fair trial.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I do not wish to be misunderstood on this point. What I intended to say and what I did say with regard to the present trials was this—that I hoped the ordinary course would be pursued. I thought it most important that should be observed, as a contrary course would produce a bad impression.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Yes, Sir; the ordinary course will be pursued. The course will be pursued which was followed when the right hon. Gentleman himself was a Member of the Government, and which has been pursued, so far as I know, for many years in Ireland. We say, without hesitation, that the officials whose duty it is to undertake the work will, without scruple, direct those jurors to stand aside who they have reason to believe cannot give a verdict without fear or favour. That is the way, and the only way, in which a fair jury can be obtained. [*Cries of* "Packing!"] Hon. Members talk of packing juries, What is the use of putting men on juries who are afraid to give a verdict according to the evidence? Is it fair to such men themselves to ask them to incur personal danger to which they are subjected? Why, Sir, it has been already stated in this House what followed certain trials at the Winter Assizes in Cork. Two of the jurors who found some of the Kerry Moonlighters guilty were butter merchants in Cork, and only the other day a notice was published publicly in Tralee, requiring the Kerry farmers not to deal with those butter merchants, because they had the courage to act upon the evidence placed before them. There were two men — two Catholics, one was a trier of the jury panel, and the other was a juror at the Sligo Assizes; both of these men decided according to their oaths. They have been Boycotted. And what did the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) read to the House to-night. He read to the House a quotation from a speech of the hon. Member for North Wexford (Mr. J. Redmond), which I confess I had hoped the hon. Gentleman would have contradicted. What was it the hon. Gentleman said? It was this—that, in his opinion, it was far better for a man to be condemned to penal servitude for the term of his natural life than to form one of the jury who would so outrage the sense of justice of the whole Irish people as to find the traversers guilty. I am bound to say that if the officials of the Crown do not take care to direct those persons to stand aside who would be influenced by fear or favour in arriving at a verdict they would not do their duty to the Government of the country. Now, Sir, I should not have said that much about the trials, but for the observation which fell from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby; but I must say this—that it is a very remarkable thing—that in spite of the defence of the Plan of Campaign which has been so freely made by hon. Members below the Gangway, and less freely by some hon. Members who do not belong to the Irish Party, there is nothing in this Amendment which is favourable to the Plan of Campaign. I have no doubt that that considerably eases their consciences. All that this Amendment suggests is that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is to be found in Home Rule. Well, but what is the real meaning of that suggestion? How does the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby suppose that Home Rule is to remedy the Irish agrarian crisis? What are the principles upon which an Irish Home Rule Parliament would be likely to act in dealing with the agrarian crisis? Are they not the principles of the Plan of Campaign? Well, but what are the principles of the Plan of Campaign? We know very well what they are said to be in Ireland—the slicing down of rents by degrees until the tenant can remain in the holding, if not free from rent at all, at least paying only the prairie value.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman quote any speech in which that is stated?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I could quote half-a-dozen speeches in proof of it. The hon. Gentleman himself said the other day, in this House, that his motto in this matter was that the tenant should neither pay nor go.

MR. DILLON: I am sure the right hon. Gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. What I said—and it is very well known in Ireland what I have said—what I have said all along in the matter is, that when the tenant is required to pay a rack-rent, and a reasonable reduction is refused, he should neither pay nor go.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I should like to press this a little further. What is it that hon. Members consider a fair rent? The hon. Member for West Belfast gave us a definition of that to-night. He said that, in his opinion, rent was not to be paid except from the surplus produce of the farm; and that the tenant was entitled to keep his furniture, his stock, and his holding, and to decline to go out of his farm unless there was a surplus profit out of which to pay rent. But the law says that if a tenant does not pay his rent he shall go out. Parliament may modify the law; but, while the law exists, it ought to be obeyed. Can the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby contradict that assertion? The hon. Member for Belfast—[MR. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): The hon. Member for West Belfast.] I accept my hon. Friend's correction. I do not think the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sexton) will represent West Belfast again. The hon. Gentleman the Member for West Belfast compared the relative position of the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland to that of the different classes of shareholders in a bank. But supposing that the shareholders in a bank declined to pay the debenture holders, or the preference shareholders, the interest due to them, unless they agreed to accept a certain reduction of that interest; and supposing that, in addition to taking that course, they combined to fight it out; if the hon. Member who takes that view were a shareholder in the bank, whether in England or in Ireland, he would soon find that the law of the land would compel him to keep his obligation; and I wish the right hon. Gentleman opposite, in the few remarks which he vouchsafed on the Plan of Campaign, had shown us why a debt due to a landlord, guarded, as it is, by the authority of the Land Act for which he himself is responsible, is to be less sacred than a debt due to a debenture holder or preference shareholder of a bank. I have carefully considered a good many speeches made in Ireland on the subject, and I believe that this is a fair representation of what the Plan of Campaign is said to be in Ireland. Well, Sir, I should characterize—and I should think the great majority of this House, including not a few honest and independent Radicals, would characterize—that Plan of Campaign as nothing less than a doctrine of public plunder. Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to accept a settlement by a Home Rule Parliament in Ireland of the agrarian difficulty based upon a doctrine of public plunder? He was not prepared to accept it last summer; but he may have changed his mind since then. At that time the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues carefully retained the settlement of the Irish Land Question in their own hands—in the hands of the Imperial Parliament—and nobody was stronger in that matter than the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley). Why did they retain it? Because they would not trust a Home Rule Parliament. But what is there in the doctrines that have been preached in Ireland in this matter, or in the acts that have been done in Ireland since that time, which has convinced the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby that he can now safely entrust to a Home Rule Parliament that which he refused to entrust to it last summer? Can they deal with a great agrarian crisis in any other way? Why, Sir, what is the cause of this agrarian crisis, if there be one? Is it not low prices? And to what are these prices due but to foreign importations; and can an Irish Home Rule Parliament deal with the question of foreign importation? Oh, no! that was carefully kept out of their province by the right hon. Gentleman; and, therefore, I very much wish that instead of some of those remarkable assertions of novel principles which the right hon. Gentleman believed had been his principles for the last 40 years, he had shown us some grounds for thinking either that an Irish Parliament would not act in accordance with the Plan of Campaign, or that it would meet the agrarian crisis in some other way. I venture to say that the right hon. Gentleman, in voting for this Amendment, is voting for what is a astonishment, as coming from one who, I remember, denounced me on the occasion to which he himself alluded for throwing over Judges and juries in Ireland, because I did not go out of my way to uphold the finding of a jury in a case about which I knew nothing at all. The right hon. Gentleman asked us to secure a fair trial.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I do not wish to be misunderstood on this point. What I intended to say and what I did say with regard to the present trials was this—that I hoped the ordinary course would be pursued. I thought it most important that should be observed, as a contrary course would produce a bad impression.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Yes, Sir; the ordinary course will be pursued. The course will be pursued which was followed when the right hon. Gentleman himself was a Member of the Government, and which has been pursued, so far as I know, for many years in Ireland. We say, without hesitation, that the officials whose duty it is to undertake the work will, without scruple, direct those jurors to stand aside who they have reason to believe cannot give a verdict without fear or favour. That is the way, and the only way, in which a fair jury can be obtained. [*Cries of* "Packing!"] Hon. Members talk of packing juries, What is the use of putting men on juries who are afraid to give a verdict according to the evidence? Is it fair to such men themselves to ask them to incur personal danger to which they are subjected? Why, Sir, it has been already stated in this House what followed certain trials at the Winter Assizes in Cork. Two of the jurors who found some of the Kerry Moonlighters guilty were butter merchants in Cork, and only the other day a notice was published publicly in Tralee, requiring the Kerry farmers not to deal with those butter merchants, because they had the courage to act upon the evidence placed before them. There were two men — two Catholics, one was a trier of the jury panel, and the other was a juror at the Sligo Assizes; both of these men decided according to their oaths. They have been Boycotted. And what did the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) read to the House to-night. He read to the House a quotation from a speech of the hon. Member for North Wexford (Mr. J. Redmond), which I confess I had hoped the hon. Gentleman would have contradicted. What was it the hon. Gentleman said? It was this—that, in his opinion, it was far better for a man to be condemned to penal servitude for the term of his natural life than to form one of the jury who would so outrage the sense of justice of the whole Irish people as to find the traversers guilty. I am bound to say that if the officials of the Crown do not take care to direct those persons to stand aside who would be influenced by fear or favour in arriving at a verdict they would not do their duty to the Government of the country. Now, Sir, I should not have said that much about the trials, but for the observation which fell from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby; but I must say this—that it is a very remarkable thing—that in spite of the defence of the Plan of Campaign which has been so freely made by hon. Members below the Gangway, and less freely by some hon. Members who do not belong to the Irish Party, there is nothing in this Amendment which is favourable to the Plan of Campaign. I have no doubt that that considerably eases their consciences. All that this Amendment suggests is that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is to be found in Home Rule. Well, but what is the real meaning of that suggestion? How does the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby suppose that Home Rule is to remedy the Irish agrarian crisis? What are the principles upon which an Irish Home Rule Parliament would be likely to act in dealing with the agrarian crisis? Are they not the principles of the Plan of Campaign? Well, but what are the principles of the Plan of Campaign? We know very well what they are said to be in Ireland—the slicing down of rents by degrees until the tenant can remain in the holding, if not free from rent at all, at least paying only the prairie value.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman quote any speech in which that is stated?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I could quote half-a-dozen speeches in proof of it. The hon. Gentleman himself said the other day, in this House, that his motto in this matter was that the tenant should neither pay nor go.

MR. DILLON: I am sure the right hon. Gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. What I said—and it is very well known in Ireland what I have said—what I have said all along in the matter is, that when the tenant is required to pay a rack-rent, and a reasonable reduction is refused, he should neither pay nor go.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I should like to press this a little further. What is it that hon. Members consider a fair rent? The hon. Member for West Belfast gave us a definition of that to-night. He said that, in his opinion, rent was not to be paid except from the surplus produce of the farm; and that the tenant was entitled to keep his furniture, his stock, and his holding, and to decline to go out of his farm unless there was a surplus profit out of which to pay rent. But the law says that if a tenant does not pay his rent he shall go out. Parliament may modify the law; but, while the law exists, it ought to be obeyed. Can the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby contradict that assertion? The hon. Member for Belfast—[Mr. JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): The hon. Member for West Belfast.] I accept my hon. Friend's correction. I do not think the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sexton) will represent West Belfast again. The hon. Gentleman the Member for West Belfast compared the relative position of the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland to that of the different classes of shareholders in a bank. But supposing that the shareholders in a bank declined to pay the debenture holders, or the preference shareholders, the interest due to them, unless they agreed to accept a certain reduction of that interest; and supposing that, in addition to taking that course, they combined to fight it out; if the hon. Member who takes that view were a shareholder in the bank, whether in England or in Ireland, he would soon find that the law of the land would compel him to keep his obligation; and I wish the right hon. Gentleman opposite, in the few remarks which he vouchsafed on the Plan of Campaign, had shown us why a debt due to a landlord, guarded, as it is, by the authority of the Land Act for which he himself is responsible, is to be less sacred than a debt due to a debenture holder or preference shareholder of a bank. I have carefully considered a good many speeches made in Ireland on the subject, and I believe that this is a fair representation of what the Plan of Campaign is said to be in Ireland. Well, Sir, I should characterize—and I should think the great majority of this House, including not a few honest and independent Radicals, would characterize—that Plan of Campaign as nothing less than a doctrine of public plunder. Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to accept a settlement by a Home Rule Parliament in Ireland of the agrarian difficulty based upon a doctrine of public plunder? He was not prepared to accept it last summer; but he may have changed his mind since then. At that time the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues carefully retained the settlement of the Irish Land Question in their own hands—in the hands of the Imperial Parliament—and nobody was stronger in that matter than the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley). Why did they retain it? Because they would not trust a Home Rule Parliament. But what is there in the doctrines that have been preached in Ireland in this matter, or in the acts that have been done in Ireland since that time, which has convinced the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby that he can now safely entrust to a Home Rule Parliament that which he refused to entrust to it last summer? Can they deal with a great agrarian crisis in any other way? Why, Sir, what is the cause of this agrarian crisis, if there be one? Is it not low prices? And to what are these prices due but to foreign importations; and can an Irish Home Rule Parliament deal with the question of foreign importation? Oh, no! that was carefully kept out of their province by the right hon. Gentleman; and, therefore, I very much wish that instead of some of those remarkable assertions of novel principles which the right hon. Gentleman believed had been his principles for the last 40 years, he had shown us some grounds for thinking either that an Irish Parliament would not act in accordance with the Plan of Campaign, or that it would meet the agrarian crisis in some other way. I venture to say that the right hon. Gentleman, in voting for this Amendment, is voting for what is a most absurd *non sequitur*. The hon. Member for Cork and, to some extent, the right hon. Gentleman have twitted us about our Irish policy. Well, Sir, we have an Irish policy, and it is not that which is presented to the House by the right hon. Gentleman. We expressed our Irish policy to Parliament last September very fully, and we have expressed it, so far as it is possible, in Her Majesty's Gracious Speech from the Throne. In the first place, having regard to the agrarian agitation and its effects in Ireland, we felt bound to say that we think it necessary that some provision should be made for the more efficient administration of the Criminal Law; that the people of Ireland should be made to feel that the law will deal promptly and quickly with those who break it, and that remedial measures, when proposed and carried in Parliament, shall be free to work in that country. But our Irish policy is not confined to an alteration of criminal procedure—we expect every day the Report of Lord Cowper's Commission on the law of land tenure and land purchase in Ireland. As soon as we receive that Report we shall not lose a day in considering it. and in submitting to the House any recommendations which the Commissioners may make, or any other proposals which we may think it right that this House should adopt. We know, and we have always said, that there is much in the Irish Land Law which requires amendment. We do not believe in a system of dual ownership. We do believe in a considerable extension of land purchase in Ireland; but we believe, also, that there are other matters in the Irish Land Law which require amendment; and these, no doubt, will be dealt with in the Report of the Commission and in the Bill which we shall introduce. Not only that, but we have in contemplation, as the House is aware, measures for developing the industrial resources of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman has, probably, forgotten that fact. Well, he thinks so quickly that I can excuse him; but those measures are really in our contemplation. We do not believe in emigration as the first cure for the congested districts in Ireland. We would far sooner see the development of agriculture or fisheries, or other works which may give employment to the population; that employment of which political agitation has so largely deprived them, and which, in view of the exceptional circumstances in Ireland, might seem to justify, to some extent, Government assistance; but we would look mainly to a re-establishment of that confidence in Ireland which would invite the investment of private capital, without which no country can flourish. Hon. Members opposite do not say that some of those proposals may not be worthy of consideration. They tell us that whatever we propose, whether it be a change in the Land Laws, whether it be a development of industrial resources, whether it be a supplementary scheme of emigration—all that must be done, not by this House, but by an Irish Parliament, and therefore they will have nothing to say to it. I saw, the other day, that an hon. Member, in referring to a possible Local Government Bill for Ireland, said that they would accept it as far as it went; but that it would be used only as a lever for the establishment of an Irish Parliament. That, Sir, is the *non possumus* which the right hon. Gentleman and hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway oppose to our policy; but surely we have a right to some better consideration than that. We represent a majority in this House; we represent the majority of the Electors of the United Kingdom. They have declined to accept your proposal for an Irish Parliament; and we have a right to press upon the House that we shall be able to lay before it, at the proper time, and as soon as possible, those proposals which we are anxious to make for the benefit and better government of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle says—"Oh, no! We are in a leaden atmosphere; and we have no hope or expectation of any satisfactory work in Parliament this year." Well, that atmosphere is of his own creating. If he, and those who sit on his side of the House, would but think of the days that have been wasted already in debating the Address, and of the duty which the right hon. Member for East Wolverhampton frankly admits lies upon them, of giving us a fair opportunity of placing our proposals before the House, I think that the leaden atmosphere might dissolve, and that we might be free from further unnecessary talk upon the Speech of Her Majesty. I ventured to say, a few days ago, speaking on the Address, that it was useless to maintain the Union unless, with the Union, we maintained the reign of law in Ireland; and I will go further, and say that it is useless for the constituencies of the country to give a mandate to this House to retain the control of Parliament over Ireland unless this House takes care to place itself in a position, and that soon, so to exercise control over its own Business, that it may fulfil the duty which the constituencies have imposed upon it.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Longford, N.): The right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken complained of the length of time occupied by these debates; and no doubt, from his point of view, his complaint is well-founded. But the right hon. Gentleman must, at least, admit that these debates may be of some service to the Party in the House of which he complained—namely, the Irish Party; for they have received many lessons in morality from those hon. Gentlemen who are attached to the landlord interest. When he attacks the Irish Party with regard to the Plan of Campaign, I should like to ask him one or two questions. The right hon. Gentleman has stated that the Irish tenants wish to deprive the Irish landlords of their rights; but has he ever considered how much per annum the Irish Land Act and Irish agitation has taken off the rents of the landlords in Ireland? It is something like £2,000,000 per annum; or, in other words, the Irish landlords have been robbing the Irish tenants for generations of £2,000,000 a-year. I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will bring in any Bill or Amendment of the law, under which this annual sum of £2,000,000 shall be dealt with as a set-off for the benefit of the tenants; because, if not, I am unable to see on what the complaint of dishonesty is founded. The Plan of Campaign is merely, at its worst, a set-off for the robbery of the Irish tenantry in the past. But there is another aspect of the case. We hear that law and order must be maintained in Ireland; and, no doubt, the terms law and order in the minds of Englishmen represent something that ought to be maintained; but whose law and whose order? We do not recognize your laws; we do not recognize the laws of Gentlemen of the intelligence of the late Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton), or of Gentlemen sitting opposite who know nothing whatever about our country. When you talk of law and order, so far as you are concerned, we believe that every one of your laws is vitiated by the fact that you have no power to impose them upon us. We merely adopt them so far as they are a convenience to us, and no further. With regard to what has been stated as to the right of the landlords, it seems to me that hon. Gentlemen forget that we have never recognized those rights. We have always maintained that the right of the tenant in the soil was a permanent right, and that the right of the landlord in the soil was merely accidental, acquired by confiscation, plunder, and robbery, and maintained by foreign bayonets. I should like to know how, if we were to press this to a degree, it would suit some hon. Members opposite? But we are not inclined so to press it; we are willing that the landlords should have a fair rent from the land, and that if he is to be paid out he should have a fair sum for his interest in the soil. It is our policy to get rid of the landlords as cheaply as we can; but, so far as the landlord's rights are concerned, we have entirely declined to recognize them. The Irish tenant has never recognized the landlord's right as an abstract right, and I do not believe he ever will do so. But I can quite believe in the right hon. Gentleman's anxiety to bring forward a scheme of purchase, and I can also understand his present anxiety about the Plan of Campaign. I hear that it is proposed further to extend the purchase scheme of Lord Ashbourne's Act. That, in my opinion, is the real ground of the anxiety of the Government with regard to the Plan of Campaign, for the Plan of Campaign has taught the Irish people how easy it is to combine against the landlords. It will teach them how easy it will be afterwards to combine against a foreign Government, if that foreign Government make themselves landlords in place of the existing ones. That is really the secret of the opposition to the Plan of Campaign. You, who put out the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) on the plea that you would not accept his purchase scheme, are now going to adopt the purchase system, and you are going at the same time, by this system of criminal procedure, as you call it, by your jury-packing and your conspiracy inquisitions, to deprive the Irish tenantry of any weapons they have in the force of public opinion with which to resist your inquisitions. This is a very serious matter for the Liberal Unionist Party, and for right hon. Gentlemen like the Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain). If it be proposed to force on the Irish people a scheme of purchase, by a Government such as the landlord Government that is now in power, a Government which will not recognize a tenant's right to his own improvements, you will have repudiation by-and-bye. I warn Liberal Unionists, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham and the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), that if you attempt to cram down the throats of the Irish people any Tory or landlord scheme of purchase, much as you fear this Plan of Campaign, the Plan of Campaign against the alien and foreign Government which has forced such purchase upon the people will be a ten times greater and more serious one. In the first instance, Sir, no scheme of purchase will be tolerated by the Irish people, or by their Representatives, which does not fully recognize in the tenant the right to his improvements. No scheme of a number of years purchase on the existing rent will be considered, unless the number of years purchase be very small, a fair or equitable one, now that the Irish tenants have seen the efficacy of the Plan of Campaign, and have shown how they can reduce landlords like Lord Dillon to reason and subjection. First convict the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Mayo (Mr. Dillon) by a packed jury, convict Mr. William O'Brien by a packed jury, suppress *United Ireland*, crush out public opinion, suppress public meeting—and then, when you have reduced the country to subjection, when you have reduced it to silence, when there is no body of men who dare, for fear of your packed juries, protest against the terms of your purchase scheme; when Ireland has been reduced to what you call quiet, a quiet that perhaps will only be broken by the machinations of Ribbon lads; when you think you have got all the conspirators in gaol, and numbed public opinion, you may carry your purchase scheme and the country may be quiet. But I do not think the Tory Government is going to remain in Office always. When you have got your reward at the hands of the constituencies another Government will come in, and upon that Government, which will probably and doubtless be a Liberal Government, will be cast the task of trying to restore law and order and contentment and peace in the country again. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) told us to-night, in the very frankest way, what are the instructions he has given to the Crown Solicitor in Ireland with regard to jury-packing. "The Crown Solicitor," he said, "will pursue the usual course and select the jurors." Now, allow me to tell hon. Gentlemen above the Gangway what is the usual course in political trials in Ireland, or even in our political trials. Under the Crimes Act, where you had a special jury, not a common jury as at present, you challenged in some cases 75 jurors, and in other cases 65. In the case of Joe Poole, who was hanged, you challenged 60; and let me tell the right hon. Gentleman, when he talks about the independence of jurors, that there is not a man in Ireland at the present moment who believes that Poole was guilty. He was defended by a Tory lawyer, and I am told that that lawyer went after the trial to one of the jury and said—"How could you find him guilty of the murder? Although it was admitted he was a Fenian, he apparently did not belong to the party who committed the crime." The juror said—"Do you know, if Poole had been proved to be in Australia at the time, we would have had to convict him?" And these are the men of independent thought! Why would they have had to convict him? Because, Sir, intimidation prevails in their set, just as you charge us with its prevalence in ours. They in their clubs, they at their dinner parties, they amongst their landlord friends, would be Boycotted. But it would be a genteel boycotting—it would not be published in *The Daily Express*. No, Sir; the forms of Boycotting amongst the aristocracy are the forms known to the Dames of the Primrose League. Respectable shopkeepers are no longer dealt with just as if they were published by resolution, such as is alleged was done in the case of the Kerry butter buyers. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary (Mr. Matthews) made a still more remarkable confession. It is true he said that the Sheriff had empanelled on this occasion a jury of 250. So a jury of 80 or 100 are commonly selected in the case of a common pickpocket, but only a moment before he had called my hon. Friend (Mr. Dillon) a petty pilferer. My hon. Friend is to be honoured with a panel of 250; it is necessary, in the opinion of the Crown officials, that when the distinguished traversers come to be tried that a very large panel should be selected. But, Sir, how did they get that idea into the Sheriff's head? Did they communicate their view to the Sheriff? I should like to ask how it is that Her Majesty's Government are able to know the views of the Sheriff so accurately, and how is it the Home Secretary is able to defend the action of the Sheriff for having, for the first time for centuries, empanelled a jury of 250, when, under the Crimes Act, even 200 was the highest number ever summoned? Of course, the Government are in league with the Sheriff. The right hon. and learned Gentleman said that in the Motion which was made in the Queen's Bench we did not question the character of the juries. No, Sir, because the Sheriff refused to let us see his books. But we have got them now, under the order of the Judge; and we intend to challenge his jury. I am sorry to say that, although the solicitor for the traversers declared on oath that the Grand Jury at the outset was illegally and corruptly arrayed, and that of 50 men on the Grand Jury scarcely one was entitled to be in it, the affidavit was not allowed to be presented to the Court; and when I put a Question to-day to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, it was answered, for the purpose of making a point against me, by the hon. and learned Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), who, after saying he did not intend to propose any change in the law, said it was very indecent for the defending counsel to put such a question to the prosecuting counsel. I did not put the question to the prosecuting counsel, but to the Chief Secretary. I asked whether he thought it a decent state of the law that when it was sworn on oath that the Grand Jury was irregularly and illegally empanelled, that proceeding could not be questioned by way of a challenge to the array, a challenge to the poll, or an appeal to the judicial discretion of the Judge. The only answer I got was that a pending matter could not be gone into. The House should remember, in the face of the Chief Secretary's declaration, what is exactly the course pursued by the Government to secure convictions in these matters. No one knows more about jury-packing, or how juries are worked, than the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, because it was he who altered Lord O'Hagan's Act. Under the Liberal Government of 1871, Lord O'Hagan passed an Act by which jurors were to be chosen alphabetically, and to possess certain specified qualifications. The moment the Tories got into Office, they saw this would not suit their book in Ireland; and, although there was no agrarian agitation at the time, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary obtained an alteration of the law, enormously increasing the qualification of jurors. What did he do in the County Dublin? It is very difficult for laymen to understand the tricks which are resorted to: it is only when one sees them at work that one can understand how they tell against traversers like my hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo. Had the traversers been tried in the city where they were originally indicted, they would have been tried by men of a £20 qualification. What is the qualification for County Dublin? As arranged by the right hon. Gentleman, there is a rated qualification for land of a £40 character, and for houses of a £10 character. Most of the farms in Ireland are rated at £20 and under. For instance, the Arrears Act only applied to farms under £30, and that included five-sixths of the Irish farms. Therefore, you will scarcely get any Irish farmer in the County Dublin on the popular side who is rated at £40. County Dublin is a villa county; it is the county in which the villa residents dwell. The merchants of the city, as a rule, reside beyond the limits of the municipal boundaries; but the house qualification secured by the right hon. Gentleman takes in all the half-pay officers of Rathmines and Kingstown, all the civil servants, and all the men in the

Government employ. By the change of venue from the city to the county, the Government hit the two qualifications; they hit the high qualification, and they hit the low qualification; and, indeed, are able to get just the kind of jury they want. The Home Secretary said—

> "Surely Irishmen do not complain of being relegated from the city to the county, as, in that case, they get a much larger population."

Well, Sir, I am surprised that the right hon. and learned Gentleman who was for so long a period an Irish Member himself, although only for Dungarvan, does not know that there is twice the population in the City of Dublin that there is in the county seats. For instance, under the Redistribution of Seats Act, which goes by population, there are four Members for the city and only two for the county. Therefore, I think the right hon. and learned Gentleman was a little out when he said there is a larger population in the county than in the city. But I will assume that you get your conviction. I will assume that the best wishes of the Chief Secretary are gratified; and I will assume that he succeeds in getting my hon. Friend and his companions, Mr. William O'Brien and others, sent to gaol for two years. Well, after all, the Tory Party are a Constitutional Party: they are very fond of ancient history; but I would ask them—"Do you think Mr. Forster felt very particularly comfortable on the day the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) and his companions were sent to Kilmainham?" Why, Mr. Forster's troubles were only beginning; and whereas now you have the Plan of Campaign adopted on 40 estates only out of 9,000 perhaps, when my hon. Friend is convicted, and when the March rents come to be paid, the Plan of Campaign may spread from 40 to 4,000 estates, and the Irish landlords, who were so glad to see the hon. Member for Cork released, will be petitioning the right hon. Baronet to proclaim an amnesty, because, of all the animals in the world, the Irish landlord is the most selfish. The Irish landlord cares nothing for State policy; he only wants to get his rents. Furthermore, I would ask hon. Gentlemen whether they think that, in this Jubilee year of Her Majesty the Queen, the way to promote the acceptance by the Irish people of those splendid measures which have been promised us by the Government, is by putting five or six Members of this House and Representatives of the Irish people, into gaol? As we told Mr. Forster, we tell you, that if you put these men in gaol by a packed jury, such as you evidently intend to do, your difficulties will be increased four-fold, and you will in fact render the country completely ungovernable. I do not propose, at this period of the night (one o'clock) to occupy the time of the House longer. I only desire, in the plainest terms, to say that when you find out by-and-bye exactly what has occurred, you cannot say that you were not warned. The fate of Mr. Forster, the fate of his Government, has had some effect—has had an enormous effect—upon the Liberal Party in this country. Although some Members of it, such as the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), have not yet come round, the noble Marquess will not join the Government himself, but he sends his Chancellor of the Exchequer to them. His reluctance to join the Government reminds me very much of Punch's butler, who said, after attending on a certain dinner party of Cockneys, "I don't mind waiting on 'em, but I should not like to have to dine with 'em." The noble Marquess's mind has yet to be penetrated by those truths and those lessons which have sunk into the mind of other Members of the Liberal Party. I believe, Sir, that even time itself will tell upon the mind of the noble Marquess. I believe the experiments in coercion which the Tory Government are now making, and their consequent failure, will tell upon his mind. I regard the advent to Office of the Tory Party as a boon. I believe that their experiments in coercion will simply lead them to disaster; and that being so, I feel fully assured that, warned by the beacon light of their failure, but a short time will elapse before a united Liberal Party, under the leadership of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), will once more come into Office and restore peace and order in Ireland.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 246; Noes 352: Majority 106.

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Glam.)
Abraham, W. (Limerick, W.)
Acland, A. H. D.
Acland, C. T. D.
Allison, R. A.
Anderson, C. H.
Asher, A.

Asquith, H. H.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Austin, J.
Balfour, rt. hon. J. B.
Balfour, Sir G.
Barran, J.
Barry, J.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, J. A.
Blake, T.
Blane, A.
Bolton, J. C.
Bolton, T. D.
Borlase, W. C.
Bradlaugh, C.
Bright, Jacob
Bright, W. L.
Broadhurst, H.
Brown, A. L.
Bruce, hon. R. P.
Bryce, J.
Burt, T.
Buxton, S. C.
Byrne, G. M.
Cameron, C.
Campbell, H.
Campbell-Bannerman, right hon. H.
Carew, J. L.
Chance, P. A.
Channing, F. A.
Childers, rt. hon. H. C. E.
Clancy, J. J.
Cobb, H. P.
Cohen, A.
Coleridge, hon. B.
Colman, J. J.
Commins, A.
Condon, T. J.
Connolly, L.
Conway, M.
Conybeare, C. A. V.
Corbet, W. J.
Cossham, H.
Cox, J. R.
Cozens-Hardy, H. H.
Craig, J.
Craven, J.
Crawford, D.
Crawford, W.
Cremer, W. R.
Crilly, D.
Crossley, E.
Davies, W.
Deasy, J.
Dillon, J.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dodds, J.
Duff, R. W.
Ellis, J.
Ellis, J. E.
Ellis, T. E.
Esmonde, Sir T. H. G.
Esslemont, P.
Evershed, S.
Fenwick, C.
Finucane, J.
Flower, C.
Flynn, J. C.
Foley, P. J.
Foljambe, C. G. S.
Forster, Sir C.
Fowler, rt. hon. H. H.
Fox, Dr. J. F.
Fry, T.
Fuller, G. P.
Gane, J. L.
Gardner, H.
Gaskell, C. G. Milnes-
Gilhooly, J.
Gill, H. J.
Gill, T. P.
Gourley, E. T.
Graham, R. C.
Gray, E. D.
Grey, Sir E.
Gully, W. C.
Haldane, R. B.
Hanbury-Tracy, hon. F. S. A.
Harcourt, rt. hn. Sir W. G. V. V.
Harrington, E.
Harrington, T. C.
Hayden, L. P.
Hayne, C. Seale-
Healy, M.
Healy, T. M.
Holden, I.
Hooper, J.
Howell, G.
Hoyle, I.
Hunter, W. A.
Illingworth, A.
Jacoby, J. A.
James, hon. W. H.
James, C. H.
Joicey, J.
Jordan, J.
Kay-Shuttleworth, rt. hon. Sir U. J.
Kennedy, E. J.
Kenny, C. S.
Kenny, J. E.
Kenny, M. J.
Kilcoursie, right hon. Viscount
Labouchere, H.
Lacaita, C. C.
Lalor, R.
Lane, W. J.
Lawson, Sir W.
Lawson, H. L. W.
Leahy, J.
Leake, R.
Lefevre, rt. hn. G. J. S.
Lewis, T. P.
Lyell, L.
Macdonald, Dr. R.
Macdonald, W. A.
MacInnes, M.
MacNeill, J. G. S.
M‘Arthur, A.
M‘Cartan, M.
M‘Carthy, J. H.
M‘Donald, P.
M‘Ewan, W.
M‘Kenna, Sir J. N.
M‘Laren, W. S. B.
Mahony, P.
Maitland, W. F.
Mappin, Sir F. T.
Marjoribanks, rt. hon. E.
Marum, E. M.
Mason, S.
Mayne, T.
Molloy, B. C.
Montagu, S.
Morgan, rt. hon. G. O.
Morgan, O. V.
Morley, rt. hon. J.
Morley, A.
Mundella, rt. hon. A. J.
Murphy, W. M.
Neville, R.
Newnes, G.
Nolan, Colonel J. P.
Nolan, J.
O'Brien, J. F. X.
O'Brien, P.
O'Brien, P. J.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, J. (Kerry)
O'Connor, J. (Tippry.)
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Doherty, J. E.
O'Hanlon, T.
O'Hea, P.
O'Kelly, J.
Parnell, C. S.
Paulton, J. M.
Peacock, R.
Pease, A. E.
Pease, H. F.
Penton, Captain F. T.
Pickard, B.
Pickersgill, E. H.
Picton, J. A.
Pinkerton, J.
Playfair, rt. hon. Sir L.
Plowden, Sir W. C.
Portman, hon. E. B.
Potter, T. B.
Power, P. J.
Price, T. P.
Priestley, B.
Provand, A. D.
Pyne, J. D.
Quinn, T.
Redmond, W. H. K.
Reed, Sir E. J.
Reid, R. T.
Rendel, S.
Reynolds, W. J.
Richard, H.
Roberts, J.
Roberts, J. B.
Robinson, T.
Roe, T.
Rowlands, J.
Rowlands, W. B.
Rowntree, J.
Russell, Sir C.
Russell, E. R.
Samuelson, Sir B.
Schwann, C. E.
Sexton, T.
Shaw, T.
Sheehan, J. D.
Sheehy, D.
Shirley, W. S.
Smith, S.
Spencer, hon. C. R.
Stack, J.
Stanhope, hon. P. J.
Stansfeld, rt. hon. J.
Stevenson, F. S.
Stevenson, J. C.
Storey, S.
Stuart, J.
Sullivan, D.
Sullivan, T. D.
Summers, W.
Sutherland, A.
Swinburne, Sir J.
Tanner, C. K.
Thomas, A.
Tuite, J.
Waddy, S. D.
Wallace, R.
Wardle, H.
Warmington, C. M.
Watt, H.
Wayman, T.
Whitbread, S.
Will, J. S.
Williams, A.
Williamson, J.
Williamson, S.
Wilson, H. J.
Woodall, W.
Woodhead, J.
Wright, C.
Yeo, F. A.

TELLERS.
Redmond, J. E.
Sheil, E.

NOES.

Addison, J. E. W.
Agg-Gardner, J. T.
Ainslie, W. G.
Allsopp, hon. G.
Ambrose, W.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Anstruther, Colonel R. H. L.
Anstruther, H. T.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Baggallay, E.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Baird, J. G. A.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, G. W.
Banes, Major G. E.
Baring, Viscount
Barnes, A.
Barry, A. H. Smith-
Bartley, G. C. T.
Bass, H.
Bates, Sir E.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Beach, W. W. B.
Beaumont, H. F.
Beckett, E. W.
Beckett, W.
Bective, Earl of
Bentinck, rt. hn. G. C.
Bentinck, Lord H. C.
Bentinck, W. G. C.
Beresford, Lord C. W. De la Poer
Bethell, Commander G. R.

Bickford-Smith, W.
Biddulph, M.
Bigwood, J.
Birkbeck, Sir E.
Blundell, Col. H. B. H.
Bond, G. H.
Bonsor, H. C. O.
Boord, T. W.
Borthwick, Sir A.
Bridgeman, Col. hon. F. C.
Bright, right hon. J.
Bristowe, T. L.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Brooks, Sir W. C.
Brown, A. H.
Bruce, Lord H.
Buchanan, T. R.
Burdett-Coutts, W. L. Ash.-B.
Burghley, Lord
Caine, W. S.
Caldwell, J.
Campbell, Sir A.
Campbell, R. F. F.
Chamberlain, rt. hn. J.
Chamberlain, R.
Chaplin, right hon. H.
Charrington, S.
Clarke, Sir E. G.
Cochrane-Baillie, hon. C. W. A. N.
Coddington, W.
Coghill, D. H.
Cohen, L. L.
Collings, J.
Colomb, Capt. J. C. R.
Compton, F.
Cooke, C. W. R.
Corbett, A. C.
Corry, Sir J. P.
Cotton, Capt. E. T. D.
Courtney, L. H.
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. S.
Crossley, Sir S. B.
Crossman, Gen. Sir W.
Cubitt, right hon. G.
Currie, Sir D.
Curzon, Viscount
Curzon, hon. G. N.
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davenport, W. B.
Dawnay, Colonel hon. L. P.
De Cobain, E. S. W.
De Lisle, E. J. L. M. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Dimsdale, Baron R.
Dixon, G.
Dixon-Hartland, F. D.
Dorington, Sir J. E.
Dugdale, J. S.
Duncan, Colonel F.
Duncombe, A.
Dyke, rt. hn. Sir W. H.
Eaton, H. W.
Ebrington, Viscount
Edwards-Moss, T. C.
Elcho, Lord
Elliot, hon. A. R. D.
Elliot, hon. H. F. H.
Elliot, G. W.
Ellis, Sir J. W.
Elton, C. I.
Evelyn, W. J.
Ewart, W.
Ewing, Sir A. O.
Eyre, Colonel H.
Fellowes, W. H.
Fergusson, right hon. Sir J.
Field, Admiral E.
Fielden, T.
Finch, G. H.
Finch-Hatton, hon. M. E. G.
Finlay, R. B.
Fisher, W. H.
Fitzgerald, R. U. P.
Fitzwilliam, hon. W. J. W.
Fitz-Wygram, General Sir F. W.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Folkestone, right hon. Viscount
Forwood, A. B.
Fowler, Sir R. N.
Fraser, General C. C.
Fry, L.
Fulton, J. F.
Gardner, R. Richardson-
Gathorne-Hardy, hon. A. E.
Gedge, S.
Gent-Davis, R.
Giles, A.
Gilliat, J. S.
Godson, A. F.
Goldsworthy, Major-General W. T.
Gorst, Sir J. E.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gray, C. W.
Green, Sir E.
Greenall, Sir G.
Greene, E.
Grimston, Viscount
Grotrian, F. B.
Grove, Sir T. F.
Gunter, Colonel R.
Gurdon, R. T.
Hall, A. W.
Hall, C.
Halsey, T. F.
Hambro, Col. C. J. T.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, Lord E.
Hamilton, Col. C. E.
Hamley, Gen. Sir E. B.
Hanbury, R. W.
Hankey, F. A.
Hardcastle, E.
Hardcastle, F.
Hartington, Marq. of
Havelock-Allan, Sir H. M.
Heath, A. R.
Heathcote, Capt. J. H. Edwards-
Heaton, J. H.
Heneage, right hon. E.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hermon-Hodge, R. T.
Hill, right hon. Lord A. W.
Hill, Colonel E. S.
Hill, A. S.
Hingley, B.
Hoare, S.
Hobhouse, H.
Holland, rt. hon. Sir H. T.
Holloway, G.
Holmes, rt. hon. H.
Hornby, W. H.
Houldsworth, W. H.
Howard, J.
Howard, J. M.
Howorth, H. H.
Hozier, J. H. C.
Hubbard, rt. hn. J. G.
Hubbard, E.
Hughes, Colonel E.
Hughes-Hallett, Col. F. C.
Hulse, E. H.
Hunt, F. S.
Hunter, Sir G.
Isaacs, L. H.
Isaacson, F. W.
Jackson, W. L.
James, rt. hon. Sir H.
Jardine, Sir R.
Jarvis, A. W.
Jennings, L. J.
Johnston, W.
Kelly, J. R.
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Kenrick, W.
Kenyon, hon. G. T.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.
Kerans, F. H.
Kimber, H.
King, H. S.
King-Harman, Colonel E. R.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, hon. H. T.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knowles, L.
Kynoch, G.
Lafone, A.
Lambert, I. C.
Laurie, Colonel R. P.
Lawrance, J. C.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Lawrence, W. F.
Lea, T.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Lees, E.
Legh, T. W.
Leighton, S.
Lewisham, right hon. Viscount
Llewellyn, E. H.
Long, W. H.
Low, M.
Lowther, hon. W.
Lowther, J. W.
Lubbock, Sir J.
Lymington, Viscount
Macartney, W. G. E.
Macdonald, right hon. J. H. A.
Maclean, F. W.
Maclean, J. M.
Maclure, J. W.
M'Calmont, Captain J.
M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J.
Makins, Colonel W. T.
Malcolm, Col. J. W.
Mallock, R.
Manners, rt. hon. Lord J. J. R.
March, Earl of
Marriott, rt. hn. W. T.
Maskelyne, M. H. N. Story-
Matthews, rt. hon. H.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Mayne, Admiral R. C.
Mildmay, F. B.
Mills, hon. C. W.
Milvain, T.
More, R. J.
Morgan, hon. F.
Morrison, W.
Mount, W. G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. Sir J. R.
Mowbray, R. G. C.
Mulholland, H. L.
Muncaster, Lord
Muntz, P. A.
Murdoch, C. T.
Newark, Viscount
Noble, W.
Norris, E. S.
Northcote, hon. H. S.
Norton, R.
O'Neill, hon. R. T.
Paget, Sir R. H.
Parker, hon. F.
Pearce, W.
Pelly, Sir L.
Pitt-Lewis, G.
Plunket, right hon. D. R.
Plunkett, hon. J. W.
Pomfret, W. P.
Powell, F. S.
Price, Captain G. E.
Puleston, J. H.
Quilter, W. C.
Raikes, rt. hon. H. C.
Rankin, J.
Rasch, Major F. C.
Reed, H. B.
Richardson, T.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Ritchie, rt. hon. C. T.
Robertson, J. P. B.
Robertson, W. T.
Robinson, B.
Rollit, Sir A. K.
Ross, A. H.
Rothschild, Baron F. J. de
Round, J.
Russell, Sir G.
Russell, T. W.

St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Salt, T.
Sandys, Lieut-Col. T. M.
Saunderson, Col. E. J.
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Sellar, A. C.
Selwin - Ibbetson, rt. hon. Sir H. J.
Selwyn, Capt. C. W.
Seton-Karr, H.
Sidebotham, J. W.
Sidebottom, T. H.
Sidebottom, W.
Sinclair, W. P.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smith, A.
Spencer, J. E.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Stanley, E. J.
Stewart, M.
Sutherland, T.
Swetenham, E.
Talbot, C. R. M.
Talbot, J. G.
Tapling, T. K.
Taylor, F.
Temple, Sir R.
Theobald, J.
Thorburn, W.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Tottenham, A. L.
Townsend, G. F.
Tyler, Sir H. W.
Verdin, R.
Vernon, hon. G. R.
Vincent, C. E. H.
Walsh, hon. A. H. J.
Waring, Colonel T.
Watson, J.
Webster, Sir. R. E.
Webster, R. G.
West, Colonel W. C.
Wharton, J. L.
White, J. B.
Whitley, E.
Whitmore, C. A.
Wiggin, H.
Williams, J. Powell-
Wilson, Sir S.
Winn, hon. R.
Winterbotham, A. B.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wolmer, Viscount
Wood, N.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wright, H. S.
Wroughton, P.
Yerburgh, R. A.
Young, C. E. B.

TELLERS.
Douglas, A. Akers-
Walrond, Col. W. H.

Main Question again proposed.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Esslemont.*)

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) I shall not, of course, offer any opposition to the Motion of the hon. Gentleman; but I wish to point out that the House has now been sitting for a fortnight, and that only two of the Amendments to the Address have been discussed. I trust, therefore, that it will be the pleasure of the House to proceed with the other Amendments on the Paper as rapidly as possible, in order that we may go forward with the substantial Business of the Session.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* next.

House adjourned at Twenty-five Minutes after One o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 14*th February,* 1887.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE — Standing Orders Committee, Lord Houghton added *v.* Lord Saye and Sele.

PUBLIC BILLS — *First Reading* — Probation of First Offenders (No. 2) * (20).

Withdrawn—Probation of First Offenders * (3).

RAILWAYS—RAILWAY BRAKES.

MOTION FOR A RETURN.

EARL DE LA WARR, in rising to call attention to the Circular of the Board of Trade with regard to railway continuous brakes; also to ask if it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to take any steps this Session to enforce the requirements which are specified in that Circular; and also to move for—

> "Return of the number of servants in the employ of each Railway Company who are regularly on duty for more than twelve hours consecutively,"

said, that some time ago he introduced into the House a Bill, with a view to carrying out the requirements of the Board of Trade on this subject, and, on the assurance of Her Majesty's late Government that they would take up the question, he withdrew the Bill, and nothing had since been done. He was quite aware that there were causes which had impeded, and he regretted to say still did impede, domestic legislation, but he would urge that this was not a new question—it was not a question for which more time could reasonably be asked—but it was one which had been for several years before Parliament and the country, and also under the consideration of Railway Companies. It was a question with regard to which experiments had been made, and upon which the opinions of the most competent engineers had been given, and which now required only some action on the part of Her Majesty's Government in order to deal with it in a satisfactory manner. The Board of Trade exercised a supervision of railways—both in their construction and also afterwards—in matters where the public safety was concerned, and although they had very wisely and with great discretion abstained from unnecessary interference, there were occasions when the public interests required their intervention. This was one of those cases. Almost immediately after the commencement of railways the subject of brakes naturally became one of consideration. The hand-brake, which was first used, and as applied to ordinary vehicles, was found, as traffic increased, to be insufficient, and a more complicated form of mechanical brake became necessary, which had now been developed in a still more scientific shape as a continuous automatic brake; and which had for some time past been much used, especially in the United States, and also, to a certain extent, in this country. The attention of the Board of Trade was some years ago called to this matter, and the inspecting officers, men of considerable practical and scientific knowledge, gave their opinion that a large proportion of the accidents on railways might be attributed to the want of efficient brakes. Following upon this—and as a result of that attention—in the year 1877 a Circular was issued to Railway Companies by the Board of Trade. It was a carefully drawn up document, moderate in its tone, but at the same time expressing in a decided manner the views entertained by the Board of Trade; and afforded the Railway Companies an opportunity of complying very easily with its requirements. After referring to the Reports upon accidents by the officers of the Board, it stated—

> "From a careful examination of which and similar information for the past few years, the Board of Trade are led to conclude that three-fourths of these accidents might probably have been avoided, or the results materially mitigated if the passenger trains concerned had been provided with continuous brakes."

This must be regarded as a most important statement, coming as it does from a Government Department in possession of the best information, and "after a careful examination." It was further added with reference to the progress which was being made—

> "There has apparently been no attempt on the part of the various Companies to take the first steps of agreeing upon what are the requirements which, in their opinion, are essential to a good and an efficient continuous brake."

As an illustration of the want of this united action, it might be mentioned that one of the largest Railway Companies—the London and North Western—were now removing a brake originally constructed at a great cost which had been for some time in use, and were fitting their rolling stock with another which did not comply with the conditions laid down by the Board of Trade, and which was in use only on one other line. The Circular further stated—

> "The Board of Trade feel it their duty again to urge upon the Railway Companies the necessity of arriving at an immediate decision and united action in this matter."

This Circular was issued in the year 1877, now nearly 10 years ago; and he would ask what progress had since been made? It was said sometimes—"The Railway Companies are the best judges of what is required." He would admit that the Railway Companies were, or ought to be, the best judges in these matters, but the question arose, did the results show that they acted upon the opinions they might have formed? What was the result of the last 10 years? In the 10 years since the Circular of the Board of Trade was issued, we found less than half of the Railway Companies had adopted the brake which the Board of Trade had pronounced to be essential for the public safety in travelling, and several of those who had adopted it had only partially and imperfectly done so. Was this a state of things which inspired confidence or promised well for the future? Were we to wait for another 10 years before anything was done in this matter to protect the lives of railway servants and railway passengers? The same, he believed, would have happened some years ago with regard to those valuable appliances, the interlocking of points and signals and the block system, if some pressure had not been employed. He had the honour of obtaining a Committee of this House to inquire into these questions, and although there was no direct legislation, the result had been the almost universal adoption of those improvements in the working of railways. An objection was sometimes made to the Board of Trade pressing upon Railway Companies the use of any particular brake. The Board of Trade, however, had no desire to force Railway Companies to adopt a particular brake; but what the Board of Trade wished—as he understood—was that the brake made use of should be one which complied with certain conditions, and was an efficient brake. In the Returns which were made by the Companies, there was a note by the Board of Trade in the last Return as follows—

> "These totals are the numbers of engines and carriages returned by the Railway Companies as fitted with continuous brakes. It will be ob-

served however, that some of the brakes so returned but very imperfectly fulfil that designation."

This was the opinion of the Board of Trade. There was often also an appeal *ad misericordiam* on behalf of the Railway Companies as regards the expense of continuous automatic brakes; but he believed it could be shown that it was not based upon facts. Upon this point he might quote the words of Mr. Laing, the chairman of the London and Brighton Railway Company, who, at the last meeting of the shareholders, said—

> "In my judgment, the increased safety in travelling is due very much to the general application of those precautions—namely, the block system and the interlocking point signals, and the Westinghouse brake." (This was a brake which complied with the Board of Trade conditions.) "These are the three great causes which have reduced the number of accidents on this and other lines so largely, and as I know some of our railway brethren are a little jealous of Board of Trade interference, I think I am bound to say the Board of Trade has done good service in urging those improvements upon Railway Companies. However, there is the result, and I may say it has been exceedingly satisfactory. If we take one case alone—the Westinghouse automatic brake—we had a Return made some time ago, and the result was to show that a very large number of accidents, both to the public, and still more to our own servants, had been averted entirely by having a brake that was able to stop trains in a very short time indeed. I think it has paid its expenses five times over in the money question, to say nothing of the humanity in saving life."

He (Earl De La Warr) knew it was more easy, in most cases, to find fault than to provide a remedy; but he would venture to suggest to the noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade (Lord Stanley of Preston) that it might greatly facilitate the settlement of this question if a committee of railway men and engineers were appointed to report upon the brakes now in use, as to whether they do or do not comply with the requirements of the Board of Trade. It remained only now for him to move for a Return of the number of servants in the employ of each Railway Company who were regularly on duty for more than 12 hours consecutively. He believed such a Return would be highly useful, and put a check to an evil which was at all times likely to be the cause of accidents. There might naturally be reasons for working overtime occasionally; but there were cases of booked time over 12 hours, and that also applied to very responsible servants, such as engine drivers, signalmen, and guards. He (Earl De La Warr) admitted that it might be done sometimes by men voluntarily; but the public should certainly be protected as far as possible against such unnecessary risks and dangers.

Moved, That there be laid before the House—

> "Return of the number of servants in the employ of each railway company who are regularly on duty for more than twelve hours consecutively."—(*The Earl De La Warr.*)

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Lord STANLEY of PRESTON) said, he could not go beyond the answer which it was his duty to give the noble Earl (Earl De La Warr) some months ago. The Board of Trade were fully aware of the importance of the subject to which the noble Earl had directed their attention; and they did not intend to relax any efforts in furtherance of what was originally intended—that moral pressure should be brought to bear upon the Railway Companies to induce them as far as possible to increase their brake power, as being necessary for the safe conduct of trains and for the safety of the travelling public. His noble Friend rightly anticipated that he (Lord Stanley of Preston) would not feel it to be his duty to recommend any particular form of brake; and, as a matter of fact, there had been great diversity of opinion among railway men upon the subject. His noble Friend had quoted the remarks of Mr. Laing at a recent railway meeting, speaking in high praise of the Westinghouse brake. He (Lord Stanley of Preston) believed that to be a thoroughly efficient brake; but, at the same time, it must be borne in mind that Mr. Laing was speaking of a railway extending over a short distance, and which was not, therefore, subject to all the difficulties which other lines were liable to in respect of the making up of trains and through connection with carriages of different patterns on other lines. It was very desirable that Railway Companies should be brought to see that there was a community of interest in this matter; and to that end the Board of Trade would cerainly do its utmost. He was not prepared to say whether they should proceed by legislation or any other way to compel the Railway Companies to take such action. He would rather trust, though the action might be somewhat prolonged, to the moral pressure which Motions like that of the noble Earl would create in the public mind. He had no reason to believe that the Railway Companies were insensible of the obligations under which they lie. It would hardly be fair not to recognize the great progress which had been made since the Board of Trade Circular was published. There was no doubt that the Railway Companies were making considerable efforts. Much, however, remained to be done. He was sorry he was not able to speak more definitely on this subject. He feared he could add little to the noble Earl's knowledge. All he could say was that the subject would continue to occupy the attention of those who had to deal with it, and that all reasonable steps would be taken, particularly as to the preservation of the public safety. As to the second part of the Motion of the noble Earl, for a Return of railway servants employed for more than 12 consecutive hours, he (Lord Stanley of Preston) had communicated with several Railway Companies, and found that there would be some difficulty in making out such a Return. He would be glad if the noble Earl would confer with him as to the terms in which a Return could be made, so that its preparation would entail on the Railway Companies the least labour possible, while giving all necessary information.

Motion *agreed to.*

STATE OF IRELAND—LEGISLATION.

OBSERVATIONS.

Lord INCHIQUIN, in rising, pursuant to Notice, to call attention to the urgent necessity for further legislation in order to deal with the disorder and lawlessness existing in Ireland, said, That if it were not for the very serious condition of Ireland at that moment, and for the momentous crisis which appeared to be rapidly approaching in that country, he would not have ventured to trouble their Lordships with any opinions of his own on the present situation on that part of the United Kingdom. He would rather have trusted to the responsible Government of the country to carry out their often repeated promises — that they would maintain at all hazards law and order in Ireland. But unfortunately, he felt himself obliged to stand up in his place in Parliament and tell the House that law and order neither had been nor were being then maintained in Ireland, and certainly not in that part of the country to which he more immediately belonged. The state of things, he regretted very much to have confess to their Lordships, in that part of the country in which he resided had been going from bad to worse during the last few months of the year 1886; indeed, so bad had the position of affairs become in some parts of the country, that he felt bound to state that, in his opinion, the condition of those districts could only properly be described as bordering on rebellion. He fully admitted that such serious language ought not to be used, unless there was good reason for it; but he said that, to the best of his belief, there was good reason for the language he was employing, and he maintained that it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to lose not a moment in bringing whatever legislation they might intend to introduce before Parliament for dealing with the state of things at present existing in the sister country. Of the difficulties which surrounded the Government he was well aware, and could fully appreciate the obstacles in their path; and, to a great extent, could sympathize with them as to the course they had thought it right to pursue. But nobody, he thought, acquainted with the present state of affairs could be ignorant of the fact that Her Majesty's Government were at that moment entirely dependent on the support of the Liberal Unionists for carrying any legislation that they might desire to adopt to bring about a state of law and order in Ireland. They all knew the difficulties the Government had to meet on account of the Opposition, led by Mr. Gladstone, who were looking for even the slightest token of disagreement between the Government and the Liberal Unionists, so that they might again re-establish the late Ministry in power, and be able to force the country to accept that which it had so emphatically declared against—namely, Home Rule. No doubt, if Mr. Gladstone again came into power, a proposal of that kind, which would hand over the loyal portion of Ireland to the tender mercies of the Land League, would be the first piece of legislation he would endeavour to force on the country. He could not, therefore, help asking noble Lords opposite, and those outside of the House who supported Mr. Gladstone, whether they considered it to be honourable and consistent with good faith to hand over the lives, the persons, the property, and the interests of every kind of the whole of the loyal population of Ireland to the tender mercies of men who they knew perfectly well were the enemies of that loyal population? Language was not strong enough to condemn such a proposal. Yet it was proposed to do that, in spite of the fact that the connection with England had now lasted for the greater part of a century, during which time the interests of the two countries had become so entirely interwoven that any break of that connection must inevitably produce the greatest amount of hardship, suffering, and sorrow to what he could only describe as the poorer and the weaker country. He should be failing in his duty as a Representative of Ireland, if he did not declare that he considered it the bounden duty of Her Majesty's Government, and of any Government that might succeed them, to maintain law and order in that country. However that might be, the fact was that a rival Government had been permitted to rise up in Ireland. He did not blame the present Ministry; it was not their fault, but that of the Ministry who preceded them, the Ministry of Mr. Gladstone, that the rival Government of the Land League had been allowed to establish itself in Ireland. The Government of the Land League, however, was a very different organization from that which the late Mr. Forster had to deal with some years ago, when it was described as an organization of "village tyrants and dissolute ruffians." Since that time the League had extended itself through the length and breadth of the land; there was hardly a town, a village, or a hamlet in which it had not an organization, and those organizations were worked with a power and a will of which their Lordships were scarcely aware. One would imagine that the people of this country would by this time have realized the state of things that existed in Ireland; but they still seemed to be unaware of the enormous power wielded by that organization. They appeared unable to comprehend that that organization was, in fact, the Government of the country at this moment. The question had certainly been repeatedly asked him during this winter, whether they had any Government at all in Ireland, or any other than that of the League; for when they heard of outrages, and looked round them, all they could do was to ask where was the strong arm of the law? His contention and sincere belief was that it was absolutely essential, whatever Ministry was in power, that the League should be suppressed. That was the conclusion of those who understood Ireland; and he must strongly impress it on their Lordships that that was the only way in which they could restore and bring about peace in that country. It would be perfectly unnecessary for him to quote from speeches of members of the National League, both in the House of Commons and outside, to show what their intentions were. They really proposed to put down the Government of the Queen, and to establish in its place a Government of their own. The attack on the landlords and the destruction of all rights of property were only a means to an end—it was only that they might the easier establish an Irish Republic across the water. He thought that should be distinctly understood in this country. The League organization, therefore, ought to be suppressed at all hazards. It was because he knew that the Government intended to bring in some legislation for dealing with the conspiracy that had lately been rife in Ireland that he introduced the subject, in order to impress on them that any legislation which was proposed for that purpose would be utterly useless unless it was accompanied by such powers as would enable them, at the same time, to suppress the National League. He had little doubt, not only that the Liberal Unionists would support the Government in any course that they took to restore law and order; but also that the country would support them just as readily as they would support a measure, if necessary, to put down robbery and murder in this country. It had been said, with a great deal of justice, that if the League were suppressed there would be a much worse organization in its place, and there would be secret conspiracies throughout the land; and he admitted that nothing more dreadful could be imagined than that Ireland or any other country should be undermined by secret societies; but would anyone argue—and it would be just as easy to do so—that, because they had in this City an open organization of thieves and robbers, that it was not their duty to put it down, because, if they did so, the thieves would hold meetings in secret? Moreover, the National League was, he contended, even now, to a great extent, a secret society. It held its courts in secret, and nobody except its own inner circle heard what went on in its secret councils, where the mischief was brewed. It was from those secret courts of the League that the terrible decrees for boycotting and the orders for resisting the officers of the Crown were issued. Only the other day there was to be an eviction in that part of Ireland with which he (Lord Inchiquin) was himself connected. It was an eviction of a tenant on the property belonging to Mr. D'Esterre. He owed £700, his rent being close upon £200 a-year. This was three years' rent of a good farm, and probably the finest land in the county. What happened? Orders were evidently sent out by the National League, that the people were to assemble and to stop the bailiffs and the Sheriff from carrying out the law. The Sheriff was accompanied by a large force of bailiffs and police, and also by a Resident Magistrate. On arriving at the scene of eviction, what did they find there? They found that the door of the house had been taken off its hinges, and an iron gate substituted, to which was chained the parish priest. The priest immediately began to argue with the Sheriff and his men as to the iniquity of the law which they were going to carry out. The influence of the priest's sacred character upon the people and the position in which he was placed were such that the bailiffs refused to carry out the eviction. Why the Resident Magistrate did not act and call upon the police to act, he left Her Majesty's Government to answer. In any case, there was an ineffectual endeavour to carry out the law, which did more mischief in the country than a thousand evictions where the law had been carried out; because it was made clear to the people that they had only to assemble in hundreds to resist the law, and they would be able to do so. If the National League were proclaimed and put down, one most important effect it would have would be to dissociate from this organization the priesthood of the country, who were now in a great measure the leaders of public opinion, and who were also, he was sorry to say, the leaders very often of those organizations which were got up for the purpose of resistance to the carrying out of the law. They had promulgated the doctrine that it was the duty of the tenants to spend all the money they required upon themselves and their families. The important effect, therefore, of dissociating them from this organization was one which their Lordships should carefully bear in mind. He would remind their Lordships also that in the early part of the autumn the National League issued an order from its headquarters in Dublin, telling the tenants in Ireland that it was their duty to satisfy every debt rather than the debt due to the landlords; that it was their duty to pay everything they might owe to the tradesmen and others; that it was their duty to spend what they required; but that the last thing they should do was to pay the rent due for their farms. They would be perfectly justified in leaving the landlords in the lurch. The natural effect of that order was that it was obeyed. When the time came for the landlord to receive his rent, he asked the tenants in the usual way to pay what was fair. The tenants said, "Oh, we have not got the money, and the state of the country is so bad we cannot pay you any rent." It was not surprising that this should be the result of such a proclamation, nor that the landlords should resort to the only remedy they had, and one which they were reluctant to carry out—namely, to proceed to eviction. A Return had lately been issued, under the auspices of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union, analyzing the Return of Evictions which had taken place during the six months from January 1 to June 30, 1886. The Returns were not complete. They had not been made up for the last half-year, and, therefore, he was unable to quote the result of those Returns. But from the present Return their Lordships would see that what had been said with regard to landlord evictions was enormously exaggerated. The Return proved that they were nothing like so numerous as the Home Rulers would have us believe. It stated that in the six months ending June last—

> "The sum total of the eviction record is that out of 1,233 cases there were only 117, or less than 10 per cent, in which tenants were evicted

from agricultural holdings on which there were residents for non-payment of rent, and were not re-admitted in any form by the landlord. It may be useful here to point out that the total of evictions given in the Government Return as having occurred in the first six months of the past year, bears the proportion of seven to every 2,000 of the total number of holdings in Ireland. If, in the remainder of the cases in which information has not yet come to hand, those evictions where the tenant has not been in any way reinstated are found to be in the same ratio as 117 to 1,233 (and there is no reason to suppose that this will not be so, as will be seen from an examination of the figures of those counties for which the information is practically complete), it would then appear that this extreme proceeding was only resorted to in one out of every 3,000 holdings in Ireland. In several counties it will be seen that it was not resorted to in a single instance during the period with which the Return deals."

This was a very important Return, and he commended it to their Lordships' study. It had also been said that there was very little serious crime in Ireland. No doubt that was perfectly true; and he attributed the fact, in a great measure, to the influence of the League, which was used—and whose interest it was—at the present moment to keep down outrages, and to keep down crime. The small number of outrages at the present time was due also, in a great measure, to the fact that the League had so thoroughly established its influence in the country, that there was no longer any resistance to its commands, and, therefore, there was no need to make examples in the country. Another, and the most recent difficulty which had arisen, was owing to the policy of allowing matters to drift in Ireland. He referred to the organization of the Plan of Campaign. He wished to ask the Government how and why it was that, the Plan of Campaign having been published on the 23rd of October, no action had been taken by them either to point out its illegality, or to take any measures for its suppression, until the week before Christmas. During two months this villanous and felonious conspiracy, which had been condemned by the highest Court in Ireland, had been allowed to spread its influence throughout the length and breadth of the land. Another result of that action had been that when Her Majesty's Government did take action, and proceeded against the authors of the Plan of Campaign, justice was brought into contempt by what took place after the decision of the Supreme Court had been given. That decision was practically avoided, for immediately it was given Mr. Dillon and his *confrères* still went about the country preaching the same doctrine. He could imagine nothing more calculated to do injury in Ireland, than the proceedings which had been allowed to take place subsequent to the decision of the High Court of Justice in Ireland in reference to the Plan of Campaign. He contended that, owing to the impossibility of the Court being able to deal with this infringement of its decision by Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Brien, a fair case had been made out for additional legislation; but he could not conceive why the Courts in Dublin did not call Mr. Dillon before them for contempt, because it seemed to him that if ever there was a case in which the Court had been set at defiance, the case of Mr. Dillon was the most notorious. If the inability of the Court to do so was owing to lack of power, then he said it was the duty of the Government to lose no time in bringing immediate additional legislation forward. The other day he had an opportunity of speaking to several legal gentlemen in Dublin, who had taken part in the administration of justice in the South of Ireland. Their opinion was, that the law as regarded the jury system required immediate amendment. The unfortunate Act of the late Lord O'Hagan had done more mischief in Ireland than their Lordships were probably aware of. It was not many years ago that he (Lord Inchiquin) sat upon a Committee appointed by their Lordships to consider the Jury Laws in Ireland, and a great amount of valuable evidence was then accumulated, but no practical action had since been taken upon it. He contended that it was the duty of the Government to make such alterations in the Jury Laws as should make them suitable to the existing condition of the country. Remedial legislation could not take place, and if it did he wished to impress upon their Lordships it would have no effect until it had been made perfectly clear that the laws of the country must and shall be obeyed. He thought they would generally agree with him that the Land Act of 1881 had proved a gigantic failure. He had opposed it at the time, and he felt that what he had said then was to a great extent coming true. There was no one in that House but would allow that dual ownership had proved a complete failure, and the first thing to be done in the way of legislation was to do away with it, and amend the Land Laws in Ireland. There was one way in which that might be done—he meant the extension of the Act of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Ashbourne). If they could so extend it and make it workable, so that it would induce tenants to come forward and purchase their holdings; it might help in great measure to remedy the evils from which the country was now suffering; but, in any case, the system of dual ownership was so intolerable that he felt confident many years would not elapse before it would be necessary to put an end to it. Turning to other remedies, there were certain districts where emigration might be of great advantage, and where he thought it might well be promoted; but his experience in Clare and the Southern Counties of Ireland was that there seemed to be a great indisposition on the part of tenants to remove to another country. Unless inducements, and very considerable ones, were held out; he did not see how they could make emigration practicable. He agreed, however, with what had been said as to the difficulties attending migration, and considered that any general improvement must come from emigration. Nor could he agree with what the Chief Secretary for Ireland said the other night on the subject of migration. It was very well to talk of those things; but they did not seem to be practicable, and there were many things to prevent their being carried out. The system of taking people, generally paupers, from a congested district and moving them to large grass farms, seemed rather to injure than improve the country, because it was, after all, these large farms that were really the mainstay of the country. They wanted to get rid of the small impoverished holdings, the state of which was such that, even if the people had to pay no rent, they would still starve. Again, however, he must say that if the Union was to be maintained—and he was one of those who earnestly trusted, and sincerely believed it would be maintained—the only way by which it could be done was by keeping and resolutely maintaining law and order in Ireland. He would conclude by reading some words, uttered by Mr. Gladstone in his speech at the Mansion House in October, 1881. When announcing Mr. Parnell's arrest he said—

> "That he had made himself beyond all others prominent in the attempt to destroy the authority of the law, and to substitute what would end in being nothing more or less than anarchical oppression exercised on the people of Ireland."

He (Lord Inchiquin) maintained that that prophecy had been fulfilled, and that it was the bounden duty of the Government to take immediate steps to deal with that oppression. He appealed to their Lordships to support the Government, and would also appeal to the Government themselves, as well as that great nation which so unmistakably pronounced at the late Election against Home Rule, to say, whether it was not now time that these treasonable conspiracies should be put down, when law and order should be restored in Ireland, when every member of the community, however humble, should be permitted to pursue his avocations without fear and trembling, and when Moonlighting and murder should be banished from the land.

Lord BRABOURNE said, that he was sorry the noble Lord (Lord Inchiquin) should have thought it necessary at the present moment to introduce this subject, because either they had, or had not, confidence in Her Majesty's Ministers. If they had not confidence, the proper thing unquestionably was to question their action or inaction by a definite Motion of Censure; but if they had confidence in them—and he, for one, was free to say that his confidence was not yet exhausted—[*Laughter*]—he could quite understand the amusement of noble Lords opposite, and how they wondered anybody could have confidence in any Government, after the experience of Government which they had exhibited—and he thought it was most desirable that if they had that confidence, they should allow the Government to choose their own time and opportunity to tell the House and the country whether they wished for further legislation upon Irish affairs, and the extent and nature of the legislation required. Nevertheless, as the subject had been brought forward, he wished to impress upon the Government and their Lordships that the crisis before them was one of no ordinary character. They were face to face with principles and projects which were utterly hostile at once to the spirit of the Constitution and the authority of the Crown. It was all very well for the supporters of the scheme of the late Government to tell them that Irishmen in common with themselves were anxious for a union of heart and soul between the people of Great Britain and of Ireland. He noticed that these declarations were always made by eminent persons immediately before some contested Election in this country, and he perfectly believed in their sincerity; but it was not to the opinion of those Gentlemen the country would look, it was rather to the language and action of the Leaders of the Nationalist Party in Ireland, to whom the late Government would have handed over the management of Irish affairs, including the settlement of the Land Question, that they must look; and if they found in that language and in their conduct principles of action laid down to which Great Britain never could in honour and in justice consent, he thought they might allow that they had escaped a great danger and might feel doubly thankful for the verdict of the country pronounced at the recent Elections. He had always felt that the principle which alone could justify the Land Act of 1881 was one which involved the repudiation of the title under which most Irish land was held, and which must inevitably land its authors, legitimately and logically, in the position in which Mr. Gladstone and his Friends found themselves that day; and therefore it was that—forfeiting, he feared, in some cases, personal as well as political friendships—he did his utmost to oppose that measure. Now, what was the position to-day? The problem was not one of amending a faulty Land Act, or of improving the relations between landlord and tenant within the scope and in the spirit of Constitutional law; it was a question in the minds of the Leaders of the Nationalist Party of destroying the title by which land was held in Ireland of banishing landlords from the country, and of adopting extravagant and impossible theories as to the rightful possessors of Irish land in future. To show that he was not exaggerating, he would give their Lordships some quotations from Nationalist speakers. Mr. Parnell himself had said—

> "The titles of almost all Irish landlords are founded on robbery and embezzlement."

Mr. Dillon said—

> "The soil of Ireland was the property of the children of Ireland, and not the property of the contemptible, rack-renting, ascendancy landlords, whose fathers had robbed it from their fathers, but from whom they would now take it."

At a great meeting at Dundalk on the 14th of January last a Roman Catholic priest, Father Sheehy, had said that—

> "For 700 years Ireland has been maintaining a combat against England; a struggle which was commenced at the dawn of history for the restoration of the land and property, and was being continued at the present moment by 20,000,000 of the Clan-na-Gael."

Their Lordships would probably be as ignorant as he was of the exact nature and extent of the Clan-na-Gael. There was a population of less than five millions in Ireland, and the number of Irish in Great Britain had been estimated at two millions, of which total number some must be presumed to be loyal, and it would probably not be dedenied that there were women and children among them. But although in the speech referred to there was very probably an exaggeration, but the words were important as showing the spirit of the meeting. Language such as that, and language of the same character all over Ireland, was not that of men who desired a closer union between the heart of Ireland and the heart of England; but of those who wished to defy the Queen and her authority, and indicated the spirit and feeling of men who would take advantage of every stepping-stone towards the end which they had steadily kept in view. He (Lord Brabourne) declared that if they found in that language and in the conduct of these agitators principles of action laid down to which Great Britain could never in honour or justice consent, it would be allowed that in having escaped from the Home Rule scheme of Mr. Gladstone they had escaped a great calamity. He also wished to point out that the agitators in Ireland did not desire the settlement of the Land Question, but the utter destruction of the title upon which land was held in the country.

There were one or two remarks which he wished to make upon the action of the Government, which he thought required some explanation. He was not going to discuss the Plan of Campaign, as men were just about to be tried for their connection with it; but he wished for information from the Government with regard to some matters in connection with it. He saw it was reported in that day's papers that Her Majesty's Government had taken steps to remove a certain Mr. Dunne from the Commission of the Peace in an Irish county for having attended a meeting for the carrying out of the Plan of Campaign. If that was the case, he ventured to think that such consistent action on the part of Her Majesty's Government would command public approval. He had also been informed that Sir Thomas Esmonde, a prominent advocate of the Plan, had been lately appointed High Sheriff of Waterford. Now he found it stated in the newspapers that on the 15th of December last that that gentleman had been engaged in carrying out the Plan of Campaign; and he (Lord Brabourne) wished to know whether that was the case, and whether the Government were aware that that gentleman had openly advocated the Plan of Campaign at Enniscorthy and other places. If it was the case, then he ventured to think that any gentleman who was found to be assisting that which her Majesty's Government had declared to be against the law could not be a fit person to administer the law in his county. He felt certain that he should receive a satisfactory answer to that question. He was told further that this gentleman had appointed as sub-Sheriff a secretary of the National League. If a mistake had been made, he felt certain that Her Majesty's Government would take such action as would sustain their character for consistency, and that they would take steps to put this right. Another question was, that of the appointment of Sub-Commissioners under the Land Act. It was probable that there would soon be a large number of these gentlemen to be appointed to the Irish Land Courts, and that, owing to considerations of health, the position of Chief Commissioner might have to be filled up. He respectfully begged Her Majesty's Government to be particularly cautious in filling up these offices, and that men should not be appointed who had denounced the very existence of landlordism. When Sub-Commissioners had first been appointed he had, in consequence of requests made to him from Ireland, questioned the manner in which these appointments had been made, and for doing so he had been blamed by several noble Lords opposite, and especially by the noble and learned Lord then on the Woolsack. He ventured to doubt whether the present opinions of some of those noble Lords who had then blamed him were identical with those which they had then held as to the merits and qualifications of the persons appointed. It was said that in giving their decisions, the Sub-Commissioners had not taken into consideration the probable fall in prices. To any one who was conversant with land and its management, the idea of fixing rent unalterably for 15 years was somewhat preposterous; but he (Lord Brabourne) thought that no man in his senses, who was in the least fit to be a sub-Commissioner, could have thought of fixing a rent even for a less time than 15 years without taking into consideration the probable fall or rise in prices. With regard to their appointment, he agreed that no man should be made a Sub-Commissioner who was connected directly with land agency or landlordism; but at the same time, as he had before observed, that should not be done which had been done by the last Government—men should not be appointed who had denied the title of the landlords to the land at all. He did not intend going into other questions relating to Ireland. Previous to, and at, the late General Election, many of them had used their utmost efforts to place before the country the real issues which were at stake with regard to Ireland; and he was not ashamed to say that, within the last year, he had had the honour of addressing many thousands of his fellow-countrymen, and he thought that he knew the policy which the great body of the British people wished to see adopted. He believed that the British people were determined that Ireland was to be and to remain an integral part of the United Kingdom, and that in every part of that country law and order should be maintained and obeyed, and they would not tolerate any weakness in the Executive where weakness would be treason to the country. They were anxious to give to every demand and every grievance put forward by Ireland a kindly and attentive consideration; but they were determined that there should be no paltering in dealing with those who defied the law, and no investing with authority of those who had done their utmost to destroy British authority in Ireland. He was sure that the noble Marquess at the head of the Government (the Marquess of Salisbury) was firm, and he trusted that the Colleagues of the noble Marquess would support him. It was by the exercise of firmness and determination alone, that they would be able to govern Ireland and best to represent the feelings expressed by the people at the last General Election; and at the same time they would earn the affections and fervent gratitude of the whole loyal population, both of Ireland and of Great Britain.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON said, he considered that it was one of the first duties of the Government to make the law respected in Ireland. At the present moment, over a very considerable portion of that country, this was not the case, although he did not agree that the whole of the feeling of the country was against the law. On this, as on former occasions, the Irish people were very easily led and very easily frightened; and he believed that now the law-abiding spirit of the people had been quelled by the more active and more demonstrative of the people. Anyone who had to do with Ireland knew that not only were many evil deeds committed of which the Government never had known and never would know anything, but also that, for reasons of private malice, wrongs and injustice were inflicted upon those who were least able to defend themselves, which, for the safety of those concerned, could not be related in that House. There was a very considerable desire to support the law, if that could be done with safety. The question of juries in Ireland was a very difficult one, and the present system inflicted a great injustice upon an industrious class of the community. Owing to the operation of the Jury Act, men were made jurors who could not discharge the duties with justice to themselves and their families. The second question they had to consider was, what was to be done in the present condition of things? That, however, they must leave the Government to answer. They could only indicate the evil and leave the Government to point out the remedy. Knowing the difficulties with which the Government were surrounded, he would not venture to indicate this or that path to be taken. But of one thing he was persuaded—namely, that it would be absolutely necessary, sooner or later, to deal with the Land Act of 1881, convinced, as he was, of the utter and conspicuous failure of that Act. Speaking of that Act not so much in a political sense as from a social and agricultural point of view, he did not hesitate to say that it was simply monstrous in the present state of agriculture in Ireland, and in face of all the possible changes of climate and seasons, to prescribe for 15 years ahead what the proper rent of land should be. If prices fell—if circumstances over which the tenant had no control turned out so unfavourable for him that he was unable to pay the rent fixed, or perhaps any rent at all, it would be impossible to exact rent from him, in spite of judicial proceedings or of the Sub-Commissioners. He repeated, therefore, that it was absurd to definitely fix the amount of rent to be paid for so many years to come. Another great mistake which had been made in this question was the establishment of dual ownership, a system under which no business could be satisfactorily carried out. The introduction of rail and steam had greatly affected a very large and once important part of agriculture in Ireland by the introduction of cheap produce from America; and the result was that at the present time, over a large part of Ireland, farming on small holdings could not be carried on at a profit, even if the tenants had the land for nothing, and he might add that, in consequence of the use of machinery and other improvements, Irish labourers had been almost improved off the face of the earth. Those changes had been much to the disadvantage of the Irish labourer or small tenant, and had borne with great hardship on large numbers of them. Statesmen would have to deal with this problem before long; and he believed that if men of all parties would unite, would thrust mere Party considerations aside, and endeavour sincerely and patriotically to find a solution of the difficulty, there would be great hope of a satisfactory remedy being found. But he almost despaired of this when he saw the attitude which had been adopted on this question by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville). He (Viscount Midleton) had expected that, as the noble Earl, who had been a Leader in that House for many years, was not afraid in the past to denounce "felonious landlords," he would now show equal courage and denounce "felonious tenants." There need be no misunderstanding as to the object of the Land League. It was plainly put by Mr. Healy in the House of Commons the other night, when he said that they should not rest until landlordism in Ireland had become extinct. The prospect now deliberately placed before the people of Ireland by those who claimed to be their leaders was to obtain possession of the land, not at a fair price, or at no price at all, but at prairie value; and yet the noble Earl opposite had not said a single word or made a single sign against that dishonest proceeding. He could only say that if a person filling the distinguished position of the noble Earl gave no more support to the cause of law and order than he had done this Session with regard to Ireland, any settlement of the question was hopeless.

Earl GRANVILLE: I only wish to ask the noble Viscount when and where I called the landlords "felonious?"

The PRIME MINISTER (The Marquess of Salisbury): It was Lord Clarendon.

Lord DE ROS: My Lords, there is one matter connected with this subject which has hardly been alluded to either in this House or in the other House of Parliament. We have been almost sickened with the heartrending details connected with the evictions which took place at Glenbeigh, and which were mainly attributable to the pernicious doctrines which have been permitted to be sown broadcast without any check throughout Ireland by a set of the most unscrupulous agitators that ever existed. But, My Lords, there are other victims to the same cause—namely, the distressed Irish ladies, who have suffered most acutely from the non-payment of rents, jointures, charges, &c. Most of these unfortunate ladies have been accustomed to the ordinary domestic comforts of civilized life, consequently their condition is most distressing. I have a list of some of the many cases, which can be thoroughly authenticated; but I will only trouble the House with reading one—

> "Blind old lady, now getting childish, and requiring constant care: no rents paid. Her only daughter has taken a situation to try to earn enough to keep her out of the workhouse for the few remaining weeks of her life. Their separation is very sad, and the daughters feel it keenly."

I do not think that any further comment is necessary on my part, except that what I have ventured to say tends to prove that some further legislation is necessary in order to prevent the terrible state of intimidation and disorder which at present prevails in Ireland.

The LORD PRIVY SEAL (Earl Cadogan) said, the noble Lord who had opened the discussion (Lord Inchiquin) and the noble Lord who had followed him (Lord Brabourne) both informed the House that Irish affairs were in a state of unprecedented crisis. But whereas the noble Lord who spoke first appeared to think that the action he had taken in suggesting the present discussion was likely to further the ends he had in view, the noble Lord who spoke second seemed to think that a desultory conversation of that sort—not intended to lead to anything—was not calculated in any way to promote those ends, or to strengthen the hands of Her Majesty's Government. He (Earl Cadogan) quite agreed with that. It was not astonishing that the noble Lord (Lord Inchiquin) had spoken strongly on the subject, because he occupied the exalted position of Lord Lieutenant in a county which could only be characterized as one of the worst with which the Government had to deal with in the whole of Ireland. There was in that speech much with which he (Earl Cadogan) sympathized, and with which he even agreed, and much with which he did not agree, and it was impossible to complain of the action the noble Lord had taken; but he (Earl Cadogan) was afraid that the answer which it was his duty to give on the part of the Government would not be entirely satisfactory to the noble Lord. This debate afforded an illustration—if any were needed—of the extreme difficulty any Government must find in meeting the expectations and the wishes of Members of all political Parties with reference to the government of Ireland. Her Majesty's Government had spent the whole of last week in defending themselves against the attacks of those who deprecated the use of what they were pleased to call coercive legislation, which was, in other words, the proper and due enforcement of law and order. Then, at the commencement of this week, the Government were called upon to face a Notice like that of his noble Friend, which declared the urgency of further legislation for dealing with the disorder and lawlessness existing in Ireland. He (Earl Cadogan) was not at all sure that this last phase of criticism was not more difficult to meet than the former one. It was easy for the Government to stand before Parliament and announce their intention to obey the mandate of the country, and to enforce, to the best of their ability, law and order; but it was not so easy to explain to their Lordships the various difficulties and embarrassments under which the Government laboured, and the opposition which they had to meet in the discharge of their duties as a Government. His noble Friend had given, with accuracy, the details of the case which occurred, he believed, on January 11. The Sheriff's officer, accompanied by a body of police, arrived to serve a writ, and found chained to the gate—or the door—the worthy priest of the parish. He was not quite sure that in the circumstances so unprecedented and unusual an obstacle might not have deterred even a larger body of men than that which was present. As he understood, the important point in the indictment of his noble Friend was that the law was not vindicated by those to whom the Government deputed its authority. Speaking from memory, he believed it was true that on the first occasion, and at the sight of the obstacle to which he had alluded, the party did retire; but it was also true that on the 28th of the month the eviction was duly carried out by the officers of the law; and, in these circumstances, no blame could be attached to the Government. If there were many cases in which evictions were not carried out at the first attempt, the fault of that did not lie with the Government. The Sheriff might send a notice requiring the presence of a certain number of Constabulary; but, unfortunately, impediments were placed in their way which were of a novel and varying nature, and it had been found that the Sheriff had not invariably informed the officers of the law of the new weapons which it would be necessary to use in order to effect an entrance into the dwellings. This really accounted, in many cases, for the temporary miscarriage of justice which had been complained of. Then, the complaints of the alleged delay on the part of the Government in dealing with the Plan of Campaign were entirely uncalled for. The best answer that could be made was to give the dates of the various occurrences in connection with the prosecution. He would remind their Lordships that the Plan of Campaign was published in the newspaper called *United Ireland* on 23rd October, 1886. It was impossible for anyone to contend that it would have been either wise or prudent or desirable for the Government to take steps at once against a newspaper, or against any person employed in the simple publication of a sketch of that Plan of Campaign in that newspaper. It was not until there were overt acts, which afforded clear evidence of the existence of a conspiracy and signs that the Plan of Campaign would be largely and widely adopted that the Government felt that they were empowered to act. On the first publication of the Plan of Campaign it appeared to fall very flat; and 14 days elapsed before the Government were officially informed of any action that had been taken upon it. The first speech of any importance made by Mr. Dillon was delivered on November 7—a Sunday—and it was an unfortunate peculiarity of Ireland that proceedings of a turbulent and unfriendly character occurred on the Sabbath. A second speech, of a still more violent character, was made by Mr. Dillon on November 21. He (Earl Cadogan) had inquired why no action was taken between those dates, and he found that it would have taken 27 days after the delivery of the first speech before Mr. Dillon could have been indicted if proceedings had been taken at once. It was too late for the Winter Assizes, as the list of prisoners for trial was returnable on December 1; therefore it was obvious that any action taken at that time must have been too late for the Winter Assizes. In order, therefore, to obtain an authoritative pronouncement on the actual state of the law—which otherwise could not have been obtained until February—proceedings were taken against Mr. Dillon in the Court of Queen's Bench on November 25. He appeared on December 1, and the case was adjourned for 10 days at the instance of Mr. Dillon himself through his counsel. The Court gave judgment on December 14, and Mr. Dillon was bound over. The proceedings that had taken place since then were those of an ordinary criminal trial. Application was made to a police magistrate on a sworn information against Mr. Dillon, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Harris, and Mr. Redmond, who were charged with conspiracy. The magistrates returned them for trial. A bill of indictment was sent up to the Grand Jury of the county at the ordinary Commission for the County of Dublin, and a true bill was found in the ordinary way. He thanked his noble Friend for giving him the opportunity to state the actual facts, and the dates with which they were connected; they were of the utmost importance, and deserved the careful consideration of the noble Lord. As to the appointment of Sir Thomas Esmonde to the office of High Sheriff of Waterford, he (Earl Cadogan) was sorry he was not able to give the information that was asked for. If Notice were given of a Question he might be able to answer it. But the name of Sir Thomas Esmonde stood first on the list returned by the Judges, and the Lord Chancellor appointed him upon that recommendation. If the facts were as they had been stated by the noble Lord, and if Sir Thomas Esmonde had violated the law and had done that which was illegal, he would, no doubt, be dealt with by Her Majesty's Government. As to the alleged urgency of further legislation for dealing with disorder and lawlessness, he would give a few official figures bearing upon the state of Ireland which did not seem to bear out the statement of his noble Friend that it was going rapidly from bad to worse. He was quite aware that in those matters statistics were, to a certain extent, fallacious. It was quite possible that there might be an amount of crime which was not reported officially, and it was also possible that the action of the National League might have the effect of diminishing the list of offences which were officially reported to the Government. The figures he would quote related to agrarian offences in all Ireland; and included in these were offences against the person, offences against property, offences against the public peace, and threatening letters. The periods covered by the figures were the last six months of 1885, the first six months of 1886, and the last six months of 1886; and the figures were as follow:—First six months, 232 threatening letters, 311 other offences—total, 543. Second six months, 239 threatening letters, 314 other offences—total, 553. Third six months, 179 threatening letters, 293 other offences—total, 472. He (Earl Cadogan), therefore, could not agree with his noble Friend that things were going from bad to worse. There was an improvement in Kerry, where, in the last six months of 1885, the threatening letters were 55, and other offences 65—total, 120; as compared with 25 threatening letters and 50 other offences—total, 75—in the last six months of 1886. Again, in Clare, another disturbed county, with which his noble Friend was connected, there was a slight decrease of offences. The figures were:—In the last six months of 1885, 67; in the first six months of 1886, 70; and in the last six months of the year, 65; showing a falling-off even in that disturbed locality. So much for the state of disorder and lawlessness in Ireland. He did not wish it to be understood for a moment, in speaking of law and order in Ireland, that the Government closed their eyes, and did not realize the serious aspect of affairs owing to the very large amount of crime they had to deplore in Ireland; but when his noble Friend asked them to act at once, to legislate even to the extent of altering the Jury Acts and other enactments, he could only refer him to the pledges which were given in the Gracious Speech from the Throne. His noble Friend would find in that Speech that the dangerous state of affairs in Ireland was recognized, and that the policy which the Government intended to pursue was pretty clearly foreshadowed. He might remind his noble Friend that the Speech informed them that the efforts of the Government to enforce the law had been seriously impeded, and that proposals would be made for a reform of legal procedure, with a view to render more efficient the administration of the Criminal Law in Ireland. Since that Speech was delivered, his noble Friend might, no doubt, reply that a considerable time had elapsed, and no scheme was forthcoming; but if there was any reason for the impatience of his noble Friend, it certainly was not to be found in that House, or even with the Government, who were anxious to press on with legislation. He could only say that in the meantime, and until the condition of Business in the other House enabled Her Majesty's Government to produce their measures for the simplification of the law and the preservation of law and order in Ireland, they were enforcing, and would continue to enforce, the law to the utmost of their power. He fully admitted that the powers which the Government at present possessed were not adequate for the proper fulfilment of their duties; but the remedy for that lay with the other House, and was a matter which, he hoped, would not be delayed much longer. He did not know that he could add anything to what he had said. He thought he might appeal to noble Lords opposite. He (Earl Cadogan) hoped that in their arduous and difficult position the Government would have the assistance of noble Lords opposite in dealing with the unhappy features that still existed in Ireland. The plan proposed by noble Lords opposite had been rejected in Parliament and by the country. Until the noble Lords had some other proposal with which to supplement those so emphatically rejected, they ought to give their assistance, or, at any rate, he hoped they would not join with those of their Friends who gave their support to men whose sole object was the embarrassment of the Government. His noble Friend was quite correct when he stated that the question of the land was the great question in Ireland. In dealing with that question it would be necessary—and he expressed merely his own personal opinion—to abolish that dual ownership which was the baneful effect of the legislation of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone). He thought they must look to the settlement of the Land Question and to the encouragement of industry, trade, and manufactures in Ireland. To both of these important questions the attention of the Government had been directed, and Royal Commissions had been appointed, upon whose Reports he trusted it would be possible to found valuable legislation, which would have a lasting effect on the prosperity of the country. But until the time came when it would be possible to examine into questions of that sort, it would be their anxious duty to maintain law and order in Ireland. To that duty all their best efforts would be directed, and in the discharge of that duty they hoped for the assistance of noble Lords on both sides of the House.

LORD FITZGERALD said, he admitted the obligation of Her Majesty's Government to maintain law and order in Ireland; and it was his desire to assist the Government in doing so fully, and in making whatever amendment of the law was necessary to that end. He had heard with pleasure the statement of the noble Earl (Earl Cadogan) that the attention of the Government was directed to the Land Question and to the promotion of industrial employment in Ireland. It had already been pointed out in that House in very forcible language that the real question which must be settled in Ireland was the Land Question. That was what the people were eager for. He did not wish to call upon the Government to state their proposals on the question at present, as he did not think it would be reasonable to do so until the Royal Commission had sent in its Report. The noble Earl had also spoken of promoting industry in Ireland. He (Lord Fitzgerald) believed a great deal might be done in the direction of increasing industries in Ireland. There was a large debt due to Ireland in this matter, England having for many years—from 1690 to 1782—through her whole course of legislation, sought to repress manufactures and industries in Ireland. He did not agree with the condemnation of the Land Act of 1881. No doubt, that Act worked a great deal of hardship, and amounted in some instances to confiscation of property; but he thought its benefits far exceeded the injuries it inflicted, so far as it inflicted injuries. He had always been anxious to assist in giving compensation to those who lost by that Act; but there was one principle in it alone to which he attributed so high a value that he would not part with it unless upon the most powerful and persuasive argument, and that principle was the principle of the fixity and security of tenure. Formerly the position of the Irish tenant was that of a mere serf, a mere tenant-at-will—he was without security, and was liable to be turned out by notice to quit at the mere whim of the landlord. No doubt the Act of 1881 required considerable amendment—extension in some directions and amendment in others—and in this he (Lord Fitzgerald) was willing to give his humble assistance whenever the subject came before their Lordships' House; but he could not concur in unqualified condemnation of the Act of 1881. With regard to the case of Sir Thomas Esmonde, it was about two and a-half years ago since his name had been recommended. He did not know whether there was any objection to him. The appointment of Sheriff rested with the Government entirely, and if the Sheriff was guilty of misconduct or illegality, it was the duty of the Government to supersede him. He did not know anything at all about Sir Thomas Esmonde—he did not know whether he had been guilty of any misconduct or illegality; but if he had been, it was open to the Government to supersede him. He (Lord Fitzgerald) wished to point out to the House thas the system of violence and intimidation referred to as the Plan of Campaign had been going on to his knowledge for more than 40 years. He had in his hands a statement made by one of the wisest Irishmen about 40 years ago which he would quote to their Lordships. Chief Justice Blackburne, in 1848, in addressing the Grand Jury of one of the Southern Counties, thus expressed himself—

> "It further appears that the principal object of this confederation is the destruction of the rights of landlords. Fraud, violence, and intimidation are resorted to, and even murder itself is perpetrated, to impede them in the execution of their legal rights and remedies. I hesitate not to say that if these designs be not frustrated the necessary effect must be that the occupiers of land must become its proprietors."

The noble Lord (Lord Inchiquin) had called upon the Government to take active steps to rehabilitate authority and maintain the law in Ireland. In

that he entirely concurred with him; and that, he gathered from the Speech from the Throne and from the declaration of the noble Earl who spoke on behalf of the Government, it was their intention to do. It was essentially necessary that the dignity of the law should be restored, and that justice should be duly, fairly, and firmly administered. The importance of that being done could hardly be exaggerated. For the last six years there had been going on in Ireland a determined conspiracy to bring the law into contempt and to bring the Judges into direspect and clothe them with calumny, and to usurp the province of the law and to defy its execution by the Queen's Government. So far back as 1880, when addressing the Grand Jury of Cork, the proceedings which he then saw going on, and every day since, had satisfied him that he was right, and that it was then, as it was now, a determined conspiracy to usurp the functions of the law, and for that purpose to throw every obloquy upon the administrators of the law. His noble Friend had referred to the recent proceedings in the Court of Queen's Bench in Ireland to compel certain persons to give security that they would be of good behaviour, and to the judgment that was pronounced on that occasion. The Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench were upright, honest, and fearless men, who were determined to do their duty and to administer the law, not against the people, but for them. For giving their decision the Judges had been thus assailed by a speaker at a meeting—

> "The Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench in this country are not like English Judges. They are not independent men; they do not sit upon the Bench to do even justice between the Crown and other men, the subjects of Her Majesty, in a political case. No; they go to the Castle, and take their orders and give judgment according to what the Castle officials order them to give. They say that the Plan of Campaign is illegal, and so say their Judges."

That was only a single specimen of the vituperation, obloquy, and calumny with which Irish Judges were assailed. That language was published in newspapers which circulated largely among the Irish people, and which were possibly the only means of information that many of them had; and thus the law was brought into open contempt, and ignorant people were led to believe that it was not honestly and impartially administered.

Such a state of things should be met by a steady maintenance of the law, and the firm administration of justice to the parties who ventured to circulate such calumnies as those to which he had alluded. With respect to the condition of land in Ireland, he desired to point out how untrue it was to say that Irish land was at present of no value; he knew the case of a farm, the tenant's interest in which was recently sold in a Metropolitan county for £8,000, at a rent of £496 a-year, being 300 acres in extent. Referring to crime in Ireland, he would quote the account of some recent Moonlighting outrages in the neighbourhood of Millstreet. Among other houses entered by the raiders was the dwelling of a farmer named Murphy, and the report stated—

> "Murphy, though a member of the National League, does not take an active part in promoting the objects of the organization. He had two daughters, named Albina and Mary. When the Moonlighters entered the premises Murphy was called on to bring forward his daughter Albina. A friend of Murphy's, who was sojourning with him, remonstrated with the armed party for their violence towards a man who had never broken the rules of the National League. While he was doing so a shot was fired, the bullet lodging in the wall. Two of the Moonlighters then entered Albina's bedroom, seized her violently, forced her on her knees, and held her in that position while another of the ruffians cut off her hair with shears, and then poured upon her head a quantity of tar. They then entered the second daughter's bedroom, and treated her as they had her sister."

The ruffians then proceeded to commit other outrages of a like description, which he could only characterize as savage and brutal, and a disgrace to the country in which they occurred. There was great difficulty in punishing such offences, because, although the law itself might be sufficient, they could not get evidence. People would not come forward and tell what had taken place because of the system of terrorism which prevailed. In alluding to the contemplated reform of criminal procedure, he (Lord Fitzgerald), would observe that that reform was at present the law in Scotland. The magistrates should be empowered to make any inquiry into the crimes that had been committed, although no accused persons had been charged before them. It was owing to the existence of that power under the Crimes Act that the murderers of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke had been discovered.

PROBATION OF FIRST OFFENDERS (NO. 2) BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to permit the conditional release of first offenders upon probation of good conduct in certain cases—Was *presented* by The Earl of Eme; read 1ª. (No. 20.)

House adjourned at Seven o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter
past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 14*th February*, 1887.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* Burnley, *v.* Peter Rylands, esquire, deceased.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Metropolis Management Acts Amendment (No. 2)* [166]: Allotments and Cottage Gardens Compensation * [167].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

BELFAST MAIN DRAINAGE BILL.

(*By Order.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order for the Third Reading be taken into consideration To-morrow." —(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

MR. EWART (Belfast, N.): Upon the Question that the Order for the third reading of this Bill be postponed until to-morrow, I wish to say that an arrangement has been come to with the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton), who has given Notice of his intention to oppose the Bill, that he and his Friends propose to avail themselves of the opportunity to express their opinions upon the measure to-morrow; but that they do not intend to put the House to the trouble of dividing upon it.

Motion *agreed to.*

Third Reading *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

QUESTIONS.

—o—

EVICTIONS (IRELAND)—CONDUCT OF THE CONSTABULARY, COUNTY LIMERICK.

Mr. FINUCANE (Limerick, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether at the eviction of Mr. Edmond O'Grady, of Ballybrood, County Limerick, towards the end of last month, a body of Constabulary under the command of Captain Plunkett, R.M., attacked without previous notice a crowd of people, wounding many seriously; whether the attack took place in a field leading to the house about to be evicted, before the eviction took place, and when the people were perfectly quiet; whether Mr. Joseph Ryan, a respectable farmer from Herbertstown, received three dangerous wounds on the head, and, accompanied by Rev. M. Ryan, demanded from Captain Plunkett an opportunity of identifying the policeman who struck him, with a view to a criminal prosecution; and, whether Captain Plunkett refused; and, if so, will the Government order an investigation into his conduct?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): On the occasion of the eviction mentioned a very determined and obstinate resistance was offered to the execution of Her Majesty's writ. In approaching the house the Sheriff and his assistants encountered various obstacles which had been placed in their way, and they were met by a large and disorderly mob, who shouted and groaned, and threw mud at the bailiffs. Captain Plunkett called upon this unlawful assembly to disperse. They refused, and thereupon he ordered a party of police, armed with batons only, to disperse them. This was done, and the eviction was then carried out. I am not aware whether a Mr. Ryan was seriously injured while the mob was being dispersed. Two of the Sheriff's bailiffs were severely wounded by the tenant and his friends. It is true that a request was made to Captain Plunkett to parade the police for identification; but as the men were at the time actually engaged in protecting the Sheriff, this request, of course, could not be complied with. I think Captain Plunkett did his duty, under very difficult circumstances.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. Finucane,

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, the party was a small party. They were engaged in protecting the officers of the Crown.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—ACHILL PETTY SESSIONS—IMPORTATION OF ILLICIT WHISKEY BY COASTGUARDS.

Mr. COX (Clare, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether three convictions have been recorded within the last month at Achill Petty Sessions against policemen, one being a wanton assault committed by Sub-constable Conalty on a boatman named John Patten for refusing to bring him illicit whiskey (poteen); and, whether information has reached him that many of the coastguards in the Island of Achill are in the habit of procuring illicit whiskey, through Neil Gallagher Dagort and others, and encouraging into the Island the importation of illicit whiskey, to the detriment and demoralization of the inhabitants; and, if so, will the Government grant an inquiry into the matter?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): Reference to the Island of Achill had to be made in this case, and the reply has not yet come to hand.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS—JOHN KAVANAGH, CO. WEXFORD.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is a fact that a labourer on the Brooke estate, in County Wexford, named John Kavanagh, applied for a cottage, some time since, under the Labourers' Act; if his application was allowed by the local Board of Guardians, and confirmed by the Local Government Board; if, since then, the agent, Mr. Hamilton, has been continually appealing to the Privy Council to prevent the scheme being carried into effect; if, meanwhile, Kavanagh lives in a ditch, and his children sleep in the open air; and, if there is any likelihood of his soon getting the cottage?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The Local Government Board inform me that the scheme for labourers' cottages in the Gorey Union fell through in consequence of informalities in the preliminary proceedings of the Guardians. The Guardians then republished their scheme, and the Local Government Board will take it up again as soon as the services of an Inspector are available. It is not the fact that Mr. Hamilton has been continually appealing to the Privy Council to prevent the scheme from being carried out. The matter has not yet reached the stage at which such an appeal could be made.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM — CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether he is aware that it is commonly alleged that Crown Solicitors in Ireland, when a jury has disagreed in any criminal case of a particular character, cause inquiries to be made to ascertain the names of the jurors in favour of an acquittal, and afterwards exclude such jurors from serving on criminal trials by ordering them to stand by; and, whether he will cause a public inquiry to be instituted in the matter, with a view to ascertaining the truth of such allegations?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): I never heard of the allegation referred to by the hon. Gentleman in his Question.

MR. MAURICE HEALY: Would the right hon. and learned Gentleman cause inquiries to be made to ascertain the truth of the statement?

[No reply.]

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether there is any reason why, having regard to the public interest excited by the matter, Crown Solicitors should not be directed to keep a record of the number and names of jurors ordered by them to stand by on criminal trials in Ireland; whether any check at present exists on the possible abuse of this power by Crown Solicitors; whether any means exist by which these gentlemen, in the absence of any record, can accurately answer official inquiries which may subsequently be made; whether there is anything in connection with the exercise of this power which the Crown consider it expedient to keep secret; and, whether, if not, he will issue instructions to Crown Solicitors to keep such a record of jurors ordered to stand by as may afterwards be available for reference?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): This Question relates to a legal matter on which my opinion is not very valuable, nor is it my duty to give instructions. But, as the hon. Member asks for my opinion, I may say that there exists already the best possible check on any abuse of this power in the publicity under which it is exercised. It is exercised in open Court, and anyone can, therefore, at once ascertain all that occurs in any particular case.

ARMY—PURCHASE OF HORSES FOR ARMY PURPOSES.

SIR WILLIAM CROSSMAN (Portsmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether arrangements can be made for fixed annual visits to central places in various counties by the officers employed in purchasing horses for Army purposes; if so, whether notice of such visits could be given continuously, from year to year, in the local newspapers, together with full information as to the stamp of horses required, and the price that will be given for them; whether, whenever the Royal or other Agricultural Society holds a meeting, as was held at Newcastle a short time ago for a show of stallions, in order to encourage farmers to breed horses for Army purposes, arrangements can be made to insure purchasing officers visiting such districts four years afterwards?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Under the present system, by which officers commanding regiments are responsible for the purchase of the horses required by their regiments, there would probably be serious difficulties in carrying out the proposals of the hon. and gallant Member; but the suggestion is one of great importance, and I will consider to what extent it could be adopted.

THE PARKS (METROPOLIS)—THE EXPENDITURE.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) asked the First Commissioner of Works, What was the amount paid by the Treasury for the purchase and laying out of

Kennington Park; of Victoria Park; of Bethnal Green Gardens; of Battersea Park, and of the Battersea Estate; of the Westminster Bridge Estate, and of the erection of the Bridge; what was the amount paid by the Treasury for the purchase of Brompton Cemetery, and from what the annual income of £5,500 is derived; what was the cost to the Treasury of the Orange Street Waterworks, and what is the annual cost to the Treasury of their maintenance; and, why Trafalgar Square is not included in the Schedule of the Public Parks and Works (Metropolis) Bill?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): I am informed that the site of Kennington Park was transferred by the Duchy of Cornwall to the Commissioners of Works without payment. The cost to the Treasury of laying it out was about £5,000. The cost of the purchase and laying out of Victoria Park (about £133,000) was met out of funds provided from the land revenue of the Crown. The site of Bethnal Green Gardens was presented by the inhabitants; the cost of laying-out (about £1,500) was borne by the Treasury. The total cost of Battersea Park and Estate has amounted to £350,000, of which about £105,000 was voted by Parliament, £200,000 was borrowed, and £45,000 was applied from proceeds of sales and rents. Of the amount borrowed, £100,000 has been repaid from the last-mentioned source. The Westminster Bridge Estate was not purchased, but was transferred to the Commissioners of Works to meet the cost of erecting a new bridge. That work involved a total outlay of £552,000—including the expenditure on approaches, £133,000. Of the £552,000, £407,000 was provided from Votes of Parliament, and the remainder from the proceeds of sales of part of the estate. The Brompton Cemetery cost the Treasury £77,000; the annual income is derived from the sale of grants of rights of interment, and from fees on interments. The capital expenditure from Votes of Parliament on Orange Street Waterworks has amounted to nearly £36,000. The net annual cost of maintenance has amounted, on the average of the last three years, to nearly £1,800. As to Trafalgar Square, I am not aware that it has ever been proposed to transfer it, and should like to consider the subject further. The charge for its maintenance is not large—about £250 a-year—besides the cost of providing water for the fountains.

ADMIRALTY — APPOINTMENTS — THE DIRECTOR OF DOCKYARDS.

SIR WILLIAM PLOWDEN (Wolverhampton, W.) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Which of the appointments specified last year for the assistance of the Director of Dockyards in the economical performance of works have been filled up; how many of those appointments have still to be made; and, what is the cause of delay in completing the staff of the Director of Dockyards essential for the economical performance of his duties?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): Of the appointments specified last year for the assistance of the Director of Dockyards, one constructor, one assistant constructor, and one engineer assistant have been filled up. This leaves four more appointments to be made if the original scheme is adhered to; but it is probable that, with the experience gained during the past year, some modification may be advantageously made.

IRELAND—MR. F. DEVERELL, COUNTY SURVEYOR OF CAVAN.

MR. P. O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Mr. F. Deverell, County Surveyor of Cavan, has applied for permission to retire on a pension; if so, what is the amount of the pension; and, how long has he been in the service of the county of Cavan?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): No application has been received by the Irish Government from Mr. Deverell for permission to retire on pension. Mr. Deverell has been 15 years in the service of the County of Cavan as County Surveyor.

ADMIRALTY — DR. ALLAN SHONE, CHAPLAIN, R.N.

MR. P. O'BRIEN (Monaghan, N.) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Under what circumstances is Dr. Allen Shone, Chaplain, Royal Navy, permitted to wear a medal for services in the Baltic?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): Dr. Allen Shone is entitled to wear the medal for services in South Africa and Egypt.

CHARITABLE DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS (IRELAND)—THE EATON BEQUEST.

MR. W. J. CORBET (Wicklow, E.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether any steps have yet been taken to make the Eaton Bequest available for the purpose intended by the testatrix —namely, the establishment of a woollen factory in Wicklow?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): Steps are being taken to have a judicial decision as to how the Eaton Bequest ought to be applied. The delay hitherto has arisen largely from the difficulty in raising a personal representative to Miss Eaton, who died nearly 100 years ago; but this difficulty has been at length overcome, and I trust that there will now be no obstacle to proceeding with expedition.

NAVY—RE-TESTING OF CUTLASSES.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether his attention has been called to the reply given in the House of Commons by his Predecessor in Office, on February 26th, 1886, to a Question regarding the re-testing of Navy cutlasses, in which he stated that in the preceding year 50 cutlasses were taken at random from store, and subjected to a severe test with satisfactory results, and promised—

> "That the whole should be re-tested as soon as the testing of the bayonets was completed;"

and, how many cutlasses have been re-tested in accordance with that promise; and, with what results?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): The re-testing of triangular and sword bayonets was not completed till late in the autumn, when the re-testing of cutlasses and cutlass sword bayonets was commenced. Up to the present time 4,398 cutlasses have been re-tested, and 2,608 have been passed; 1,426 cutlass sword bayonets have been re-tested, and 1,287 passed. The re-testing is now proceeding at the rate of 1,000 weapons per week.

In reply to Colonel EYRE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough),

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said, he could not give the names of all the Gentlemen who were to form the Committee to inquire into the question of the defective cutlasses supplied to Her Majesty's ships; but he would give those which had been decided upon. They were—Sir H. Hussey Vivian, M.P. (Chairman), Colonel Duncan, M.P., R.A., Mr. J. Ruston (late Member for Lincoln), Captain the Hon. Thomas Brand, R.N., and Colonel Wood, late 10th Hussars.

ARMS (IRELAND) ACT—MR. JAMES O'MAHONEY.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If a respectable farmer named James O'Mahoney has been refused a licence to carry fire-arms by Mr. Warburton, R.M., Bantry; and, whether Mr. Warburton, when applied to by farmers in the Bantry District for licences to carry fire-arms, usually demands a certificate from two local magistrates; and, if so, will Mr. Warburton be informed that the Law requiring such a certificate has been repealed?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): This Question, and No. 15, also standing in the name of the hon. Member, necessitated inquiries in the localities mentioned, and there has not been time for the replies to come to hand.

REFUGE AND LIFE HARBOURS—APPROPRIATION OF PUBLIC MONEY.

ADMIRAL MAYNE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether Her Majesty's Government is prepared to give practical effect to any of the recommendations or suggestions of the various Commissions or Committees, by appropriations of public money for the construction or improvement of Refuge and Life Harbours in those places where, though it is manifestly impossible to borrow money, great saving of life and property would result from the existence of such harbours?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I regret that I can only refer the hon. and gallant Gentleman to the reply which I recently gave to the hon. Member for North Somerset (Mr. Llewellyn), and stated that the Board of Trade do not see their way at present to give effect to any such recommendations or suggestions as those named, though they fully recognize their importance. Communications on this subject are passing between the Department and the Treasury.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—POSTAL ACCOMMODATION AT NEWRY.

Mr. M'CARTAN (Down, S.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether he is aware that the limited mail train between Dublin and Belfast does not stop at Newry, although it is the largest town and the only Parliamentary borough between the terminal station; that application has lately been made to the Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland to stop the train at either Bessbrook or Gorah Wood for the accommodation of Newry, but that the Company replied this would require five minutes additional time from the postal authorities; and, whether he is prepared to grant this, or in any way to arrange with the Railway Company to enable them to meet the wishes of the people of Newry and district?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): The facts are substantially as put by the hon. Member. This question has been before me on several occasions; and the difficulty is that an allowance of five minutes additional time for the running of the train would involve a corresponding curtailment of postal accommodation at Belfast and Derry, and would, to that extent, sacrifice time gained for mail purposes with much difficulty and expense. In the interests of those two important towns it appears feasible to sanction a stoppage of the day mail trains at Gorah Wood or Bessbrook only if the Railway Company would engage to make up, by increased speed, for the time which the stoppage would necessarily occupy.

STATE OF IRELAND—POLICE PROTECTION—DENIS BRENNAN.

Dr. KENNY (Cork, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether a man named Denis Brennan, living near Bantry, County Cork, is under police protection; whether the police escort, whilst on protection duty with Brennan, use his (Brennan's) car for their conveyance; if Brennan is paid car hire for the use of his vehicle whilst so employed in his own protection; and, if so, will the practice of paying him be discontinued; and, if Brennan attended in Bantry a sale of cattle at the suit of "Alexander M'Carthy *v.* Timothy Downing" within the past three months, and received no molestation; and, if so, is a police escort still necessary?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): Brennan was not paid for the use of his car for the purpose stated.

POST OFFICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—DISMISSAL OF FEMALE CLERKS.

Mr. COX (Clare, E.) asked the Postmaster General, If he will state the number of female clerks declared incompetent and dismissed from the General Post Office, London, after six months' probation, also the number dismissed after less than six months' probation, since the clerkships were open to competitive examination in the year 1881; and, how many so declared incompetent received appointments in other branches of the Service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): In answer to the hon. Member, I beg leave to state that the number of female clerks who entered since the clerkships were open to competitive examination in the year 1881, and who were declared incompetent and dismissed from the General Post Office after six months' probation, was 14. The number dismissed after less than six months' probation was one. None of the female clerks declared incompetent received appointments in other branches of the Service.

MERCHANT SHIPPING—THE REGISTER OF SHIPPING—VESSELS MOVED BY TOWING.

Mr. J. C. STEVENSON (South Shields) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether it is the case that the Board, after having, some years ago, removed from the Register of Shipping all vessels which are moved by towing, have recently resolved that such vessels must be registered; whether the owners of such vessels, after having been required at some expense to obtain a "measurement brief," in lieu of a certificate of registry, are now put to a further expense for registration; and, whether such expense is considerably greater in the case of vessels which were formerly on the Register than in the case of vessels previously under a foreign flag?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): It is not the case that the Board have removed from the Register of Shipping all vessels which are moved by towing. Such vessels were not required to be registered at all until recently; but it has now been decided that they must be registered, in order to comply with the law. It is the fact that the owners of unregistered vessels who have obtained a certificate of measurement are charged a small fee of 10*s.* and upwards for survey prior to registration. The hon. Member, however, is perhaps under a misapprehension as to a measurement brief being equal to a certificate of registry. It is not so, although it has been sometimes used for purposes of clearance with the Customs. The expense is greater in the case of vessels which were formerly on the Register than in the case of vessels previously under a foreign flag, inasmuch as the law requires a certificate of seaworthiness in the former case, but not in the latter.

ARMY (ORDNANCE STORE DEPARTMENT)—CLOTHING CONTRACTS.

MR. COGHILL (Newcastle-under-Lyme) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether the whole of the clothing for the Army which is not made up in the Government factory at Pimlico is put up for tender; and, if so, whether there have been any exceptions to this rule during the last 12 months; whether it is a fact that a three years' contract for clothing has been given to a firm in Ireland without tendering, at a higher rate than the articles would have been supplied at by contractors in England under a contract for the same period; whether the Directors of the Limerick Clothing Factory chiefly, if not entirely, consist of officers in the Army or officials in Government employment; and, whether preference is given to this Company over other contractors; and, if so, whether the quality of the work done by them is superior to that done by other contractors?

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.) asked, Whether it was not a fact that the tender of the Limerick Company was lower in price than the other competitors; and, whether the prices were not from 15 to 40 per cent lower than the cost for similar work at Pimlico; and, whether the Government Inspector did not declare the Limerick work to be far superior?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): My answer to the Question will, practically, cover the points raised by the hon. Member (Mr. J. O'Connor). The contracts for making Army clothing are, as a rule, put up to competition. In the competition for 1886 the Auxiliary Forces Company, whose factory is at Limerick, secured an order for over 100,000 garments, and their prices in the aggregate were about £1,600 below those of the next lower competitor. This Company's tender, for the articles for which they have received a three years' contract, had, on the whole, been for three years the lowest received; and, in those circumstances, I felt perfectly justified in awarding them a more lasting contract. A recent competition this year has, however, shown that an English firm are now willing to accept even lower prices. They have received orders for 86,000 garments, and further contracts will shortly be offered for competition. The names of the Directors can be furnished to the hon. Member; but I may say that the only Director of the Limerick Company who is known to hold an official position is an Equerry to the Duke of Cambridge, but not an officer in the Army. The action taken with regard to this Company has been justified by their low prices, which have for years in most articles been the lowest offered. With some exceptions, their work has been as good as, as well as cheaper than, that furnished by other contractors; though I do not wish to draw any invidious distinction as to superiority of work between one firm and another.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR asked if an investigation of the prices of recent tenders had proved that there could be no profit arising out of them?

MR. NORTHCOTE: I am afraid I cannot answer that.

QUARRIES REGULATION—LEGISLATION.

Mr. BROADHURST (Nottingham, W.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill this Session to provide for the inspection and regulation of quarries?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said, the question was now engaging his attention. As he stated on Friday last, he hoped to be able to take an early opportunity of stating the intention of the Government upon the subject.

POST OFFICE—THE TELEGRAPH SERVICE—CASE OF PATRICK WARD.

Mr. MARUM (Kilkenny, N.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is the fact that Mr. Patrick Ward, of Kilkenny, was one of those persons who were, during the pressure that occurred at the date of the transfer of the telegraphs to the State, provisionally placed on duty; that, in 1876, an Act was passed legalizing the position of such of these officers as could be certified as having given satisfaction, and as having conducted themselves properly; that Patrick Ward passed the usual examination in the School of Telegraphy, Dublin, as the Instructor can now testify; that he now holds a certificate in writing, signed by the Controller of the General Post Office, Dublin, testifying that there

> "was, nor is, nothing against Mr. Ward's integrity or his general character;"

that, nevertheless, his services were then dispensed with by a former Postmaster General on the alleged ground that he could not be certified under the Act of 1876; that the officer who held at that time the position of Superintendent of the Telegraph Department, with control of the issue of such certificates, has, since the dismissal of Patrick Ward, been himself dismissed from the Service, for malfeasance in his said office; and, whether, under all the circumstances, he will now take into favourable consideration the case of Patrick Ward, with a view to his re-instatement in the Telegraph Service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Raikes) (Cambridge University): The statements made by the hon. Member respecting Mr. Patrick Ward are generally correct. Mr. Ward's duties were, however, performed in so unsatisfactory a manner that the Postmaster General could not give the necessary certificate required by the Post Office and War Office Act of 1876; and as Mr. Ward's employment could not, therefore, be legalized under that Act, there was no alternative but to dispense with his services. The re-instatement of Mr. Ward would not be of advantage to the Service; and I regret, therefore, that I am unable to hold out any hope that that course could be adopted. The officer who held the position of Superintendent of the Telegraph Department at the time Mr. Ward was discharged has not been dismissed from the Service, but has been pensioned.

COAL MINES REGULATION BILL—EXTENSION TO IRELAND—THE TRUCK SYSTEM.

Mr. MARUM (Kilkenny, N.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is prepared to extend the Coal Mines' Regulation Bill, about to be introduced, to Ireland; whether he is aware that the Acts in force as to Great Britain, in reference to the payment of labourers in goods or by truck, have specifically repealed the Acts which had previously prohibited the truck system in Ireland; that whereas the Agricultural Labourers' Acts (Ireland) do not apply to labourers in mines, although the same are rated for the relief of the poor under the Poor Law Code, the question of their habitations is entirely ignored; whether he is aware of the poor condition of the habitations of the mining population in the anthracite coal district of Castlecomer; and, whether he is prepared to incorporate in his proposed measure provisions to meet the above state of things in Ireland?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): The Bill I am about to introduce will extend to Ireland. I am aware that some of the Truck Acts extending to Ireland have been repealed, and that what is generally known in England as the Truck Act—namely, the Act of *Will.* IV., does not extend to Ireland. There is, however, the 17 *Geo.* c. 8, still in force regulating the question of truck in Ireland. I am informed by the Inspector of Mines that many of the mining population at Castlecomer are in a very poor condition. The questions of workmen's habitations and truck were not dwelt with in the Act of 1872, and it is not my intention to deal with them in the Bill which I am about to introduce. Such questions appear to me to be foreign to a Bill for the regulation of mines.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked when the Report of the Chief Inspector of Mines as to truck would be in the hands of Members?

MR. MATTHEWS: I stated the other day that I should not be able to lay the Report before the House; but that I would show it to the hon. Member.

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—THE CORVEE.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is contemplated to replace the *corvée* by any increase of the Land Tax in Egypt, in view of the fact that the reduction of that tax, proposed by the Earl of Northbrook, and assented to by the Powers, to the amount of £450,000, has not yet been effected; whether, if so, the supplementary tax will be submitted to the Assembly of Notables before it is decreed; and, whether there is any intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government to ask the House to assent to any portion of the Military or Civil Egyptian expenditure being thrown upon the British taxpayer?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): It is not proposed to impose a supplementary tax in lieu of the *corvée*. The intention is that the abolition of forced labour shall be taken as the substitute for a reduction of the Land Tax; that the tax should be kept up to its former figure, except in cases where it was manifestly too high for the taxpayer to pay it; and that £250,000 out of the receipts should be devoted to hiring labour under contract in substitution for the *corvée*. This proposal has received the assent of the Powers in principle. The question of the distribution between this country and Egypt of the past military expenditure in Egypt is still under discussion. With regard to the coming financial year, there is no intention at present to undertake any portion of the Civil Egyptian expenditure. I have already informed the House that the military expenditure falling on this country will be very small, and it is possible that there may be none.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL (Kirkcaldy, &c.) asked whether they were to understand that the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord Randolph Churchill) was entirely in error in saying that something like £500,000 was to be asked for in the Supplementary Estimates in connection with the Egyptian Expedition?

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON replied that the question between this country and Egypt of the distribution of the past military expenditure was still under discussion.

ARMY—THE ROYAL MILITARY ACADEMY, WOOLWICH—IMPROVED ACCOMMODATION.

SIR HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, having regard to the scale of payment required from and made by the Gentlemen Cadets or their friends, he will be so good as to take measures with a view to the provision, without further delay, of those improved accommodation and facilities at the Royal Military Academy, which have been recommended from time to time by the Board of Visitors, including sleeping rooms, hot water for bath rooms, and suitable arrangements for sickness?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Arrangements are in contemplation for shortening the course at the Royal Military Academy. When adopted it will reduce the number of cadets, and the accommodation afforded by the building will then probably be sufficient for their requirements.

CONTRACT FOR CARTRIDGES FOR QUEENSLAND—THE EXPLOSIVES ACT.

MR. DE LISLE (Leicestershire, Mid) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the firm of Messieurs Latimer Clark, Muirhead, and Co., Limited, who have been granted a Government contract for the supply of loaded cartridges, have obtained a licence under the Explosives Act; and, if so, where the licensed area is situated, and the date of the licence?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. STUART-WORTLEY) (Sheffield, Hallam) (who replied) said: No licence under the Explosives Act has been granted to, or applied for, by the firm mentioned in the hon. Member's Question. The firm, have, however, today effected with the Metropolitan Board of Works a registration of their premises at Northumberland Walk, Millwall, under Sections 21 and 39 of the Act of 1875. This registration, and the terms of sections 46 and the Order in Council thereunder, empower them to—(1) store a maximum quantity of 200lb. of powder; (2) load safety cartridges; (3) keep an additional 500lb. of explosives contained in safety cartridges, equivalent to about 41,000 rounds of Martini ammunition.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—DISTRICT INSPECTOR TILLY.

Mr. COX (Clare, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If during the Recess he instituted the personal inquiry and examination of the case of District Inspector Tilly which he promised at the close of the last Session; and, if so, with what result?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): Yes; I have inquired into this matter, and I had a personal interview, of some length, with Mr. Tilly. I satisfied myself that the objection which prevented his promotion—namely, a very serious impediment in his speech, was only too well founded. But Mr. Tilly is a good officer, and it is my intention to bear him in mind and to find employment for him, in which that defect will not impede his usefulness.

MOROCCO—IMPRISONMENT OF THE FREE NEGRO FATTAH.

Mr. A. E. PEASE (York) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is a fact that the free negro Fattah, who had been wrongfully imprisoned as a runaway slave, but who was liberated by order of the Sultan of Morocco last year, owing to the representations of the British and other Ministers at Tangier, has been re-arrested and is now in prison at Tangier; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government will communicate with the British Minister at Tangier with a view to securing his release?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N. E.): It is true that El Fattah has been re-committed to prison. The Moorish authorities have replied to the remonstrances of the British and Portuguese Representatives that, as the Sultan gave direct orders for the arrest, they cannot discuss the question.

AFRICA (EAST COAST)—REVIVAL OF THE SLAVE TRADE.

Mr. A. E. PEASE (York) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is aware that large numbers of slaves are being exported from Tulliar Bay, on the South-West Coast of Madagascar, to Réunion, and that the French traders at Tolia (Tulliar Bay) send commission agents into the interior to purchase slaves, who undergo cruel treatment at the hands of the Bara natives who capture them, and also at Norsi Vey (South-West Madagascar), where they are sent to work in irons, whilst awaiting shipment to Réunion; and, whether he is aware that a British brig, *The Town of Liverpool*, is engaged in this trade, and if any steps are being taken to suppress the traffic by Her Majesty's Government; and, if not, whether he will cause inquiries to be made, with the view of preventing any British vessels from engaging in this trade, and of making such representations to the French Government as may induce them to co-operate in the suppression of this traffic?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir James Fergusson) (Manchester, N.E.): Reports to this effect have been received, as I stated in substance in my reply of the 11th to the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. M'Arthur). Instructions were at once sent to the British Naval Consular and Colonial officers, with a view to the suppression of the traffic, and the co-operation of the French Government was secured. I was in error in stating on Friday that the Vice Consul about to be appointed on the West Coast will have judicial powers; but he will watch and report any irregularities to the Consul and to the Commanders of Her Majesty's ships.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SCOTLAND)—LENZIE PUBLIC SCHOOL.

Mr. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether, in giving their provisional sanction to a scale of school fees in Lenzie Public School (the only public school in Lenzie), of from a minimum of 7*s.* 6*d.* per quarter in the case of infants, to 21*s.* per quarter in Standards V. and VI. (exclusive of the secondary department), the Scotch Education Department took into consideration the ability of the railway servants and working classes of Lenzie to pay the same?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): The functions of the Department in respect of the scale of fees in any State-aided school are confined to ascertaining whether the scale is in accordance with the Scotch Code. It is for the School Board to fix the fee; and I must presume that in doing so they have regard to the class of children for whom the school is intended to provide; but this is a matter as to which I have no independent means of judging.

MR. MUNDELLA (Sheffield, Brightside) asked, whether the Scottish Education Department sanctioned a scheme which raised the scale to 21*s.*; and whether it was consistent with the Code?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not inconsistent with the Code, I believe.

NAVAL CONTRACTS—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

ADMIRAL MAYNE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he has received the Report of the Committee which has been inquiring into the subject of Naval Contracts; and, if so, whether he will have it printed and laid upon the Table of the House?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing), in reply, said, the Report of the Committee had only just been concluded; and he proposed, so soon as the Admiralty had had time to consider it, to lay it upon the Table of the House.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—LAW OF EXTRADITION.

MR. W. G. CAVENDISH-BENTINCK (Penryn and Falmouth) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government has been called to the anomalous state of the Law of Extradition between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and the dissatisfaction felt in both Countries in consequence; and, whether Her Majesty's Government will enter into negotiations for extending the scope of the existing Treaty?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): A Convention between Great Britain and the United States for the purpose of extending the scope of the existing Extradition Treaty was signed on the 25th of June last. This Convention is understood to be now under the consideration of the United States Legislature; but their decision thereon has not reached Her Majesty's Government, who, for their part, are prepared to ratify it.

MINES REGULATION ACT, 1872—EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN AT THE PIT'S BANK.

MR. M'LAREN (Cheshire, Crewe) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, with reference to the deputation of Members of Parliament and Miners' Representatives which waited upon him on 10th February to urge, among other things, that after a certain time, not specified, all women should be forbidden by law to work in connection with mines, even above ground, Whether the deputation admitted that the women who now work at the pit's bank are "thoroughly honest and virtuous," and whether they gave any reason for preventing them working except that the work was "hard and unwomanly;" whether he can state the number of women who are employed at the pit's bank in connection with mines, and if it is not the case that their average health is better than that of seamstresses and of women who work in cotton mills; what steps do the Government propose to take in the matter; and, will he consent to receive a deputation of women who work at the pit's bank, and others, to state their case?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said, that the hon. Member correctly stated the views of the deputation which recently addressed him. He was informed by the Inspector that in 1885 the number of women working on the pit's bank, in connection with mines, was little short of 6,000. The Government did not feel disposed to interfere with the employment of those women, and did not consider the limitation of their numbers necessary. Consequently, he did not consider a deputation from the women necessary, although he would be happy to receive one.

STATISTICS OF TRADE AND LABOUR—LABOUR BUREAUX.

Lord ELCHO (Ipswich) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that in several of the larger towns of England labour bureaux have been successfully started; whether the Government of the day, some time ago, promised to institute a similar Government Office; whether anything came of this promise; and, if so, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Report of the proceedings and work done by the bureau; and, whether, in view of the present depression in trade, Her Majesty's Government can see the way to developing the idea, and to extending the sphere of its usefulness, and by collecting and disseminating information and statistics as to the condition of trade and the labour market, so as to enable capital seeking labour and labour seeking employment to meet?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Board of Trade have no official knowledge respecting the labour bureaux referred to by the noble Lord. As regards the second and third parts of the Question, I would refer the noble Lord to the Parliamentary Paper on Labour Statistics, which was presented to the House of Commons on the 21st of September, and which contains full information as to the arrangements made by the Board of Trade for giving effect to the Resolution of the House on the 2nd of March last. In answer to the latter part of the Question, I can say that the first volume of the statistics is now in the hands of the printers, and that other volumes will, it is hoped, be published during the year.

POLICE (METROPOLIS)—"PRIZE COMPETITION FOR CHILDREN."

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether his attention has been drawn to the following notice which, in the form of a large placard, appears in the windows of the "Pier Tavern," Manchester Road, Poplar—

> "Prize Competition for Children.—All Children bringing jugs or bottles to this house will be presented with a ticket according to the value of the goods supplied, and on Easter Monday the six children presenting the tickets representing the greatest number will receive prizes accordingly;"

whether the above notice does not constitute a direct inducement to children to frequent the public-house, and therefore infringes the provisions of the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Act of last year; and, whether he will consider if any, and what, steps can be taken to stop a practice calculated to lead to widespread demoralization?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) (Isle of Wight): Prior to the Question of the hon. and learned Member my attention had not been drawn to the placard quoted therein. Upon the facts stated, it is not possible to say whether what is complained of constitutes an offence against the Act passed last Session; but I may point out to the hon. and learned Member that his professional experience makes him as competent to form an opinion on the subject as I am. It will be for the magistrates who have to deal with the licence to consider whether such a notice is likely to have the effect suggested in the concluding paragraph of the hon. and learned Gentleman's Question. The matter is not one in which I have any power to interfere.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that the following placard is now being, or has lately been, exhibited in the window of the "Pier Tavern," in Manchester Road, Cubitt Town, Poplar—

> "Prize Competition for Children.—All Children bringing jugs or bottles to this house will be presented with a ticket according to the value of goods supplied, and on Easter Monday the six children presenting the tickets representing the greatest number will receive prizes accordingly;"

and, whether he can take any action to prevent such temptations from being thrown in the way of children?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham E.): My attention has been called to this matter by the Question of the hon. Member, and I at once communicated with the Chief Commissioner of Police, and I am informed that he gave notice immediately to the proprietor of the house that the renewal of his licence would be formally opposed at the Licensing Sessions.

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS—THE CARDIFF BANK.

MR. HOWELL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, the failure of the Cardiff Trustee Savings Bank has resulted in a loss to depositors of over £25,000; whether that bank printed the words "Government Security" on its books, and "Government Savings Bank" on its annual Reports; whether the Government will take steps to prevent other trustee banks from using the name of the Government in a manner calculated to convey the false impression that all deposits in such banks are guaranteed by the State; and, whether he will undertake, on behalf of the Government, that an official inquiry shall be instituted into the circumstances attending and connected with the recent failure of the Cardiff Trustee Savings Bank?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): It is, I regret to say, the fact that the failure of the Cardiff Trustee Savings Bank has involved the loss of upwards of £25,000 to the depositors. I have inquired, but I have not been able to ascertain, whether the words "Government Security" were printed on the books of the bank, and the National Debt Commissioners inform me that the words "Government Savings Bank" were not inserted in any Returns made to the Commissioners. No evidence to that effect has been brought to the notice of the Registrar of Friendly Societies, or of the Commissioners of the National Debt. As to the third Question, the only legal designation of a trustee savings bank is "savings bank certified under the Act of 1863." I am afraid I cannot undertake that an official inquiry shall be instituted into the circumstances stated, as the Savings Bank Acts do not give any special powers to the Government which would make such an inquiry complete and exhaustive.

MR. HOWELL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, having regard to the number of frauds, extent of the defalcations, and the losses to depositors, and also to the number of failures and consequent loss to depositors where no fraud was established, in connection with Trustee Savings Banks, the Government will propose such an alteration in the existing Laws for regulating Trustee Savings Banks as will render the Trustees of such Banks jointly and severally responsible and liable to the depositors for all moneys deposited or invested in the aforesaid Banks under their management?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I am not able to hold out any probability that such proposals as those to which the hon. Member refers will be made to Parliament. It will be borne in mind that wherever a savings bank exists there exists also side by side with it a Post Office Savings Bank, which affords absolute Government security to the depositors. The trustees of savings banks generally are unpaid officers, who give their time and labour, as a rule, with the single desire to benefit their fellows and to encourage thrift; but if the hon. Gentleman will communicate with me privately I will consider any case of fraud or misrepresentation with which he may be acquainted, with the view to adopting any precautions which may be practicable in order to obtain better protection for the depositors in these banks.

MR. HOWELL gave Notice that in consequence of the answers of the right hon. Gentleman to the first Question he would call the attention of the House to the subject at the earliest possible date.

SIR HENRY DRUMMOND WOLFF—EXPENSES OF HIS MISSION.

MR. S. WILLIAMSON (Kilmarnock, &c.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether Her Majesty's Government are considering the propriety of speedily putting an end to the burden on the taxpayers which Sir Henry Drummond Wolff's Mission imposes?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): In answer to the hon. Gentleman, I have to say that Sir Henry Drummond Wolff is engaged in the conduct of delicate and difficult negotiations at Constantinople and at Cairo; and Her Majesty's Government, therefore, have no present intention of terminating his mission.

MR. S. WILLIAMSON: As arising out of the answer I have received to this Question from the First Lord of the

Treasury, I wish to ask whether our accomplished Diplomatic Agents at Constantinople and at Cairo are in the enjoyment of good health, such as to enable them satisfactorily to discharge the duties of their position?

MR. W. H. SMITH: I can assure the hon. Gentleman that our Diplomatic Agents at Constantinople and at Cairo are in the enjoyment of good health, and they are also in the enjoyment of the most complete confidence of Her Majesty's Government. But Sir Henry Drummond Wolff is charged with a special mission and a special duty, which render it necessary that he should represent Her Majesty with respect to them both at Cairo and Constantinople.

MR. S. WILLIAMSON: As arising out of this particular answer, I beg to give Notice that the attention of the Government and the House will be directed to this matter either on the Estimates or on some other occasion.

PURCHASE OF LAND ACT, 1885—AMOUNT OF ADVANCES.

MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, What is the total amount of advance sanctioned up to 31st January, 1887, under "The Purchase of Land Act, 1885;" and, the sum applied for up to the same date respecting which no decision has been arrived at?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): The total amount of advances sanctioned up to January 31, 1887, is £1,849,405. The amount of applications in which investigations were proceeding, but respecting which no decision had been arrived at up to January 31, 1887, is £383,754.

IRELAND — INFLAMMATORY LANGUAGE—MR. W. O'BRIEN'S SPEECH AT WOODFORD, CO. GALWAY.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to a speech made on Sunday last, at Woodford, by Mr. W. O'Brien; and, whether it is true, as stated in that speech, that Lord Dunsandle has agreed to give his tenants a reduction of rent, amounting to 20 per cent, and to re-instate his evicted tenants, and pay all law costs; and, also, whether it is true that Mr. W. O'Brien has stated that he will hand over a handsome cheque to Lord Dunsandle?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I have no knowledge of the subject of the alleged arrangement between Mr. O'Brien and Lord Dunsandle, and I have not seen the report to which the hon. Member alludes; but if that report be correct, it would seem that Mr. W. O'Brien had somehow become possessed of money that did not belong to him.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — THE AMENDMENTS TO THE ADDRESS.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE (Bradford, Central) asked, Whether it was intended to proceed with the Amendment placed on the Paper by the hon. Baronet the Member for the Wells Division of Somerset (Sir Richard Paget)?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): With reference to the Question which the right hon. Gentleman has addressed to my hon. Friend, I wish to make an appeal to him, and, at the same time, to my noble Friend the Member for Wilts (Lord Henry Bruce), who has also given Notice of an Amendment. Although the Government feel with him that the condition of agriculture is one which may well attract the attention of Parliament, it must be obvious to my hon. Friend, and to hon. Members on both sides of the House, that it is impossible for the Government to accept an Amendment; the circumstances of the present time render it quite impossible for them to do so, and at any time no Government could accept such an Amendment. I trust, therefore, that my hon. Friend and my noble Friend will, under the circumstances in which they are placed, consent to withdraw the Amendments of which they have given Notice, reserving to themselves the opportunities which will be afforded to them of raising discussions on the questions—questions which well deserve consideration at the hands of the Government and the House. It is a matter of the very highest importance that the debate on the Address should be concluded with the least possible delay. The House must feel that its time is taken away very rapidly by discussions which stand in the way of the progress of Public Business and in the way of questions in which hon. Members are interested. Therefore, I appeal to both sides of the House to conclude the discussion on the Address with the least possible delay, and enable the House to get to the Business of the Session.

SIR RICHARD PAGET (Somerset, Wells) said, the decision of the right hon. Gentleman placed him in a position of considerable difficulty. He had received assurances from many hon. Members, as well as from persons outside the House, of their approval of his Amendment, as a very strong opinion prevailed that the question of English agriculture was quite as deserving of the attention of the House as that of other parts of the British Isles. While recognizing the force of the appeal of the Leader of the House, he hoped he would not be thought unreasonable or exacting if he asked an assurance that the Government would afford facilities, or, at any rate, give opportunities for the discussion of this important matter, either on Report of the Address or by the grant of a special day.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) desired to know whether he should be right in supposing that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury would raise no objection to a discussion of the question on the Report of the Address? He (Mr. Chaplin) did not see any necessity for any Amendment being moved; but if it were generally understood that the question could be discussed on the Report, he believed hon. Members representing agricultural constituencies would be satisfied, and he had no doubt that the hon. Member would be willing to abstain from moving his Amendment.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON (Essex, Epping), speaking as the Representative of a constituency as strongly interested in this subject as any, joined in the request of the hon. Baronet (Sir Richard Paget) that facilities should be given for a discussion. It was one of the greatest importance and——

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): Mr. Speaker, I rise to Order. Might I ask what is the Question before the House, and whether we can debate this question?

MR. SPEAKER: Debate would certainly be out of Order. The course was that the First Lord of the Treasury made an appeal to the hon. Baronet (Sir Richard Paget); and the hon. Baronet and the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) were giving reasons for a counter-appeal. But the right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt) is right in thinking that no debate is permissible.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Then, Sir, do we understand that on this side of the House we are at liberty to make observations?

MR. SPEAKER: I told the right hon. Gentleman it would not be in Order.

LORD HENRY BRUCE (Wilts, Chippenham), who had on the Paper an Amendment respecting the dwellings of the poor in large cities, said, he begged the indulgence of the House in reply to the right hon. Gentleman's appeal to him to withdraw his Amendment to the Address. He had no wish whatever to embarrass Her Majesty's Government; but he considered his Amendment a national one—a very grave one, too—and one which was in no sense of the word a Party question. If, however, Her Majesty's Government would give him an assurance that the Act which followed the Marquess of Salisbury's Commission would no longer remain a dead letter, he was willing to withdraw the Amendment standing in his name.

MR. W. H. SMITH: It is not in my power to promise my hon. Friend (Sir Richard Paget) a particular day for the discussion of his Amendment; but, of course, he will have the opportunity of raising a discussion on the Report stage of the Address. It is not the desire of the Government to interfere with the discussion of a very important question not merely to England, but also to Scotland and Ireland; but I again appeal to the House to bring these discussions within reasonable bounds, so as to enable the House to get to the business that lays before it.

SIR RICHARD PAGET said, that, as he understood it was not the desire of the Government to limit a reasonable discussion on this matter on the Report stage, he gave Notice that he withdrew the Amendment.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE wished to know whether the hon. Member would move the Amendment on the Report? He himself had an Amendment to the hon. Member's Amendment; and if the hon. Member left the matter to a general discussion it was an open question whether he should not move his Amendment in a substantive form.

PARLIAMENT—DIVISION LISTS—CORRECTION OF AN ERROR.

Mr. PARNELL (Cork): I wish, Sir, to point out that in the Official Report of the Division on Friday upon the Amendment which I moved to the Address, the total number of the Ayes is given at 246; but I find that there are only 244 names exclusive of the Tellers, the total number, exclusive of the Tellers, being given at 246. In going over the list of the names for the Ayes I also find that the names of two hon. and gallant Members who voted in the Aye Lobby are not given. I refer to the hon. and gallant Member for Central Finsbury (Captain Penton), and the hon. and gallant Member for North Galway (Colonel Nolan). The addition of the names of those two hon. and gallant Gentleman who voted in the Aye Lobby would make the total number 246, as given in the official list, a correct one. I therefore beg to move that the official list be corrected.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not necessary for the hon. Member to move anything. As the hon. Member has given me the information I will take care that an erratum be inserted correcting the error, and rectifying the official list.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [THIRTEENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January].—[See page 84.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

AGRICULTURAL HOLDERS (SCOTLAND)'

Mr. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.), in rising to move, as an Amendment, at the end of the 10th paragraph, to add—

> "And humbly to express regret that it is not proposed to inquire into the exceptional position of agricultural holders in Scotland bound under 19 years' leases, contracted and entered upon prior to the recent serious fall in the prices of all agricultural produce; a fall which has rendered stipulated rents inequitable, and in many cases impossible, under the altered circumstances of the Country; the operation of which leases, especially those still covered by the Law of Hypothec, tends to prevent the full development of the productive capabilities of the land,"

said that, in reference to the appeal which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, he could assure the House that he had no desire to discuss the question raised in the Amendment in a manner which might be considered in any way obstructive to Public Business. The Amendment which had been put upon the Paper by the hon. Member for Somerset (Sir Richard Paget) showed the importance of the interest taken in the subject of agriculture on both sides of the House. He should like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the subject had been pressed upon Her Majesty's Government, both in the present and in the last Parliaments. About 12 months ago a Memorial was presented to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) on behalf of the tenant farmers of Scotland. That Memorial was signed by some 1,400 Scotch tenants, who were bound under leases, in the course of a very few days, and in the middle of a very severe snowstorm. The defeat of the right hon. Gentleman's Government put an end to any further progress in regard to the Memorial; but the Secretary for Scotland was waited upon by a deputation of Scotch farmers, and the right hon. Gentleman knew how strongly they had pressed this matter upon his attention. The right hon. Gentleman, who received the deputation with the greatest courtesy, expressed some doubts as to the prudence of the House of Commons interfering to put an end to existing contracts. He (Mr. Esslemont) at once admitted the difficulty of the position. About a year ago the question was discussed in that House, and the Secretary for Scotland would not deny that the vote on that occasion was of such a kind as to show that the feeling of the country was in favour of, at all events, an inquiry into the subject. He hoped Her Majesty's Government would understand that he did not intend his Amendment as anything like an ill-natured Vote of Censure upon them. It was rather a Motion of remonstrance, and appeal for consideration. He did not ask that the Government should commit itself to any definite course of conduct. All he asked was that, in some form, Her Majesty's Government might direct an inquiry into the circumstances of the tenant farmers in Scotland who were now bound under 19 years' leases. His appeal was on behalf of those leaseholders who had entered upon their leases prior to the existing circumstances of agriculture, and before the abolition of the Law of Hypothec. The Commission appointed by the House of Lords brought out the fact that the competition for farms, and the consequent high rents that prevailed in consequence of the operation of the Law of Hypothec, were admitted on all sides. Those who had entered into leases prior to 1880 were placed in a position which those who had taken their farms since 1881 could not be placed in. The landlord had an opportunity of following the stock on the farm, and applying it to the payment of rent, within a period of two years; and they had also the security of calling upon the tenant to give security for his rent, even before it was due. The consequence was that, in spite of the enormous fall in prices, the landlord was secure of his rent, although every other creditor should go without one farthing. He admitted that it should not be the purpose of the Government to interfere lightly with existing contracts; but he submitted that it might be necessary, under exceptional circumstances, for the Government to interpose to relieve one of the parties to the covenant, if there had been such a change of circumstances as to make this interposition necessary and desirable in the common interests of the country. [Mr. BIGGAR: Oh!] He understood that the Government had given an assurance to the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) that, if he had an opportunity of bringing forward his Bill on what was practically the same subject, they would be prepared to apply the Irish Land Act to leases which had hitherto been excluded. He claimed for the farmers in Scotland that they had not been riotous; they had not done any of those things which the Government said ought to militate against the people on the other side of the Channel; they had been a law-abiding and industrious people; and they had been uncomplaining and long-suffering to the very last degree. They had not brought their case before the House until they had found it to be a real necessity. Therefore, he hoped the Government would listen the more readily to their appeal, and give him the assurance given to the hon. Member for South Tyrone, that they would be willing to apply existing law to current leases. He would now prove that the circumstances of the tenant farmer were such as could not have been foreseen or provided against by any prudent man. That he would do from the evidence given in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade. In that Report Sir James Caird stated that in this country the revenue for agriculture was £42,000,000 per annum less than it was prior to 1880, and that the tenant farmers, apart altogether from the proprietors, had borne £20,000,000 of that loss. Under 19 years' leases in Scotland they were bearing the burden of those £20,000,000, and were, therefore, providing a rent for the land which, on the evidence of the Commission, was not in the land, and which could not be got out of the land. The question, then, was, whether those poor farmers were to be financially bled to death under the Law of Hypothec? The landlords had a powerful temptation to keep them as long as they could, for they knew that, in present circumstances, the farms would yield them a third less rent if let to new tenants, and they were prepared to take as much as they could get. It would be said that he was advocating an interference with sound fiscal and economic law. But the Law of Bankruptcy came in, and said that when a man was insolvent there should be no preference given to one creditor over another, and that the estate should be fairly divided in proportion to the claims of the creditors. Under 19 years' leases, there was certainly the reverse of that law. The landlord had it in his power to hold the poor tenant to his lease, with just as much as would pay him the arrears and the current rent; and he had a powerful temptation to do so, because he knew that if there was to be a change he could not let his farm, except at about a reduction of a third of the present rent. He did not say that all landlords were hard-hearted and obdurate. In the county, for instance, to which he belonged, the Nobleman who had held the position of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (the Earl of Aberdeen), who was a large landowner, had met his tenants fairly, by giving them the option of renouncing their leases, or taking re-valuation. He (Mr. Esslemont) would not ask so much as that. He thought it probable that if all leaseholders in Scotland had an opportunity of renouncing their leases to-morrow, there might be so many farms thrown upon the market as to place the landlords at a disadvantage. But he would give the option to the landlord, and he would say that it was perfectly fair that the landlord should meet the tenant in either of two ways—either that he should allow the renunciation of the lease, with the privileges of an outgoing tenant under the Agricultural Holdings Act; or, if he was not prepared to renounce the lease, he should submit it to some suitable tribunal to say whether the tenant was rack-rented, and whether it was possible for him to remain on the farm without ruin to himself. And if the tribunal decided that it was possible for him to remain on the farm without ruin, then the tenant ought to remain. But he held that it was not possible. The figures which were laid before the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had not been disputed—they had been entirely borne out by the evidence given to the Royal Commission on Trade. It appeared from the figures given by Sir James Caird before that Commission that wheat had fallen from 59*s*. 2*d*. in 1874 to 29*s*. 4*d*. in 1886; barley, from 44*s*. 4*d*. to 24*s*.; oats, from 30*s*. to 22*s*. 4*d*.; potatoes, per ton, from prices ranging from 65*s*. to 100*s*. in 1874 to 45*s*. to 70*s*. in 1886; beef, per stone, was 9*s*. to 11*s*. in 1874, and 7*s*. to 8*s*. 3*d*. in 1886; mutton, per lb., was 9*d*. to 10½*d*. in 1874, and 6*d*. to 8¼*d*. in 1886; Highland wool was 12*s*. to 17*s*. in 1874, and 11*s*. to 12*s*. in 1885; Cheviot wool was 28*s*. to 40*s*. in 1874, and 17*s*. to 29*s*. in 1885-6; cheese, per cwt., 68*s*. to 82*s*. in 1874, and 45*s*. to 65*s*. in 1885-6. In an average of 10 years, from 1871 to 1880, the average price of the three white crops was 14*s*. 3*d*., and on the 2nd of February last it was 9*s*., being a decrease of more than a third. Taking the prices all over, as far as he could ascertain, the yield of an acre of land was at least £2 less now than it was in the 10 years prior to 1880; and he appealed to the House whether, under these circumstances, it was possible for any existing tenant to pay a rent fixed in those years without paying it out of his accumulated savings, or out of that which belonged to his creditors? He should be met, no doubt, with the objection—and it was a fair objection—that 19 years' leases were considered, both by landlords and tenants, to be profitable in the interests of agriculture for the whole of this century prior to 1880. He did not deny that statement; but he would call attention to the fact that the rents under the 19 or 21 years' leases were originally intended to be a proportion of the produce of the land. It was found convenient for the landlords, and it was a their instigation, that this yield of at proportion of the produce of the land was turned into a money payment. If the rent under the 19 years' leases in Scotland had continued as a proportion of the yield of the land, there would have been comparatively little injustice felt by the tenants in Scotland, because the landlord of to-day would have been receiving only 9*s*. instead of 14*s*. 3*d*., or, practically, one-third less rent than he now received. Thereby there would have been a reduction of from 25 to 40 per cent in the present rents in Scotland. Then it might be asked—Why should you interfere with a bargain entered into by two men with their eyes open to relieve one who had made a bad speculation? He was willing to admit that both landlords and tenants were to blame for the existence of the 19 years' leases. If it could be proved that the parties entered into the bargain on equal terms, he would have little sympathy with any demand for interference; but they did not enter into the leases on equal terms. These conditions in regard to hypothec, game, and the confiscation of tenants' improvements, were universal throughout Scotland, and the tenant had no option but either to leave his farm or to accept the terms that were offered to him. It was not until the passing of the Agricultural Holdings Act that the tenant right was recognized in any shape or form by Scotch law. He thought it had been admitted that that Act had not gone far enough. It did not meet the circumstances of the country at the present time; but it had introduced an important principle, which must be applied still further before it could do justice or give satisfaction. If the Secretary for Scotland had done right in appealing to landlords to give reductions of rent, as the more humane and generous of them were doing, why could it be wrong for the House to intervene on behalf of those landlords who would not give reductions, and who insisted on exacting their full pound of flesh? Parliament must in many such cases interfere, particularly if the exaction of the law was against the interests of the country generally. His contention was that, under the existing conditions, it was impossible for the tenants to do that justice to the land which they ought to do. He did not ask that the House should go to any very great length. He would be content if he had an assurance from the Government that they would inquire into the circumstances; and if he had some assurance that a full inquiry would be made with the view of meeting the exigencies of the case, he should not press his Amendment to a Division. But if, on the other hand, the Government said that nothing could be done for these tenants, and that the landlords must go on exacting their pound of flesh, he considered the case was so urgent that he would feel himself bound to take the sense of the House on the Amendment.

MR. ANDERSON (Elgin and Nairn), in rising to second the Amendment, said, he felt very much indebted to his hon. Friend the Member for East Aberdeen (Mr. Esslemont) for having brought forward such an important question. The facts were beyond dispute—that there had been an enormous reduction of prices of agricultural produce, and that under leases fixed at a time of high prices there must be an enormous loss. Suppose that a farmer eight or 10 years ago took a farm at £500 of rent. He would naturally spend in his manure and labour bill, &c., £1,000, so that £1,500 would have to be made by him out of the produce of the farm before there was any profit. Supposing the value of the produce was reduced 33 per cent—which he took to be an average reduction—that would at once make £500 of loss a-year. That had been going on for years, with the result that many farmers had been ruined, many more were being ruined, and the only men who were able to hold out were men of capital who clung on to the last, hoping for better times. If that was not a case for interference by Parliament, he should like to know what case could be mentioned in which Parliament ought to interfere? The answer given by the Scotch Secretary the other day at Edinburgh was—"Oh! you must not interfere in the case of voluntary contracts made between private individuals." Those agricultural contracts, however, were very different from the ordinary mercantile contracts. In many cases they were not voluntary contracts. The landlords had a monopoly, and when times were good and everybody was rushing into farming, they did not scruple to make the most they could out of the tenants; and farmers had no option but to renew their leases or to leave the farm on which they expended their capital, or adopt the other panacea—emigrate. If the tenant left his farm he would receive no compensation; and, as he did not wish to leave the neighbourhood, the result usually was that he signed the lease. Therefore this was a case in which Parliament might interfere. Parliament had often interfered with voluntary contracts before. The Conservative Party boasted of the part they took in the Factory and Workshops Acts. He could scarcely expect hon. Gentlemen opposite to take the same view on this question—which was one between landlord and tenant. Whenever that was brought forward, hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, who chiefly represented the landlord class, said—"Oh, you are going to interfere with the sacredness of voluntary contracts." There was an outcry when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) brought in his Hares and Rabbits Bill; but the House interfered then, and it interfered in a very drastic manner under the Agricultural Holdings Act. The question was fully discussed in the last Parliament, when the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. Barclay) proposed an Amendment; and he (Mr. Anderson) understood that the alternative which the hon. Member for Forfarshire proposed—and which was supported by many hon. Members—was that, in the case of existing leases, Parliament ought to interfere for the purpose of giving the tenant the option of putting an end to the lease or fix a fair rent. That was a reasonable proposal. Everybody knew that in Scotland there was no means of settling a fair rent. The rents were all fixed by the landlords. It would be a fair proposal that some independent valuer should be introduced, and he should be curious to hear what the Government had to say to that. He (Mr. Anderson) could not help thinking that on this question of the land the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) was at a great disadvantage. He had stated in Scotland that he was most anxious to make his tenure of Office a success. He (Mr. Anderson) cordially wished him success. But the right hon. Gentleman was under a disadvantage in respect that he did not represent a Scotch constituency, and apparently he had some difficulty in getting into touch with the Scottish people. On many matters he had made remarks and expressed opinions which were certainly not held by the majority of the Scottish people. The Member of a Conservative Government was in a great difficulty. If he went to the very select band of Scotch Tory Members, he certainly would not find from them the opinion of Scotland on many questions, and especially upon questions relating to land. The right hon. Gentleman was in another difficulty in dealing with this Land Question—namely, that he was himself a landlord, and that he looked upon all these questions about land from a landlord's point of view. If the policy of Her Majesty's Government with regard to the land was to be directed and dictated from a landlord's point of view, it was doomed to utter and entire failure. He was afraid from what the right hon. Gentleman had said the other day in Scotland that he still adhered to the view which he had often expressed—that on land questions there ought not to be any indulgence given to tenant farmers.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): When did I say that?

MR. ANDERSON said, he deduced it from what the right hon. Gentleman said in his speech at Edinburgh. The right hon. Gentleman had also said to a deputation which waited upon him in regard to crofters' questions that, in his opinion, the crofter was a most fortunate person, and that the crofters were the most happily situated people on the face of the earth. He (Mr. Anderson) might also refer the right hon. Gentleman to the action he had taken in all legislation as between landlord and tenant, for on every possible occasion he had adopted and urged the views of the landlords, as against the tenants' interest. The matter was perfectly notorious. If they looked back to the debates on the Crofters' Act and the Agricultural Holdings Act, they would find that the great champions on the part of the landlords were the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Sleaford Division (Mr. Chaplin). They headed all the attacks against the tenants' interests. He hoped that in this matter the Government would not adopt a hostile attitude on this question, and throw itself entirely on the landlords' side. There were, no doubt, many good landlords in Scotland—there were many in his own constituency. But there were also many landlords who could not be so described. In Scotland the policy of the landlords at the present time was discredited. It was a policy which was not favoured or accepted in Scotland. There was a very strong feeling that in the past the landlords had not treated their tenants in the way to which they were entitled. There was a strong feeling that the rights of the tenants should be extended. That was a burning question, and the right hon. Gentleman must not deal with it in the way he had done with former questions between landlord and tenant. Anyone who had any doubt upon the matter should compare the political map of Scotland with what it was years ago. In the North of Scotland there had been a complete clearance of the lairds from political power. One of the first things which the people did the moment they got political power was to make this return; and it was not an unjust return for those shameful agricultural clearances which had taken place in the Highlands of Scotland. The Amendment gave the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland an opportunity of at once getting up and closing the discussion. They were anxious not to waste the time of the House. The right hon. Gentleman would save time by getting up and telling them that in some form—not in the form of an Amendment to the Address, but in some other form—he was willing to grant the hon. Member for East Aberdeen (Mr. Esslemont) the inquiry he desired. He should have thought that that was a course which Her Majesty's Government would have taken readily. A few months ago inquiries were the very things they seemed to desire; and he could not help thinking that, among the many inquiries they had issued, none was more important than that which was now asked for.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the 10th paragraph, to insert the words—"And humbly to express regret that it is not proposed to inquire into the exceptional position of agricultural holders in Scotland bound under nineteen years' leases, contracted and entered upon prior to the recent serious fall in the prices of all agricultural produce; a fall which has rendered stipulated rents inequitable, and in many cases impossible, under the altered circumstances of the Country; the operation of which leases, especially those still covered by the Law of Hypothec, tends to prevent the full development of the productive capabilities of the land."—(*Mr. Esslemont.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HALDANE (Haddington) said, he did not rise for the purpose of making a speech, but to give expression to a protest. Like the Mover and Seconder of the Amendment (Mr. Esslemont and Mr. Anderson) he (Mr. Haldane) represented an agricultural constituency; and he took the side of the tenants, the miners, and the farm labourers. He (Mr. Haldane) belonged to the Radical Party, and he thought the debate on the Address had been protracted to a degree incompatible with the public interest. If the case for legislative interference which the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire (Mr. Esslemont) submitted was one of urgency, why did he proceed in that fashion? Why did he not bring it forward as a Bill or Resolution, or as an additional provision to one of the Bills shortly coming before the House, instead of taking a course calculated more than any other to paralyze the House and render it incapable for the performance of those duties which had been committed to it as a trust. As to the other Amendments on the Paper he (Mr. Haldane) said nothing. One of them in particular—that of the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron)—appeared to him to stand on a somewhat different footing; but, as regarded the present Amendment, he appealed to the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire not to persist in it. The hon. Member, he was sorry to find, would insist. He felt it to be his duty to protest against the course the hon. Member had thought fit to take—to protest in the interests of the dignity of the House and of the trust committed to him and others by their constituents—and, having uttered that protest, he would leave the House, and refuse to listen any longer to the discussion on the Amendment.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): Sir, I think that the protest which the hon. Member for Haddingtonshire (Mr. Haldane) has just made has emphasized the extraordinary course which has been taken in this matter by the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire (Mr. Esslemont). The inconvenience of raising every possible grievance on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne is one which has been steadily growing of late years, and has now reached a point which practically debars us from dealing with the Business of this House until, at least, a fortnight after the usual time. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Esslemont) has been good enough to state that he did not mean his Motion to be taken in the nature of a Vote of Censure upon the Government; but the fact is that the Motion of the hon. Gentleman, from the very nature of the case, can only be considered as a Vote of Censure. If it were carried we should, under Constitutional usage, feel obliged to resign. We oppose the inquiry asked for, because we believe that the House now is in possession of every information which is possible after inquiry upon the question. The hon. Gentleman who seconded the Amendment (Mr. Anderson) states that I regard the whole question raised by it from a landlord's point of view, and that I am not likely to meet his views as Minister for Scotland, partly because I am not a Scotch Member, and partly because I am a Scotch landlord. Well, I should like to tell the House what I told a deputation which I received at Edinburgh. I stated to that deputation then—and I repeat it now—that, so far as my advice and my voice can carry, I would advise the landlords of Scotland not to act strictly and harshly within the letter and the terms of contracts made in times when matters were more prosperous and prices more favourable to agriculturists; and, further, I would advise the landlords to meet their tenants half-way, and this advice I gave not only in the interest of the tenants, but of the landlords themselves. But the hon. Gentleman opposite, and those who take his view, appear to me to confound the principles of morality with the principles of the law. They ask the Government to make the landlords do that which they should do of their own accord, but which it is not desirable that the House should compel them to do. Before I come to consider the Motion which the hon. Gentleman has placed before us, I would say that there are not many landlords in Scotland who enforce against their tenants the strict letter of their contracts made in 1874. [*Cries of* "No, no!" *and* "Yes!"]

MR. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.): I called the attention of the House also to the case of trustees who are not empowered to give tenants reductions on existing contracts.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: These are questions with regard to which the Government are prepared to give full consideration; but the House knows that it is not the case of the trustees of estates, but of the landlords, that the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire has raised. But I will ask this question—Does the hon. Member mean to tell the House that there are many landlords in Scotland who have insisted in dealing with their tenants upon the strict letter of the bargains they made in the year 1874, and have compelled their tenants to fulfil to the uttermost those contracts which were entered into when agriculture was in a very different condition to what it is now? I venture to say that very few landlords have acted in this spirit with reference to their tenants.

MR. ESSLEMONT: Yes; many.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman says that many landlords have done so; but this I do not admit. I do not say that there are no landlords who have maintained the terms of their leases made in 1874 intact. All I say is that when the terms of those leases have become hard to bear in consequence of the fall in prices of agricultural produce there are very few landlords in Scotland who have not shown a desire to reconsider the terms of those contracts. Now, Sir, passing to the inquiry which is asked for by the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire, I may say that there are two conditions which should be fulfilled before an inquiry of this kind is granted First, the inquiry should have reference to a matter with regard to which the House is ignorant; and, secondly, it should have reference to a matter in respect to which a remedy is possible. I apprehend that neither of these conditions is fulfilled in the present case. I was amused to hear the hon. Gentleman the Seconder of the Amendment assure us that the facts are beyond dispute. If that is so, what do we want with an inquiry? My second objection is that an inquiry is useless unless you think that out of an inquiry will spring some possible remedy. Now, the Government are not prepared to suggest the only remedy of which the hon. Gentleman has given an indication—the breaking of agricultural contracts by force of law. They are not prepared to support an inquiry which must end in that suggestion or nothing. The hon. Member for Elgin and Nairn says I expressed doubt to the deputation with whom I had an interview in Edinburgh as to the possibility of doing anything; but I think he put the proposition rather more mildly than I did. I did not express doubt. I expressed a conviction that on the lines on which he would proceed there would be a considerable loss to public morality and no compensating advantage to any class in the community. To that opinion expressed, not harshly, but decidedly, I and my Colleagues still adhere. An inquiry such as the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Aberdeenshire proposes would raise hopes that cannot possibly be fulfilled, and would suggest to the minds of all connected with agriculture the idea that this House is prepared with a remedy, which, in fact, it is not. For this reason—if for no other—I would ask the House to pause before it sanctions this proposal. The hon. Member desires us by legislation to break contracts deliberately and freely entered into by independent parties. I am much astonished at some observations made by the hon. Gentleman the Seconder of the Amendment—who, I believe, is a lawyer—because he seemed to me to confound the forbidding the making of contracts with the breaking of contracts already existing. I think the House should look very jealously at the first of these proposals, and should be very cautious in saying that independent and presumably sane individuals should not enter into this or that contract; but that is a very different thing from breaking existing contracts by legislation. The hon. Gentleman quoted the Hares and Rabbits

Bill—that legislative triumph of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt). There are one or two other Agricultural Acts which lay down that landlords shall not make certain contracts with tenants; but those afford no parallel to breaking contracts entered into consistently with law. Nor does the Workshops' Act—to which he referred—afford a parallel to this case of 19 years' leases. The hon. Member and others dissented when I referred to these contracts as freely entered into; but how is that denial consistent with the fact, already admitted, that 19 years' leases were the favourite expedient, not of the landlords, but of the tenants?

MR. ESSLEMONT: The right hon. Gentleman misunderstood me. I said they were entered into not on behalf of the tenants more than of the landlord.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is admitted by the hon. Gentleman that 19 years' leases were as much liked by the tenant as by the landlord; and I say they were much more liked by the tenant than by the landlord. If the hon. Member doubts this, let him look back at the debates which from time to time have taken place here upon agricultural questions prior to the time when bad times began to come upon us. In those days tenants gained advantages during the currency of a 19 years' lease—for the value of land rose during the period—and before the end of his term he found he had made a very good bargain. In those days hon. Members were fond of drawing the comparison between the Scotch tenant farmers and their less fortunate brethren, the tenants from year to year. How, then, can we accept the proposition that the parties to the agreement did not make it freely? The truth is that in Scotland, more than elsewhere, landlord and tenant are joint capitalists working a business. They are partners in a business—each contributing his share of capital—the landlord contributing to it considerably, apart from the value of the land. If hon. Gentlemen will take the trouble to investigate the landlord's expenditure they will find the truth of my proposition, and they will find that, leaving out of account what has been called the prairie value of his land, he does not now get interest on his expenditure. If there are two contributors to the business how is it possible for this House to interfere in their mutual arrangements, unless it is prepared to go much further, and to interfere in any contract between capitalists when the agreement is inconvenient to one or other of the parties? On what point of the downward track are you going to halt? How does the case of a tenant farmer under a 19 years' lease differ from the farmer who buys his farm intending to work it with his own capital? Suppose a man has laid out part of his capital in buying the farm, and the rest of his capital in providing stock to work it. Let us suppose he did this in 1874, which I take as the culmination period of agricultural prices and agricultural rents. He would have purchased at 30 years of the then net rental; and in what position would he be now? He would be worse off than the tenant farmer, for he would be unable to cast any portion of the burden on his landlord. The difference between the two would be simply this—that while the purchaser of the land has capitalized his outlay the tenant has not. The hardship would be equal, or rather harder on the man who had bought the land, than on the tenant who merely rented the farm. Shall we go back to his case, and afford him relief from the results that followed his purchase of land under the high prices of 1874? How can you draw a distinction? If you once enter upon such a course you will have your attention drawn to one hard case after another; and you cannot stop at agriculture. You must deal with wages, commercial contracts, the interest on loans, &c.; and a vast mass of agreements will be thrown before Parliament for it to say which of them shall be null and which shall be binding. The hon. Member tells us the system tends to prevent the full development of the practical capabilities of the land. That argument is used whenever an alteration is asked for in land legislation. It was used by those who tried to have the system of 19 years' leases extended to every tenancy. The reason why capital is not more largely invested in land is an obvious and very melancholy one—that capital so invested no longer pays interest. No alteration that the law yet can make will persuade people who have simply a commercial object in view to invest money in a business which has ceased to pay. You have in the past induced landlords to make large investments of capital which never paid much, and which do not pay at all now. They were ready to do so, because landed property was, at that time, supposed to carry with it certain advantages and pleasures of a more or less shadowy kind; but those shadowy benefits have vanished altogether now. Landlords were prepared to invest money for a small return. I do not know whether the recent course of legislation has tended to induce any man — tenant or landlord — to invest money in a business in which payment is so very precarious. The return is uncertain, even if there is no legislative interference. But the acceptance of proposals of the kind now before the House add to the evils consequent on bad seasons and foreign competition the still greater evils of legislative insecurity. It is because I believe that those evils, not to agriculture alone, but to every business, under the course suggested by the hon. Member, would eventually entail so much more serious misfortunes than any advantages his proposal may have, that, on behalf of the Government, I must meet the Amendment with an emphatic negative.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR (Kincardine), in supporting the Amendment, said, it was an error of the Secretary for Scotland to inform the House that in former times the 19 years' lease was an advantage to the tenant; but it was not more an advantage to him than to the landlord. Indeed, the well-known Act which Lord Advocate Montgomery induced Parliament to pass in 1770 was solely in the interests of the holders of entailed estates, which were then so tied up by old Scotch Acts as to be left untilled. Its great advantage was that it gave the tenant confidence, and thus was a stimulus to better cultivation of the land. On the whole, it worked more in the interest of landlords than of tenants. It was notorious that long leases on moderate rents enabled the tenants to make their improvements in land which the entailed holders had neither the power nor the money to carry out; and nearly all the reclamation, fencing, inclosing, draining, had been effected by tenants with long leases. But times had now changed. As the improvements such as the tenants formerly carried out on moderate rents ceased to be needed, the lands by undue competition became rack rented; and it was notorious that tenants who had entered on 19 years' leases before the fall of prices set in were being ruined at the present time. He (Sir George Balfour) thought that matters had arrived at such a pass that some relief should be given them. He thought that, at all events, some inquiry should be made, so that the true nature of the situation should be revealed, and that legislation should follow. He (Sir George Balfour) could not conclude without recognizing the great liberality and fairness of the Secretary for Scotland, who had in the debate and at the meeting at Edinburgh avowed his belief that landowners and tenants were joint shareholders, and should share in the diminished profits as well as losses in the farming operations. If those views were carried out by all landowners, many experienced farmers would be saved from bankruptcy and ruin.

Mr. MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbright) said, he quite agreed that the tenant farmers of Scotland were deserving of sympathy; he knew from experience that they had a wide field and fair play when they entered into these 19 years' leases. Hon. Members who seemed so anxious to get rid of the existing system of leases seemed to ignore altogether the fact that a few years ago, before the existing depression commenced, they did not hear one voice raised against these leases; and was this improving leases' system, which had existed for 150 years or thereabouts, and had worked well and successfully, to be uprooted and removed by an Act of Parliament, simply because they had depression in the country? A great deal had been said about hypothec; but if the argument held good that the landlords gained so much on hypothec, was it likely that he would let go a tenant who paid his rent under hypothec? Was it not more likely that he would treat them with leniency, and let them free of a portion of his rent. The landlords had shown great consideration to their tenants. He quite believed that there were thousands of instances in Scotland in which, if the full rent were exacted, tenants would be bankrupt in two or three years. It was proposed to put down these 19 years' leases; but he must remind the House that the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. Barclay) had brought forward a Bill to have these agricultural leases made perpetual. How would perpetual leases do? Surely, if the leases were to be held in perpetuity, the tenant would fare far worse than he did now. He considered that this proposal to break up commercial obligations was so preposterous that he could not understand hon. Gentlemen coming there to advocate it in sincerity. He might be asked, being a landlord, what he knew about this question? But he wanted to ascertain who knew about the case? Was it hon. Members who went out of Lincoln's Inn, and went down to Scotland to raise up feelings of bitterness between landlord and tenant which they thought it would be to the advantage of this country to come under? He (Mr. Mark Stewart) trusted the good feeling which had always prevailed between landlord and tenant in Scotland would long continue. If they were to have those periodical Acts of Parliament interfering with their private agreements, then they might say good-bye to capital, as well as to those friendly relations. In his view, it would be the most utter folly to bring such a question as that before the House of Commons in a responsible manner, and ask the Government to legislate upon it. He believed that the better way was to speak to such landlords as did not understand the question so well as those who were continuously supervising their estates, as he believed that if they knew the difficulties their tenants had to undergo they would do as many thousands had done—that they would amend the contracts and reduce the rents in many ways; but if they were to come into that House and say that Parliament was to interfere, he believed they would, instead of doing good, do a vast deal of harm. If such a Bill as that suggested were passed it would be simply sowing the seeds of animosity and bitterness between landlords and tenants in Scotland.

MR. SHIRESS WILL (Montrose, &c.) said, he shared with the hon. Member opposite the desire to bring the debate to a close as early as possible. Reference had been made to a deputation which waited upon the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour); and he (Mr. Shiress Will) would read only one sentence from an opinion expressed on that occasion—

> "Hard and disastrous times have come; and what are the equitable relations which ought to exist between two parties in business in the present circumstances? My view is that they should share the losses—that they should share the diminution of profits which have resulted from causes not under the control of either of the parties."

He was happy to acknowledge that those were the words of the Secretary for Scotland, and after he read them he had great hope that the result of that discussion might be that the right hon. Gentleman would have seen his way to give some form and shape to the very excellent opinion he then expressed. But to-night the right hon. Gentleman had apparently drawn a distinction between moral law and some other kind of law. It was, in the right hon. Gentleman's view, a moral thing that losses should be shared, and that the tenant should be in some way relieved, but that it would be an immoral or in some way a wrong thing to attempt legislation in order to remedy the existing evil and bring about the moral and right thing. He (Mr. Shiress Will) was totally unable to follow the right hon. Gentleman in that argument. There was a great deal of talk on this matter about the sanctity of contract; but the fair way, he thought, was to carry the inquiry a step further back, and ask whether the reason assigned for disturbing a contract was or was not a good, sound, and moral reason; and if it was a good, sound, and moral reason, then could it be wrong to disturb a contract, provided the disturbing of it was for the benefit of the whole country? The right hon. Gentleman seemed unable to account for the fact that the Scotch tenants formerly preferred the 19 years' lease, but did so no longer. The reason was close at hand. In former times they had not the Agricultural Holdings Act to protect them, and no compensation for the improvements they made upon the land; and it was just and right that they should have a long lease to enable them to get out of the soil the capital they put into it; but now that Parliament had passed the Agricultural Holdings Act, the necessity for the 19 years' lease had, to a great extent, ceased. The Amendment of the hon. Member for East Aberdeen (Mr. Esslemont) was based, to a great extent, upon the exceptional circumstances existing in Scotland. The Law of Hypothec gave the landlords great powers—much larger and more effective powers than the Law of Distress in England gave to English landlords. Besides that, the Scotch Act of Sederunt of 1756 entitled the landlord to insist on security for five years' rent if one year was in arrear, and provided for a forfeiture if two years' rent was in arrear. Such were the exceptional securities for his rent which the Scotch landlord enjoyed. Some alteration was made in the law in 1867 ; but substantially this exceptional security remained the law until the year 1880, when the Government of the Earl of Beaconsfield abolished the Law of Hypothec, but upon two conditions. One was that if the tenant was in arrears he should find security for one year's rent, instead of five years as before. Previous to 1880, under no conceivable circumstances could the landlord be a loser by the failure of his tenant; because the landlord had that security, and because it was no interest of his to seek for and get the best man ; and all sorts of men entered the field, and there was an undue competition for the possession of vacant farms. The retired grocer or baker in the town, or some other tradesman, having possibly a fancy for a country life, desired to go into a farm, and accordingly offered an advanced rent to get it. What was the position of the farmer who had to meet this competition? He was not free to go, because if he went he left behind him the improvements he had made during his 19 years' lease. Probably he had lived on the place for 19 years, and perhaps his father before him. It was the neighbourhood in which he had made his friends. Such a man was handicapped. The undue competition to which he was subjected necessarily inflated rent. This fact was established by a Royal Commission which sat in 1865, and by a Commission which sat a few years after. It was because of the exceptional circumstances—because Parliament was, in a sense, responsible for that exceptional law—that they asked that these contracts between landlords and tenants in Scotland, made under such conditions, should be reconsidered and revised. This revisal was for the interest of the two parties themselves. Obviously it was for the interest of the landlord that his soil should be in the hands of a man competent to till it, rather than it should be in the hands of a man who was in pecuniary difficulties and was compelled to starve it. Then, surely, it was for the interest of the whole country that so important an industry as the agricultural industry should not be allowed to go to the wall as it had been doing. The condition of the tenant farmers in Scotland was as bad as in England, and in some cases worse, because in Scotland they had tenants paying rents largely out of capital, without which it was impossible to carry on large farms. If in Scotland they did not have so much land out of tillage as they had in England, it was because, as a rule, the Scottish farmers had been men of considerable capital and backbone. But if the present state of things was to go on, he was afraid that nothing but ruin and starvation stared them in the face. He (Mr. Shiress Will) had worked out a calculation to show how the fall in prices had affected farmers in Forfarshire. He took a farm of 350 acres worked on the seven years' shift. Its sale produce would be potatoes, wheat, barley, and oats, and the farmer would fatten stock. The farmer would have 50 acres under potatoes, which, at six tons to the acre, would yield 300 tons. He put aside 30 tons for seed, and he had 270 tons for sale. The price of potatoes had fallen in 10 years 15*s.* per ton. The loss on potatoes would, therefore, be £202 10*s.* Of wheat he would grow, say, four quarters to the acre, yielding him, on 50 acres, 200 quarters. He put aside 25 quarters, leaving 175 quarters for sale. The reduction of price was 10*s.* on the last 10 years. Hence would arise a loss of £87 10*s.* On barley, five quarters an acre would yield 250 quarters, and, setting aside 35 quarters for seed, 215 quarters would be left for sale. As the fall in price represented 10*s.* per quarter, the farmer's loss would be £107 10*s.* Of oats he grew, say, 300 quarters, and put aside 180 for seed, the food of his horses, and so forth, leaving him 120 quarters for sale at a fall of 7*s.* per quarter, or £42. Such a farm as he had supposed would fatten 60 cattle; and he calculated that, making all allowances, and reckoning that the farmer could buy half that number of cattle to fatten at £6 per head less than a few years ago, the loss in this particular would amount to £240. The total loss of the farmer, in consequence of the fall of prices in these 10 years, might be stated at £679. Advantages might be reckoned on the side of the farmer in respect of the diminished cost of wages, cake, manure, &c., to the value of nearly £100. The average rent of such a farm in Forfarshire as he had imagined was 30*s.* an acre. On a similar calculation, the loss on a farm of 280 acres would be £498, and on a farm of 210 acres £374. The losses he had shown, therefore, amounted to more than the rent of the farms. It would, therefore, be seen that, in these cases, the Scottish farmer had a grievance upon which he could found a fair claim for redress. They had the capital of the farmer going and the man himself being ruined. It was not for the interest of the country that this process should be allowed to go on. It was said, if prices had gone up, the landlords would not be able to ask for a revision of their contracts. But he (Mr. Shiress Will) ventured to say the cases were not on all-fours. The hon. Member for Haddingtonshire (Mr. Haldane) had refused to take part in the debate. One of his grounds of refusal was that the hon. Member for East Aberdeen should have waited for the Government legislation. That might have been very well if the Government had said that they were going to legislate; but the Government had said that they were not going to legislate. The other ground of refusal was that the hon. Gentleman should have brought in a Bill; but it only required a little experience in the House to show how hopeless it was for a private Member to get an opportunity of legislating. For those reasons he had been unable to take the same view as the hon. Member for Haddingtonshire.

Mr. WALLACE (Edinburgh, E.) said, he also desired to offer a protest, though not in the spirit nor with the conclusion of the hon. and learned Member for Haddington (Mr. Haldane). He would not, like him, take up his hat and walk out of the House; but he hoped he would be in the House, and give his vote in favour of the Amendment. He desired to speak in language of gentle resentment against what seemed the indignity put upon Scottish matters in certain language he heard to-night from the Government and their followers, that the bringing forward of such an Amendment relating to Scotland showed a want of dignity; and that the time of the House was being wasted, which might be more usefully employed. If his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Haddington was going to protest in that spirit, he ought to have protested when the Irish Amendments were before the House. It seemed to him—and he thought some countenance was given to it by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland—that the notion of the Government and their followers was that the House existed for the purpose of emphasizing Irish Business and English Business, but of shunting Scottish Business.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): I did not say so. I gave no countenance to it.

Mr. WALLACE said, he accepted the disclaimer of the right hon. Gentleman, although it seemed to him he was encouraging that idea. But he did not accept the disclaimer for some of the right hon. Gentleman's Friends on the Front Government Bench, and other hon. Members behind him. If they wanted to shunt any Business, let them shunt the Irish Business to Dublin, and then the Government might have time to deal with English and Scottish Business. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland, he thought, travelled in the direction that, but for certain difficulties which were insurmountable, he would have gone in the lines of the Amendment; but, in consequence of those difficulties being so insurmountable, his position was stationary. The right hon. Gentleman's first difficulty was that the inquiry was useless, as the facts were already well known; therefore, that the inquiry would be nugatory, and that there was no use inquiring into that which they all knew about perfectly well. He (Mr. Wallace) thought the right hon. Gentleman was merely playing with the word inquiry. No doubt, it was useless for him to inquire into facts which he knows; but was it the case that the House—which would have ultimately to judge upon them—knew the facts? He doubted it very much. He questioned very much whether the English and Irish Representatives were acquainted with the facts of the agricultural condition of Scotland. Such an inquiry would not be simply to inquire into facts, and to throw them together like beans into a sack, but to collect facts—to collate, to classify, and systematize them—so that every individual who perused the Report would have a comprehensive acquaintance with the case. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had manufactured this difficulty, as persons did who did not want to know things which might prove difficult and disagreeable. The right hon. Gentleman's second difficulty was that, if such an inquiry was granted, and the facts clearly brought home, it would be impossible, consistently with certain considerations which he enumerated and amplified, to give legislation of the nature pointed at in the Amendment. Some of the reasons of the hon. Gentleman seemed to him more the reasons of the moral philosopher than the practical statesman. One of them was that if they began with agricultural contracts they could not stop there. There was no kind of commercial or private contract that the Legislature would not be invoked to revise; but he would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that there was all the difference in the world between contracts where the matter was land and contracts of any other description. In our dealings with Ireland it had been established beyond recall that the revisal of land contracts was now a recognized fact in politics. [*Cries of* "No, no!" *and cheers.*] Well, it was no use going back upon that to dispute it. The whole question was argued out 16 years ago. It had been proved over and over again to the satisfaction of the country—although, perhaps, not to the satisfaction of many hon. Gentlemen on the other side—and the resolution the country came to was that, in matters of land, revisal of contract was to be considered as an established political truth, and accordingly he did not think they were called upon to enter into elaborate reasoning to show that exceptional legislation in matters of agricultural contract was a recognized political fact and principle. He might, however, refresh the right hon. Gentleman's memory with one or two considerations that tended to remove the difficulty he felt in this matter. One was that the title to property in land rested upon a different basis to that of personal property. [*Cries of* "No!"] Yes; the title to personal possessions was founded on industry; the title to landed property was ultimately founded upon something which was not industry. [*Laughter.*] A word to the wise was sufficient, therefore he would not pursue to its utmost conclusions the distinction he had indicated. He had no doubt, however, that what convinced the country of the necessity of dealing with the land and with land contracts in a way that they would not deal with the creations of human industry was simply that the title to one kind of property rested on a foundation which was not possessed by the other. If this was an abstract consideration the right hon. Gentleman was to blame for setting him a bad example, for all his arguments had been more of a homiletic than of a practical character. Another reason why revising land contracts would not necessarily lead any practical statesman to consider that he was bound to go on to the revisal of industrial or commercial contracts was that the country might be irretrievably ruined if they abstained from revision of the land contracts, because they would thereby ruin the condition of the land. They were sterilizing the land by making it impossible for the skilled class, who were able to fertilize it, to till it successfully. There was no inevitable loss to the country if they did not interfere to prevent a merchant becoming bankrupt. While there were 4,000,000 Scotsmen there was only one Scotland. When a bankrupt manufacturer or merchant went down in the commercial struggle his place could be supplied to-morrow by another just as useful to the community as the one who unsuccessfully preceded him; but if once they ruined the country by sterilizing the land, they could not replace it by a new country—they could not get a new one. In the one case the country lost, in the other the individual lost. That was a sufficient reason for men with practical views of politics to refuse to interfere with commercial or industrial contracts, although they might find themselves bound to interfere with agricultural contracts. He was not arguing the question from the individual interest of landlord or tenant, but from the point of view of the interests of the country—a point of view which the right hon. Gentleman seemed to have entirely forgotten. He would conclude by asking the question which the hon. Gentleman the Mover of the Amendment (Mr. Esslemont) had asked, and which was not answered. It was this. If there was such a consensus of opinion with respect to the Bill of the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell), why should there be this difficulty in connection with a similar proposal for Scotland? He (Mr. Wallace) confessed his mind was so constituted that he could not see why the public interest should be jealously safeguarded in Ireland by protecting Irish cultivators, while the public interest in Scotland did not require at all to be attended to by making the same provision for the protection of Scottish cultivators. If there were reasons, they remained occult and mysterious to him; and he trusted that if there were such reasons they would be dragged from their dark and abysmal depths by some hon. Member opposite.

SIR ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL (Renfrew, W.): I think that some of the arguments of the hon. Member for East Edinburgh (Mr. Wallace), who has just addressed the House, are somewhat peculiar, and scarcely those which any hon. Member who has lived in Scotland, as I have done all my life, can subscribe to. I shall, therefore, only attempt to give a short answer to it. In the first instance, we are told that there is a difference between agricultural contracts and those which are made in connection with anything else. If the title to land is not founded on industry, what is to be said of the man who has earned his money and has invested in the purchase of land? If there is one thing which distinguishes Scotland more than another, it is the closeness of the tie by which the tenant farmers and the landlords have been united together in carrying on agriculture as a great business. They have always attempted to help each other as far as it has been possible, and a spirit of fairness has been manifested on either side. In recent times of depression the Scotch landlords have made large reductions in their rents; and I have no doubt they would be willing, if the necessity were to arise, to make a still larger reduction. Therefore, I cannot think that any special grievance has been made out in regard to the Scotch tenants. I know that in East Lothian reductions have been made of as much as 35 per cent, and even 40 per cent. In my county, in the West of Scotland, reductions of 10, 15, and 20 per cent have repeatedly been made, and the same course has been pursued in Argyllshire. I am not so well acquainted with Perthshire and Aberdeenshire; but I know that large reductions have been made, and that similar reductions have been made all over the country. Although I do not deprecate inquiry, I should regret it, because I believe that it might do something to impair the spirit of fairness and mutual good feeling which characterizes the landlords and tenants of Scotland. There is another thing I wish to point out. Only a few years ago it was maintained that the system of leases was the cause of the difficulties of the Scotch tenant farmers; but it must not be forgotten that the very same farmers previously pointed to that system as the basis of their prosperity. They were in the habit of priding themselves on being unlike their English *confrères*, in the fact that they did possess leases. What have leases done for the Scotch farmers? They have afforded a large security both for the farmer and the landlord, and the result has been that the landlord has willingly undertaken all the permanent improvements. He has put up the buildings and drained the land, and at the end of every lease he has put the whole of the farm in proper order. During the time that leases have existed much has been done, especially in the erection of farm buildings, and vast improvements have been effected, even in the last 10 years, which have been of considerable assistance to the tenant farmers in enabling them to carry on their agricultural operations. There is one thing which has brought about the existing depression in Scotland as well as in England—namely, the cheapness of foreign freights. You cannot go on running powerful steamers across the Atlantic, as is now being done, without affecting the price of agricultural produce here; but those freights have not been remunerative, and it will not be possible for the steamers to be run much longer at a loss. And every penny of a rise will increase prices at home. The farmers were looking forward, when I left Scotland last, for better times. I do not think the farmers of the West have been so hard hit, probably because they have been able to work their farms cheaper. But, at the same time, so far as the inquiry proposed by the hon. Gentleman is concerned, I am bound to say that I think it would be very inopportune at the present moment, because, however much we may wish for inquiry, we know that it would be impossible to secure it by moving an Amendment to the Address. I shall, therefore, feel bound to give my vote against the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire (Mr. Esslemont).

Mr. A. L. BROWN (Hawick, &c.): Sir, I, for one, feel very unwilling to interpose in a debate which hon. Gentlemen opposite regard with so much impatience, and exhibit so much disinclination to allow to proceed. But the extraordinary urgency of the question and the dire necessities of the Scotch tenant farmers have rendered the consideration of their case imperative, and must be considered my excuse for going into the matter. Let me remind the House that we have been discussing Irish grievances ever since the 27th of January. We are quite ready to concede that the tenant farmers in Ireland are suffering severely from bad Land Laws; but we maintain that the tenant farmers of Scotland are equally suffering from bad Land Laws. As yet they have not been listened to, when they have come forward to state their case to this House; and I presume the reason has been that they have never employed any political delegates to represent them here; but, on the contrary, they have been "thirl to the lairds." The Irish people have 85 determined servants prepared to ventilate their case thoroughly; but the Scotch farmers find themselves in an isolated position. They have committed their interests into the hands of the landlords, and when they come here they find a union of landlords against them, and they do not know where to go to for redress. What are the facts of the case? The state of affairs in Scotland is this—We find a great number of hard-working, decent, clever, and capable men who have been brought to ruin, we find a greater number of them are on the brink of ruin, and the cause of this is that the contracts which they entered into 15 or 17 years ago have been prejudicial to them, and if adhered to will inevitably bring these capable, honest, and industrious men into the Bankruptcy Court. We never find such things in trade or commerce. We may find a particular branch of commerce languishing, but not an entire class of capable, honest, and hard-working men who will inevitably be ruined if they keep the contracts which they have entered into. The real cause of all the mischief has been the Law of Hypothec, by means of which rents were forced up. If the contracts entered into under the Law of Hypothec are kept, the result will be the ruin of those who have entered into them. I wish the House to keep carefully in view the fact that this Law of Hypothec, which this House has since repealed, was a bad statute which forced rents up. The supporters of the law admitted that it had forced up rents. A Commission sat in Edinburgh in 1864, and witnesses, who consisted principally of Representatives of the landlord class, stated clearly that rents had been forced up by it; and that if that law were repealed rents would necessarily come down again, because there would be less competition. Surely it does not require any evidence to prove that this is how the Law of Hypothec works. If a farm is vacant, you will find 10 men applying for it, and the landlord naturally takes the highest offer. He says—"What does it matter to me what the tenant can pay? I am sure of 20*s.* in the pound, and if the tenant fails I can fall back upon the next tenant." I do not know whether anybody realizes the tremendous fall of rents that has taken place. In merely repealing the Law of Hypothec the House did not go far enough. Perhaps I may be allowed to mention instances of the fall of rent in the Galashiels district between 1872, 1873, and 1882-3-4, and 1885. One rent which fell in 1882 was £525 a-year; but the new rent accepted by the landlord was only £250, or a fall of more than 50 per cent. In the case of another rent which was formerly £750, it now stands at £331, a fall of 56 per cent. Taking nine farms, I find that the average reductions which have been made upon them amount to a fall of 43 per cent. These, however, are rents which were entered into 15 years ago. Let me mention the fall since 1882. One tenant offered £330 a-year for a farm in 1882. That offer was refused, and the proprietor kept the farm in his own hands. Last year he allowed the tenant who had made the previous offer to take it at a fall of 18 per cent. In other instances the difference in the value of farms since 1882 has been from 20 to 30 per cent. How are the tenant farmers to contend against a state of things like this? The Law of Hypothec has been repealed; but, as I have said, Parliament did not go far enough; it ought to have annulled the contracts entered into before its repeal. I am sorry that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate is not in his place. I remember the right hon. and learned Gentleman taking credit to himself and his Party for repealing the Law of Hypothec; and I think it must be generally admitted that in repealing that law the House determined that it would no longer force rents up in this artificial way. What I would ask the House to consider is, whether it will insist, in the present circumstances of the tenant farmers, upon payment in full of the rents which have been artificially forced up? Look at the present state of landlord and tenant in Scotland! It has been demonstrated, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that the tenants cannot pay their present rents. If hon. Members will put themselves in communication with any reliable persons, whether land factors, manure merchants, corn merchants, bankers, or business men, with opportunities of observation, they will be told that the capital is not slowly and surely, but quickly and surely dwindling away. Then I would ask the House if it will do anything to stop this strain upon the resources of men who form the backbone of the country? I know the case of one tenant who had a considerable amount of capital of his own. He was so independent that, whereas neighbouring tenants were getting reductions of rent, he declined to go to his landlord and ask for a reduction; but at length all his Scotch spirit of independence was starved out of him, and when he did go to his landlord for a reduction he was refused, because, as the factor told him, he had money. I maintain that the landlords are pursuing a foolish policy. They are taking all they can get and reducing the farmers to the position of men who will very soon not have a penny of capital left. It is notorious that in the South of Scotland, at least, the landlords are taking just what their tenants offer them, so that the Scotch farmers, perhaps unconsciously, are putting in force the notorious Plan of Campaign. A Scotch farmer told me that he had paid £1,000 a-year rent for a number of years; but last rent day he went to the landlord and said—"Here is £750; you can either take it or not." The landlord took it, and said never a word. Like the sheep before the shearer was dumb, and opened he not his mouth, he submitted without a murmur to 25 per cent being taken off the rent. How is it that such serious political consequences should arise in Ireland from putting the Plan of Campaign in force, and that the same thing should not apply in Scotland? It is because, in Scotland, the system of large farms prevails, and the tenants pay from £500 to £1,000 and £1,500 a-year in the shape of rent. No landlord in these hard times can afford to lose tenants who pay rents running from £500 to £1,000 a-year; and he must, therefore, take what the tenants offer. Now, it is altogether different in the case of the small farms in Ireland. Many of the Irish tenants pay only £5 or £6 a-year, and it is sometimes considered to be good policy on the part of the landlord to clear out some of them, in order to strike terror into the rest. Surely, if the Plan of Campaign is demoralizing—and I do not deny that it is and must be demoralizing, and that it will be admitted to be so by hon. Members from Ireland—surely, then, if it is demoralizing in Ireland, it is equally demoralizing in Scotland. The Amendment now before us is directed to securing the moral as well as the material wealth of the country. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland has taken up the old attitude on this subject. I impute to the right hon. Gentleman no lack of sympathy with the wants of the Scotch tenants. On the contrary, he has always shown great sympathy with them. I know some of his Scotch tenants, and I have been told that he is not only a kind, but a considerate and just landlord. Kind landlords are so rare now-a-days that this covers, not only a multitude of sins, but almost every kind of sin. The right hon. Gentleman has stated that there have been good landlords, who have been endeavouring to meet these hard times by making wise and just concessions; and he says that we are now asking the Government to interfere in the case of a small minority of bad landlords. We say that that is not so. We maintain that there are a great number, not of absolutely bad landlords, but of exacting landlords, who take their pound of flesh. When anything is proposed to remedy the grievance, we are told that we are interfering for the sake of a few. Surely, in 1847, when the Irish Famine took place, that was a time for good landlords to show kindness and consideration. But what was the case? Why, that some 200,000 or 300,000 houses were levelled to the ground. We were told when the Crofters' Act was passed that it would have very little effect, and would only deal with a few bad landlords; but when Sheriff Brand went North and conducted his investigation, the result was a reduction of rents, which ranged from 30 and 40 to even 50 per cent. History proves that it is the good landlord who is the exception, and the bad landlord who is the rule; but there are so many things which interpose between the landlord and the tenant that even good landlords are prevented from giving complete redress. Then, what we say in reply to the argument of the right hon. Gentleman is this. If there are few bad landlords, so much the better for the right hon. Gentleman and so much the better for the Executive, because there will be fewer cases to interfere with, and the great mass of the landlords will never know that such a measure exists. We are asked by the Secretary of State whether we should require the interference of the Government in the event of times being prosperous—should we ask the Secretary of State to interfere in the direction of raising rents? Now, that is a very awkward question for those who put it. It is said that the landlords would be quite justified in raising their rents in good times—that they are entitled to participate in good times, especially if they are called upon to make sacrifices when the times are bad. But, I would ask, why should the landlords participate in good times? I ask the question in all its nakedness, Who make the good times? High prices do not bring about good times, any more than low prices bring about bad times; but good times are brought about by men being industrious, and exchanging their property wisely and cleverly. Surely, then, it is the men who make the good times who ought to enjoy them. Why should the landlords, who are mere rent-drawers, participate in good times? I did not ask the question, and I am not going to answer it; but, if the question is asked, I reply that we on this side of the House, who belong to the Radical Party, will be quite willing to answer the question, both in the towns and in the country. Another case put before us by the Secretary for Scotland was that bankruptcies occur in all the large towns, and that they are caused by exactly the same reasons as those which press upon agricultural tenants. But I contend that in the towns there never was any department of industry where men entered into contracts wholesale, and where they would be ruined if they kept those contracts. I speak as a business man, and I am utterly ignorant of failures in trade and commerce arising from any such cause at all. You meet with failures which result from laziness, from a disinclination to face liabilities, and from dishonesty. They may arise in certain branches of industry where trade is languishing; but you never meet with a great department of industry, where clever and industrious men have entered into contracts, who will be ruined if they keep those contracts; therefore, the illustration of the right hon. Gentleman altogether fails. You will never be asked, and you know it, to interfere in the same way with trade and commerce. That, Sir, is our case. I know very well that we have not much to hope for; but we protest against the attempt which has been made to stifle this Scotch grievance. I do not know why the Government should grudge the short time we asked for stating our case. It simply means that the Scotch Members do not show the grit and the determination of the Representatives of the Irish tenant farmers. We have brought our case forward at this moment because it is the best opportunity that will be available this Session for bringing before the House and the country the grievances under which the Scotch tenant farmers are suffering, and it is the best chance we have of letting the Scotch people see who are their real friends and who are not. We have brought the question forward in all confidence that the country will acquit us of having wasted a single moment of the precious time of the House; and I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland and his Colleagues whether even such courteous and timid Conservative Gentlemen as they are cannot devise some measure of relief without incurring the danger of bringing the British Constitution about their heads?

MR. J. C. BOLTON (Stirling): Sir, I will ask the indulgence of the House, while I express the great regret with which I have heard many of the speeches which have been delivered to-night by my hon. Friends. It is undoubtedly the case that the Scotch tenant farmers are entitled to the sympathy of every Member of this House; but I cannot think that the best means of bringing that sympathy to a practical result is to indulge in such exaggerations and misstatements as those I have listened to this evening. I do not mean by that that the statements as to the value of land having fallen to the extent that has been asserted by the Mover and Seconder of the Amendment have been exaggerated, but that the condition of the Scotch farmer has been altogether misstated and misrepresented. I think that no complaint can be made of the Scotch tenant farmers on comparing their condition with that of the Irish tenant farmers. The hon. Gentleman who spoke last (Mr. A. L. Brown), in fact, answered that proposition as completely as it is possible to do so. His proposition is that the Scotch farmer ought to have the protection of this House, and ought to be released from his contract with his landlord, because he does not find himself in a position to deal on equal terms with the landlord. Now, the hon. Gentleman told us that there are farmers in Scotland who pay rents of £300, £400, £500, and £600 up to £1,500 a-year. Are these men persons who are not standing on equal terms with the landlords in the matter of bargain? I represent an agricultural constituency, and I maintain that the farmers in my county, at all events, are perfectly able to deal with the landlords on equal terms. I mean by "able" that they are in an equal position to deal on terms of equality with the landlords throughout the country, and that they do so deal with them. The hon. Gentleman the Member for East Edinburgh (Mr. Wallace) said that he would like to have this inquiry, because the House and the country are not aware of the position in which the Scotch tenants stand. Now, I must say that the hon. Gentleman, in my opinion, has not enlightened the country by his statement of facts. He asserts that the failure to intervene between the landlord and tenant, in order to break contracts entered into years ago, is ruining the country. Undoubtedly, the agricultural interest is a very large interest, and a very important one in Scotland; but the proposal contained in the Amendment is not to apply to the whole of the agriculturists of Scotland, but simply to apply to those cases which were entered into before 1880. I mean those which still exist. What proportion will they be?

MR. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.): About two-thirds.

MR. J. C. BOLTON: I believe, at the outside, they will only amount to one-third. We have been told by another hon. Member that we might, without any breach of economic law, interfere with the existing contracts between the landlord and tenant. But I deny that there has been any legislation in this House affecting Scotland in which existing contracts have been interfered with. No doubt, the Hares and Rabbits Bill and the abolition of the Law of Hypothec involved interference to some extent; but the Law of Hypothec still remains where it was, so far as it was in existence at the time of the passing of the Act. Nor was the Hares and Rabbits Bill made absolute There has been no legislation by this House in which existing legislation has been interfered with. [An hon. MEMBER: The Agricultural Holdings Act.] The Agricultural Holdings Act does not interfere with existing contracts. I am speaking strictly of Scotland, and I maintain that it does not interfere with, or affect, the existing tenants under their leases. [An hon. MEMBER: It does.] Undoubtedly, it gives them the right to obtain compensation for unexhausted improvements. The main argument in favour of that Bill was that it would enable tenants to farm their land up to the last day; that it would give them a right to demand and claim compensation for improvements that were not exhausted; but it also gave them the power to take the value of those improvements in another fashion. My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Montrose (Mr. Shiress Will) said he had a good sound moral reason for disturbing these contracts. The only good sound moral reason I can find for that is, that it would be for the benefit of the tenant farmers. But if that seems to be a sound and moral reason in the view of the tenant farmers, it would appear to be a very immoral and unsound reason in respect of the landlords. But, in reality, I am confident that in Scotland there is no necessity for a spur of this kind to be applied to the landlords. I am speaking now of landlords generally. I presume there may be exceptions; but to speak of the landlords of Scotland as men who are exacting the last pound of flesh is to make a statement for which, in my opinion, there is the very weakest foundation. [An hon. MEMBER: We only ask for inquiry.] Inquiry! Well, I am not opposed to inquiry; but my impression is that this Amendment is not brought forward with the view and intention of obtaining inquiry. The Amendment could not possibly be accepted by the Government. Everyone knows that an Amendment of this kind, forced upon the Government, and carried against them, means the upsetting of the Government. Therefore, I say that in bringing forward an Amendment of this kind, those who support it cannot have had it in their mind that the inquiry could by any possibility be granted; and, therefore, they must have some other object—some preparation for something else to follow. My impression is that it is intended to lead up to the Bill of the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay), for the purpose of setting up a tribunal in Scotland to regulate agricultural rents. To that Bill, so long as I have a seat in this House, I will give the most determined opposition. I have risen, however, for a special purpose—not to go into the merits of the case, but to express my great sympathy with the Scotch farmers in their present distress, and my belief that the landlords themselves will do the utmost in their power spontaneously to meet that distress. I believe that it will require no spur of this kind to induce them to do so; and I can only express my regret that so much exaggeration and misstatement has been made.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY (Forfarshire), rose to address the House, when——

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. J. W. BARCLAY, resuming, said, the uncompromising speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) would carry dismay to the hearts of the farmers in Scotland. He (Mr. Barclay), however, would thank him for stating his opinion so frankly. The farmers in Scotland would now see that they had nothing to hope from this Government. The Scotch Members, however, had some ground for complaint against the right hon. Gentleman. He did not think it became the right hon. Gentleman to snub the Scotch Members for bringing forward this question. Upon one of the first opportunities—perhaps the only opportunity—Scotch Members would have of calling attention to this important subject the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland gave them a lecture on the waste of time in Parliament. He (Mr. Barclay) protested that this was not a waste of time. Agriculture was in a critical situation, and he did not know when there would be another opportunity of bringing the question forward. It was understood that once this debate was concluded the Government would demand the whole time of the House for dealing with the question of Procedure. When that question would be settled it was impossible to say; and he thought his hon. Friend (Mr. Esslemont), after the Notice of Motion which he gave at the close of last Session, would have been failing in his duty to his constituents if he had not seized this opportunity. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland objected to the Amendment on two grounds—first, that there was nothing to inquire into; and, secondly, that it would be impossible for Parliament to interfere in the way contemplated by the Mover of the Amendment. It was evident that there was very much to inquire into. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland said that the whole of the landlords in Scotland, with, perhaps, a small minority, had made reasonable concessions to their tenants; but he (Mr. Barclay) had very different information. He would state, with confidence, that not one-half of the landlords had made concessions; or, if they had made concessions, they were totally inadequate. That, at any rate, was a point worthy of inquiry. Then the question arose whether Parliament should interfere. The right hon. Gentleman said that, whatever might be the result of the inquiry, this was a question on which Parliament ought not to interfere. That was the "no surrender" cry that they had heard before; and notwithstanding which hon. Members opposite had found it expedient to surrender. Had hon. Members opposite forgotten that Parliament intervened in the case of the Irish farmers in a very comprehensive way? He thought his hon. Friend the Member for Stirlingshire (Mr. Bolton) voted for the Crofters' Bill; and that, surely, was a greater interference with contract and with the rights of landlords than was contemplated by this Amendment. Not only did the Crofters' Act interfere with contracts, but it actually took away land from the landlord, and gave it, under certain conditions, in perpetuity to the tenant. The fact was that the question of interference with contract depended upon necessity, and when necessity had been proved it was the duty of Parliament to interfere. The reasoning of the right hon. Gentleman opposite he (Mr. Barclay) was utterly unable to follow. The right hon. Gentleman said many landlords had done what was just and fair in giving reductions to their tenants; but that it would be immoral in Parliament to compel other landlords to act in a similar manner. But the existence of Parliament was for the purpose of making the unjust and unfair minority follow the example of the just majority. The Secretary for Scotland further said that if they were going to interfere with land contracts, they would be called upon to deal with other descriptions of contracts. But Parliament had asserted, over and over again, its right to deal with contracts regarding the tenure of land upon the broad principles of public policy; and these 19 years' leases had special claims to be considered outside the scope of general contracts. He would recommend Parliament to deal with those leases in the interests of the landlords themselves. No doubt, many landlords had not given concession to their tenants, and in many other cases the concessions had been altogether inadequate; and in some cases concessions had been given merely to induce the tenant to barter away his right under the Agricultural Holdings Act. Looking broadly at the circumstances, then, would it not be well, in the landlord's interest, that the rent should be reduced to what an impartial tribunal would consider a fair amount, so that the tenant should be encouraged to go on improving his farm, instead of holding his hand, and coming at last to absolute ruin? The nature of this contract was exceptional. He did not think the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate, whom he saw opposite, could mention any other class of contracts extending over so long a period as 19 years. What would be the position of a manufacturer if he were forced to contract for 19 years for his raw material, and if, during the contract, the value of his produce were reduced by a third? That was a practical point worthy of the consideration of hon. Members opposite. When the ruin of a whole class was at issue, as in this question, he thought it afforded a strong argument why Parliament should inquire and deal impartially and equitably between the parties. It had been admitted that the Law of Hypothec had had the effect of raising rents above their natural market value, and that law had been abolished on account of its injustice; but the whole of the leases of Scotland, with the exception of those entered into during the last five years, were entered into subject to the Law of Hypothec. From that it followed that more than two-thirds of the leases were still under hypothec. Then, if that law had been condemned as an unjust law, he thought Parliament might fairly be called upon to interfere now, and do away, as far as possible, with its evil effects. His hon. Friend the Member for Stirlingshire had had the courage to tell them that farmers were in a position to deal with landlords on equal terms; but Parliament, in the Ground Game Act and the Agricultural Holdings Act, practically declared that the tenants were not in a position to make fair terms with the landlords. The 19 years' lease had been found long enough to encourage the hopeful farmer to invest largely in improvements; but it had not been long enough to enable him to get the money back again.

Parliament must interfere with contracts when necessity arose. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. A. J. Balfour) had questioned the necessity. Well, what was the present position of the tenant who took a lease eight or 10 years ago? Could he possibly by any industry make the rent out of the land? The right hon. Gentleman could not dispute the fact that there had been a fall in the value of agricultural produce in these years which was equal to a rent of 30*s.* or £2 an acre. In fact, the losses, on an average, were nearly equal to the whole rent. He contended, therefore, that the necessity had arisen for dealing with this question. This state of matters could not go on indefinitely. The tenants of Scotland had brought their case before Parliament at various times. He (Mr. Barclay) last year moved an Amendment to the Address inviting the attention of Parliament to the whole question of agriculture, and afterwards the farmers placed their case before the late Prime Minister. He could have wished his hon. Friend had made his Amendment equally wide. What would the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland like the farmers of Scotland further to do, in order to persuade him of their necessity? The right hon. Gentleman could agree to legislate for the crofters of Scotland when they showed him the necessity, and when the framework of society in the West Highlands was breaking in pieces; then the Government of the day admitted the necessity. Were the farmers throughout Scotland to be forced to adopt similar or equally cogent means? He believed the farmers were honestly, earnestly, and anxiously trying to fulfil their obligations; but it was very trying and harassing for the farmers to be placed in the position of seeing year by year their capital melting away, while the landlord made no allowance for the change of circumstances. The condition of farmers under a 19 years' lease was most pitiable and most deplorable, for comparatively few landlords sympathized with their tenants to the full or even necessary extent. They laboured hard and lived soberly; but the money, instead of going to remunerate them, was paid into the landlords' pocket; and, if Parliament did not interfere, this would be continued until their means were totally exhausted. He thought it would be exceedingly unfortunate if the farmers were pushed to any greater extremity. It was a most unfortunate example which Parliament had set. When the crofters or the Irish farmers were driven to resist the law, Parliament took up their grievances and dealt with their case as justice demanded. The claim of the Scottish farmers was founded equally on justice with that of the Irish farmers or the Scottish crofters; and they were practically told that Parliament would not do anything for them as long as they were quiet. That was the lesson which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland taught them that night. The right hon. Gentleman said it would be impossible and immoral to interfere; but he did not say anything of immorality on the part of the landlord who held to his bond. Neither did Shylock. The fact was that the system of land tenure in Scotland had broken down. That was becoming more apparent every day. Its breaking down was of the nature of creeping paralysis. The extremities—Ireland and the Highlands—were attacked first; but the longer they delayed dealing with it the worse it would be for the landlords, the tenants, and for the nation at large. The system had broken down, because the British farmer, with all his burdens and restrictions, could not compete with the foreigner. The farmer must make the most he could out of the land, and, in order to do so, he must have complete freedom in his cultivation and absolute security for his capital. It was the duty of Parliament, without further delay, to consider this question; to consider how they could best allow and induce the farmer to make the most of the land. That was the most important subject with which the House could deal. It was hopeless to look for any improvement in the business of farming so long as the present system prevailed. He repeated that the statement of the Secretary for Scotland would, therefore, be very disappointing to the Scottish farmers; but he did not think it would be long before the right hon. Gentleman would see cause to modify his opinion. The Crofters' Act could not be confined to the Western district of Scotland; and, notwitstanding what his hon. Friend the Member for Stirlingshire (Mr. Bolton) had said, farmers generally were anxious, and, he believed, determined, to have the principle of the Crofters' Act extended to the whole of Scotland.

MR. C. GRAY (Essex, Maldon): I intend to vote against the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Aberdeen (Mr. Esslemont), because I am of opinion that the question of the position of agriculturists would be much better considered as a whole. Before long this House must devote its attention to the consideration of this important question. If the Scotch farmers are really supporting this Amendment, I am very sorry that it should be so, because I am sure that if it were carried they would not obtain the object which they desire. I think the House will say—"Why should we interfere in this matter, and why should it be supposed that your only remedy for the unfortunate position you now occupy is by breaking through some contract or other you have made with your landlord?" The English tenant farmers are suffering quite as severely as those in Scotland, and they ought to be accorded precisely the same privileges. I hope, however, when the question affecting the agricultural interest is discussed in this House every hon. Member, whether English, Scotch, or Irish, who may take part in it, will show that respect for contract which, up to the present, I am proud to say, English farmers have maintained.

MR. R. PRESTON BRUCE (Fifeshire, W.): My hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) is a great authority on agricultural matters, and especially upon Scotch agriculture; and, therefore, any statements by my hon. Friend must be received with respect. At the same time, I think it is highly important to examine the argument which my hon. Friend has laid before the House. I understood the hon. Gentleman to say that it is sufficient to prove the case for interference with existing leases, if it be admitted that a great fall in the prices of agricultural produce has taken place, such fall having rendered it impossible for many tenants to carry out the bargain which they entered into some 15 years ago. I understood my hon. Friend to say that if that is admitted the whole of his case is proved.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY: What I said was, that if there had been a fall in the prices of agricultural produce equal to the whole amount of rent, in my opinion the necessity for interference was proved.

MR. R. PRESTON BRUCE: My argument will not depend upon the precise amount of the fall of prices; but I contend that the fact that a fall has taken place, whether equal to one-half or to the whole of the rent or not, is not, of itself, sufficient to prove the expediency of this demand for an interference with existing contracts. But it would be necessary to show something more than that. It would be necessary to show, besides, that the parties to the contracts are not themselves taking proper steps to meet the change of conditions which has happened. Now, as to how far such steps are being taken, as to how far the landlords are making sufficient reductions in view of the depreciated agricultural conditions, it is impossible to arrive at an exact opinion. Opinions will vary on the subject; but my own belief is that gradually the necessary reductions are being made; that a very large proportion of the bargains entered into 15 years ago have already been modified; that every day more and more of them are being modified; and that the difficulty will be met in that way. But I think that, even supposing that were not the case—and I admit that there will be only too many exceptions—that there will be only too many industrious and deserving farmers driven to the wall and obliged to meet ruin—there is another thing we have to examine before we adopt the proposition of the Mover of the Amendment. We have to look at the consequences of the measure which the hon. Member proposes. We have to examine those consequences, and see whether they themselves will not be as bad, or perhaps worse, than the existing condition of things. The present proposal is simply a proposal to break existing leases in Scotland; and I know very well what will be the consequences of the passing of a measure of that kind. The simple and inevitable result would be to put an end to the system of agricultural leases for a term of years. [MR. ESSLEMONT: Hear, hear!] My hon. Friend says "Hear, hear!" He admits this result; and, in considering the proposal, one has to consider whether it is desirable to put an end to the system of leases. Now, I confess, for my own part, that I am not at all satisfied that it would be a good thing for the interests of Scotland, as a whole, to put an end to the system of agricultural leases. A great deal has been said to-night against that system; but the one fact which cannot be denied is that, under that system of 19 years' leases, agriculture in Scotland has reached a point of excellence which can, I believe, hardly be equalled by any other country in the world. And I can hardly think that a system which has produced such results as that can be altogether a bad one. Well, my hon. Friend has proposed to destroy the system of leases. He proposes to pass a law which would prevent anyone in future from entering into such a lease. Then I would like to know from the hon. Member what he is going to substitute, because I can well understand the view of those who think that it would be a better thing for the country, and a better thing for agriculture, if they can bring about a state of things under which the owner of the land cultivated the land himself, under which the farmer is the owner of his farm. I sympathize very much with their view myself; but I ask myself whether that is the result which is going to follow from the destruction of leases? I confess that I fail to see how such a result is to follow. In the first place, so far as my limited experience goes, the tenant farmer of Scotland is not at all desirous of purchasing his farm. I do not know whether the hon. Member for Forfarshire denies that. According to my experience, not many tenant farmers of Scotland have that in view.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY: Lord Glasgow's estate has been partly sold to the tenants.

Mr. R. PRESTON BRUCE: I am glad to hear it; but that does not prove a general desire among the tenant farmers of Scotland to become the owners of their farms.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY: They seldom get a chance.

Mr. R. PRESTON BRUCE: What is the alternative? It is that they should fall back upon a year-to-year system of tenancy, protected by some measure of compensation for improvements. Some may think that that is a better form of tenure than 19 years' agricultural leases; but that is not my opinion. I believe myself that no system which depends mainly on the valuation of improvements is ever likely to be very satisfactory; because, in the nature of things, it is impossible to value the improvements in such a way as to meet the justice of the case; or, rather, in such a way as that both parties will recognize the justice of the award. Therefore, I maintain that in driving the tenant farmers of Scotland out of this system of 19 years leases into the system of year-to-year tenancies you are driving them from not a perfect system, but a pretty good system, into one which is much worse. That is why I cannot sympathize with the step which my hon. Friend proposes to take. I deeply sympathize with the farmers who are under great pressure; and I trust that the landlords will more and more realize the necessity of meeting them and of saving them. It is not a matter of charity on their part to do this; because, if the landlords drive to the wall—drive to ruin—these men, who are the only men capable of cultivating the soil, they will be ruining themselves at the same time. I do not believe the landlords will be prepared to commit an act of such extreme folly. I apologize for detaining the House; but I cannot, under the circumstances, support the Amendment of my hon. Friend (Mr. Esslemont).

Mr. M'LAGAN (Linlithgow) said, the subject was well worthy of being brought before the House; but he could not, in the words of the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire (Mr. Esslemont), censure the Government for not having introduced it into Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech, because, if the Government were to introduce into the Queen's Speech every grievance that was felt by every class in the country, the Speech would be interminable, and the discussion on the Address would last throughout the whole Session. For that reason, he (Mr. M'Lagan) could not support the Amendment, although sympathizing deeply with the subject brought under the notice of the House. Then he did not agree in his sweeping condemnation of the whole system of leases, though he admitted that the tenants under the leases to which the hon. Member had limited the scope of his Amendment were not able to pay the rents out of the produce of their farms. In fact, agriculture in Scotland owed its high excellence and superiority to those 19 and 21 years' leases. It should be borne in mind that before those leases were introduced into Scotland English agriculture was so far superior to that of Scotland that men were sent from Scotland to England to learn farming. After leases were introduced in Scotland, however, so rapid became the improvement in Scotch agriculture, that the reverse applied, and young men were now sent from England to Scotland for the purpose of studying farming. If they interfered with those leases they would be interfering with commercial contracts. The tenants reaped as much benefit from these leases as the landlords. The relations between landlord and tenant were different in Ireland, England, and Scotland. In Ireland relations were based very much on vague sentimental agreements; in England they were regulated very much by equity; and in Scotland they were based on commercial contracts; and if they interfered with the system of leases, they would be interfering with commercial contracts. The result of these different forms was shown in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), when he introduced his Irish Land Act of 1870, where it was shown that in Ireland land had doubled in value up to 1870, in England it had trebled, and in Scotland it had sextupled. The tenants, under the leases entered into in 1852, profited by the large rise in the price of agricultural produce which had, from various causes, taken place during that period in this country; but when, in 1874, prices began to fall while the rents remained the same, the tenants suffered. It was this class of tenants whom the Amendment would affect; and there was no doubt that there was going on amongst such tenants a slow but certain depletion of their capital, with the result, if not checked, that they would have, first, an impoverished tenantry, and then an impoverished soil. It was, therefore, for the serious consideration of the landlords whether they should not come forward and give some timely aid to their tenants to prevent that fall which must take place on the expiration of the 19 years' lease; and this ought to be the more readily done, because the tenants of Scotland were not promoting or favouring demoralizing schemes for reducing their rents. On the contrary, they were struggling with all their might to fulfil their legal obligations. He had known tenants go to their landlords and tell them to take everything on their farms, as they had no more to give, and offering to give up their leases at the same time. All the talk had hitherto been in favour of the tenants, and they had not heard a word in favour of the landlords; but he believed that in some cases the landlords were worse off than the tenants. He himself knew a case in which the tenants went to their landlord to demand a reduction of their rents, and the landlord's answer was that if he gave them the reduction sought he would have nothing to live on himself. The fact was that both landlords and tenants were the innocent victims of bad Land Laws, by which the dead hand had been able to place conditions on the rights of proprietorship hurtful to the living owners and disastrous to the country; and whatever else might take place, he hoped the question of an alteration of the Land Laws would be carefully considered by the present Government. The Government had already shown that they were willing and able to consider the matter—witness Lord Cairns' Act—and if the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland, with his two Legal Advisers, would come forward and remove those scandals from which many were still suffering, they would be conferring a great boon upon that class, and doing a great deal to assist agriculture. He agreed with the hon. Member for Fife (Mr. R. Preston Bruce) as to the value of leases. The Scotch farmers were far too long-headed to give up a system which had proved so beneficial both to agriculture and to themselves. At the same time, he appealed to Parliament that these were subjects for inquiry; and it would, at least, show their sympathy with the farmers if the Government agreed to appoint a Committee of Inquiry.

DR. CLARK (Caithness) said, he was astonished at the observations made by the hon. and learned Member for Haddington (Mr. Haldane), when he remembered well last year that, upon a similar discussion taking place, he voted for a Motion of the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay), and for another Motion—that of the hon. Member for the Bordesley Division of Birmingham (Mr. Jesse Collings)—on which the Tory Government was defeated. He (Dr. Clark) trusted before the Division they would hear something from the Lord Advocate in answer to some of the arguments which had been adduced. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland was exactly the kind of speech one would expect from him. The right hon. Gentleman was a thorough believer in the old doctrine of political economy. He strongly believed in the rights of property, but took very little notice of the rights of humanity. The usual political and economical arguments had been used. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman was accurate regarding his first argument—namely, that they had never had any interference by the House of Commons regarding contracts made between parties. There were the cases of adults, and of the Truck Acts, by which they prevented the master and workman from paying or receiving in kind. It was, however, a matter of small importance to him whether the House had interfered in the past or not, for he thought that in the future they would have to interfere, and the sooner the right hon. Gentleman thought more of the rights of humanity and less of the rights of property the better it would be for the Conservative Party in Scotland. One of the arguments used by the hon. Member for East Aberdeen (Mr. Esslemont) was that the Law of Hypothec affected the tenant; but in his long and elaborate reply the right hon. Gentleman never said a single word regarding that. He entirely ignored the arguments both of the Mover and Seconder of the Amendment. The Law of Hypothec was an unjust and immoral law, because it gave one creditor a preferential claim over all the others—namely, to the creditor who had only let his land to the tenant over the creditor who actually gave his goods; and it permitted legal robbery, because it permitted the landlord to take possession of the property of other people. One of the cases in which Parliament had interfered was the following:—Up to the year 1871, the rate for education was a burden upon the landlord only; but when the Education Bill was brought in, one-half of the burden was transferred from the landlord to the tenant, and it was in many cases, especially in the Western Highlands, that that burden amounted to from 10 to 12½ per cent on the tenant's rental. There was no talk about contracts then. He now asked that Parliament should do for the tenants what it did for the landlord then. He asked the House to save men from being ruined. The Scotch landlords generally, he admitted, were acting very generously; but there was a minority who either could not or would not do so. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that the Bill ought to go further. The Irish Land Act and the Crofters' Act had, he thought, acted very unfairly, and would ruin some landlords. The House ought to consider the rights of all the parties interested when when it did interfere. In Scotland the Crofters' Commission had reduced rents from 40 to 70 per cent; and when they went to the county he represented he believed they would ruin some landlords. One of the great rack-renters, a banker, would be ruined; while the man who sold him the estate would be scot free. Mr. Hussey, the well-known Irish land agent, gave evidence that he had bought an estate, and borrowed two-thirds of the money on mortgage. The Land Court reduced the rent by one-third, and the whole of his capital disappeared. That was very unfortunate, and he thought the Courts which reduced rents should likewise have the option of reducing the burdens on landlords, such as were imposed upon them by wills and in deeds. He did not see why the capitalist should get his pound of flesh and the landlord pay all the burdens. The Court ought to have power to lower mortgage charges as well as rent. There was one statement made by the right hon. Gentleman that he was very glad to hear; he told them that the bulk of the landlords of Scotland, especially those in the Lowlands, were in the unfortunate position that they were not able to get a fair return, in the shape of interest, for the money they had invested in improvements. If the right hon. Gentleman had carried out the argument to its legitimate conclusion, he would have seen that his argument amounted to an admission that economic rent, in the scientific sense of the term, had, in those cases, entirely disappeared. To that extent, it would appear that the Government agreed with

Sir James Caird; so that, in the Western Highlands, the Crofter Commissioners ought to have reduced rents by 100 per cent, instead of from 40 to 70 per cent. From his knowledge of the Lowlands of Scotland he would deny the assertion of the hon. Baronet the Member for West Renfrewshire (Sir Archibald Campbell) that the improvements there were made by the landlords; for, in some of the leases he had seen, the tenants were compelled to spend some hundreds of pounds on improvements. He would make bold to say that in the Western and Northern Highlands, doubtless, all the improvements were, and had been, made by the tenants; but in Lowland Scotland, as much as in Ireland, a large section of the improvements had been made by the tenants, and that, capital for capital invested in the soil, there had been more proportionately invested by Scotch than by Irish tenants. The fact was generally admitted that the Scotch farmer could not pay the rent out of the produce of the soil. Therefore, if he paid it he must pay it out of his capital, which was limited. The position now, therefore, was such that the farmers of Scotland ought to be protected by a general extension of the Crofters Act, or by a measure like the Irish Land Act. Their leases must be broken, the only question being whether they should be broken by recourse to the Bankruptcy Court, or by the intervention of a Land Court. He warned hon. Members opposite that if the farmers should be forced to go through the Bankruptcy Court, many of them would change their political faith. Unfortunately for Scotland, the Lowland farmers had generally been Conservative. But they would then probably come to the conclusion, as they had done in the North, that large landlords were not the best men to represent them. No doubt there had been a fall in dairy produce, as in corn and cattle also; but he could not see why the hon. Member for Stirlingshire (Mr. Bolton) saw any difference between the position of the Scottish and the Irish leaseholder; and if the Government were compelled to support a measure to enable Irish leaseholders to break their leases and get new rents, he could not see on what principle they refused the same boon to Scottish leaseholders. He was no Socialist; indeed, he approved of the institution of private property, and he was sorry that right hon. Gentlemen opposite were adding force to the Socialist agitation by their present attitude. For if they refused to grant moderate reforms, instead of evolution, they would bring about revolution. The hon. Baronet the Member for West Renfrewshire told them that some men had bought their land. Well, some men had bought slaves, but that did not give them a better right to hold men. The truth was that manlordism and landlordism were alike in that respect—and both must go. If the landlords met them fairly now, they would get compensation, and be fairly and generously treated; but if they refused redress, and turned the capitalist farmer against them, and demanded their full pound of flesh, then probably, like Shylock, they would want their whole pound and meet Shylock's fate.

MR. C. S. PARKER (Perth) said, the hon. Member who had just sat down (Dr. Clark) had given them an example of what the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland had said—that if they got on an inclined plane it would be difficult to say how far they might slide. The House seemed to have got on somewhat of an inclined plane in its dealings with Irish land. They had passed Irish Land Acts for Irish reasons, because they were demanded by the Representatives from Ireland, to give legal sanction to customary and equitable rights of tenants in Ireland. But now the hon. Member for Caithness said that, with his experience of both the North and South of Scotland, he saw no difference between Scotland and Ireland; and, further, that Land Courts ought to regulate not rents only, but also mortgage interest and other charges upon land. The hon. Member had, with a fairness which, no doubt, the House would appreciate, admitted that landlords were great sufferers, as well as tenants, by the fall in prices. Indeed, landlords, though often they could afford it better, were, perhaps, the greater losers. For if the annual value of land dropped largely, anyone who rented the land for a few years only was, no doubt, a great loser for those years; but he could then quit it and go. The man whose whole property was invested in the land could not quit and go; and he lost his capital value. But the question now before the House was whether or not they were to censure the Government for not having introduced into the Queen's Speech a promise of inquiry into this question of leaseholds in Scotland? They had been told that no inquiry was wanted, because the facts were well known. But to whom were they well known? Were they well known to that House, and to the new constituencies who had so great a power now in sending Members to that House, and in instructing them what they should do when there? He would say, from both those points of view, that there was some need of inquiry. Urban constituents knew little of agricultural leases; and he thought the debate that evening showed that, to a certain extent, even hon. Members wanted a little more knowledge of the facts. Two of the supporters of the Amendment gave contradictory views of the way rent was determined. The hon. Member who seconded the Amendment (Mr. Anderson) had told them that all rents were fixed by the landlord; while, on the other hand, the hon. Member for the Border Burghs (Mr. A. L. Brown) told them that, in his experience, the tenant was fixing the rent. He said that in the South of Scotland landlords were accepting gladly what the tenants offered. They did not need a regular Plan of Campaign, for one Scotch tenant in himself was as formidable as a whole host of Irish campaigners. The tenant said—"Take this, or want," and the landlord took it, with never a word. He (Mr. Parker) did not like this loose language about there being no free contract now, because the tenant was dictating everything to the landlord, and that a while ago there was no free contract, because the landlord dictated the terms. It seemed to him that most contracts were made under considerable pressure of various considerations, and each party considering whether, on the whole, under the circumstances he would take it. There was one point as to which he himself, though he had listened to the whole debate, still stood in need of information; and that was the number of tenants in Scotland, not who had been affected by the general fall in prices, but who, wishing to be emancipated from the 19 years' lease, had found that their landlords would not release them. That was an important point. Were they asked to legislate for a few persons only, or for a whole class who were being ruined? Unhappily many tenants were being ruined, but many landlords also. Hon. Members talked of monopoly. The chief monopoly he had observed lately was the monopoly of the advertisement columns of newspapers by landlords offering their estates for sale. But what he wished to know was this. How many cases were there where a tenant came to his landlord, and said—"I have been losing; I have been paying rent out of capital, and I want to get out of my lease," and where the landlord refused to let him go? How many cases were there?

Mr. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, E.): Thousands.

Mr. J. C. BOLTON (Stirling): Very few.

Mr. C. S. PARKER said, he could not at present cross-examine the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire, who said there were "thousands;" but there was a good formula which the head-master of one of our public schools was in the habit of using in cases of this kind. When anyone made a sweeping general statement he would say—"Name six." ["Name!"] His (Mr. Parker's) belief was that what usually occurred was this. The tenant farmer went to his landlord and said he wished to give up his lease; and the landlord usually replied that he might do so, not, perhaps, on the same terms as if he had run out the lease. However, he would be glad to have some information as to the thousands of cases which the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire spoke of. As to inquiry, he had no objection to it; on the contrary, he thought it might have two good results. It might open the eyes of many who talked loosely on the Land Question to the true facts of the case on the one hand; and he was convinced, on the other hand, that it would make more clear to many landlords the moral claims of their tenants upon them for liberal remissions of rent.

Dr. R. McDONALD (Ross and Cromarty) said, there were thousands of cases in the Western Highlands where just reductions of rent had been refused. He would give the hon. Member for Perth (Mr. C. S. Parker) the name of one tenant rented at £300 a-year, and who for the last seven years could only pay his rent from the proceeds of a business that he carried on in connection with the farm. The landlord, although assured that the rent could not be paid out of the farm, refused to release the man. He might also mention the case of the tenants of the Scottish Provident Institution, who had been refused reductions by the trustees, and whose rent the Land Court reduced 50 per cent. Those cases were of common occurrence. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) had insisted on the sacredness of contract, and he (Dr. McDonald) agreed with him; but there were cases where contracts had, when necessary, been broken, as, for instance, by the Crofters' Act of last year. He wished also to point out that there was a little Bill pending for the benefit of leaseholders in Ireland. It was proposed to enable them to take advantage of the Irish Land Act. He (Dr. McDonald) should like to know, in view of the Government's intention to extend the law to old leases not now under it, whether contract was more sacred in Ireland than it was in Scotland? The Government had seen that their contemplated action in the matter of Irish leases was a deplorable necessity. It was understood that the Bill was to have the support of the Government; and, on speaking on the matter to an hon. Member, he said—"It is a deplorable necessity in Ireland." He (Dr. McDonald) supposed that the Government would not see that it was a deplorable necessity in Scotland until the Scotch Members made them see it. There were cases in which large sheep farmers in the Highlands had been ruined. The landlords sold the sheep and turned the farms into deer forests. The same thing might be done in the South. An hon. Member had said that the landlord was very poor, and that the tenant must do his share. Did he mean that the tenant was to be sent to the workhouse in order to keep the landlord out of that institution? They talked of ruining the landlords. He knew of thousands of large farmers who had been ruined by the landlords; and if a landlord was ruined here and there, he did not know that he was more deserving of pity than the poor tenant. A case had certainly been made out for inquiry, and he hoped the Government would make up their minds to grant it.

SIR DONALD CURRIE (Perthshire, W.) said, he wished to point out that there were other leases, besides those for 19 years—say, for 15 years and 10 years—requiring consideration as much as 19 years' leases, which would not come within the application of the moral law of which they had heard so much that night. The hon. Member for East Edinburgh (Mr. Wallace) had told them that the basis of all claims for property or proprietary rights in the United Kingdom was that of industry; in other words, that a tenant farmer who worked the land was the representative of industry, and, therefore, had the only claim to the property, the landlord having no possessive rights whatever. He (Sir Donald Currie) dissented from that doctrine entirely, and held it to be vicious and unjust. From much that had been said, one would think it was a disgrace to be a landlord. Well, he was a landlord, and the lands he held had not been left to him; he had purchased them by the fruits of his industry. He had worked for them in the commerce of the country, so as to obtain that which enabled him, by payment under legal process, to purchase and own, and this was said not to be proprietary right.

MR. WALLACE (Edinburgh, E.): I spoke of the ultimate title.

SIR DONALD CURRIE replied that he preferred the present and absolute possession and right. He could not go into the dim and distant future of his hon. Friend. He preferred to deal with the positive possession of property—its inherent rights, claims, and duties. He was a landlord in a Highland constituency, and he had offered his tenants, the other day, the alteration of all their leases, if they pleased, or to cancel them altogether. That was not what any other hon. Member who had spoken that night about the iniquities of landlords had done; but when he had made that offer not a single tenant would accept it. No; they preferred to remain as they were, and preferred him to make yearly leases, because they believed they would be fairly treated. And now it was his rule to make 15 year leases, with five year breaks at the option of tenant and landlord; but the tenant farmers of Aberdeen wished 19 years' leases when the price of beef was high, and it was to their advantage to have long leases. If there was a singular thing in the discussion they had had that night, it was that they had not heard the opinion of the Leaders of the Liberal Party, who, for some years past, had been engaged in legislating on the subject. He would like to hear the opinion of the Front Bench as to whether the Liberal Leaders favoured the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Aberdeenshire (Mr. Esslemont). They had not a single word to say in favour of the Amendment. It was quite inconsistent with their previous policy and legislation. It was not in connection with the Queen's Speech that this subject should be dealt with, but upon a much larger basis. He contended that the farmers required, and were certainly entitled to, a very large measure of relief in the matter of land legislation. The Agricultural Holdings Act should be improved. He would also like to see the Hares and Rabbits Act extended to existing leases, and the remnants of the Law of Hypothec which were still in force abolished. But let them not be misled by arguments based upon the Law of Hypothec in relation to the question of large farms with 19 years' leases, for hypothec was injurious chiefly in respect to small holdings. He would further say that if the Government would bring in a measure dealing with agriculture to the general advantage of Scotland no one would rejoice more than himself. He did not believe that the tenant farmers of Scotland desired that the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire should be carried. He believed they were straightforward men, who knew perfectly well how to steer through the present difficulties. They were suffering greatly, and so were the landlords; but this proposed alteration was not an adequate cure. They must deal with the agricultural question as a whole; and it was impossible to deal with it in a debate on the Address, and upon a simple proposal as to 19 years' leases.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 96; Noes 198: Majority 102.

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Limerick, W.)
Balfour, Sir G.
Barclay, J. W.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, T.
Blane, A.
Bradlaugh, C.
Broadhurst, H.
Brown, A. L.
Burt, T.
Cameron, C.
Campbell, Sir G.
Campbell, H.
Carew, J. L.
Channing, F. A.
Clancy, J. J.
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Cobb, H. P.
Conybeare, C. A. V.
Cox, J. R.
Craig, J.
Crawford, W.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Ellis, J. E.
Esmonde, Sir T. H. G.
Fenwick, C.
Finucane, J.
Flynn, J. C.
Foley, P. J.
Fox, Dr. J. F.
Gilhooly, J.
Gill, T. P.
Graham, R. C.
Harrington, E.
Hayden, L. P.
Healy, M.
Holden, I.
Hooper, J.
Howell, G.
Hunter, W. A.
Jordan, J.
Kenny, C. S.
Labouchere, H.
Lane, W. J.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leahy, J.
Leake, R.
Lewis, T. P.
Mackintosh, C. F.
M'Cartan, M.
M'Donald, Dr. R.
M'Laren, W. S. B.
Mahony, P.
Marum, E. M.
Menzies, R. S.
Molloy, B. C.
Montagu, S.
Morgan, O. V.
Murphy, W. M.
Nolan, J.
O'Brien, J. F. X.
O'Brien, P.
O'Brien, P. J.
O'Connor, J. (Tippry.)
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Kelly, J.
Parnell, C. S.
Pickersgill, E. H.
Picton, J. A.
Pinkerton, J.
Power, P. J.
Price, T. P.
Provand, A. D.
Pyne, J. D.
Quinn, T.
Rowlands, J.
Rowlands, W. B.
Russell, E. R.
Russell, T. W.
Schwann, C. E.
Shaw, T.
Sheehan, J. D.
Sheil, E.
Sullivan, D.
Summers, W.
Sutherland, A.
Swinburne, Sir J.
Tuite, J.
Wallace, R.
Watt, H.
Wayman, T.
Will, J. S.
Williamson, S.
Wilson, H. J.
Woodhead, J.
Wright, C.

TELLERS.
Anderson, C. H.
Esslemont, P.

NOES.

Agg-Gardner, J. T.
Ainslie, W. G.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Baird, J. G. A.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, G. W.
Banes, Major G. E.
Barry, A. H. Smith-
Bartley, G. C. T.
Bates, Sir E.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Beckett, E. W.
Bentinck, W. G. C.
Beresford, Lord C. W. De la Poer
Bethell, Commander G. R.
Bigwood, J.
Birkbeck, Sir E.
Blundell, Col. H. B. H.
Bond, G. H.
Bonsor, H. C. O.
Bridgeman, Col. hon. F. C.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Bruce, Lord H.
Bruce, hon. R. P.
Burdett-Coutts, W. L. Ash.-B.
Burghley, Lord
Caldwell, J.
Campbell, Sir A.
Charrington, S.
Clarke, Sir E. G.
Cochrane-Baillie, hon. C. W. A. N.
Coddington, W.
Coghill, D. H.
Cohen, L. L.
Colomb, Capt. J. C. R.
Cooke, C. W. R.
Corry, Sir J. P.
Cross, H. S.
Cubitt, right hon. G.

Davenport, H. T.
Davenport, W. B.
Dawnay, Colonel hon. L. P.
De Cobain, E. S. W.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Dimsdale, Baron R.
Dixon, G.
Dorington, Sir J. E.
Dugdale, J. S.
Duncan, Colonel F.
Duncombe, A.
Dyke, rt. hn. Sir W. H.
Elcho, Lord
Elliot, hon. A. R D.
Elliot, hon. H. F. H.
Evelyn, W. J.
Ewing, Sir A. O.
Eyre, Colonel H.
Fellowes, W. H.
Fergusson, right hon. Sir J.
Field, Admiral E.
Fielden, T.
Finch, G. H.
Fisher, W. H.
Fitzgerald, R. U. P.
Fitz-Wygram, Gen. Sir F. W.
Folkestone, right hon. Viscount
Forwood, A. B.
Fowler, Sir R. N.
Fraser, General C. C.
Fulton, J. F.
Gedge, S.
Giles, A.
Gilliat, J. S.
Godson, A. F.
Goldsworthy, Major-General W. T.
Gorst, Sir J. E.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gray, C. W.
Grimston, Viscount
Gunter, Colonel R.
Gurdon, R. T.
Hall, C.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamley, General Sir E. B.
Hanbury, R. W.
Hankey, F. A.
Hardcastle, F.
Hartington, Marq. of
Heaton, J. H.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hermon-Hodge, R. T.
Hervey, Lord F.
Hill, right hon. Lord A. W.
Hill, Colonel E. S.
Hill, A. S.
Hoare, S.
Holland, rt. hon. Sir H. T.
Holmes, rt. hon. H.
Houldsworth, W. H.
Howard, J. M.
Howorth, H. H.
Hughes-Hallett, Col. F. C.
Hunt, F. S.
Hunter, Sir W. G.
Isaacs, L. H.
Isaacson, F. W.
Jackson, W. L.
James, rt. hon. Sir H.
Jennings, L. J.
Johnston, W.
Kelly, J. R.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.
Kerans, F. H.
Kimber, H.
King, H. S.
Knowles, L.
Lafone, A.
Lambert, I. C.
Laurie, Colonel R. P.
Lawrence, W. F.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Legh, T. W.
Leighton, S.
Lewisham, right hon. Viscount
Llewellyn, E. H.
Long, W. H.
Low, M.
Lowther, J. W.
Macartney, W. G. E.
Macdonald, rt. hon. J. H. A.
Maclure, J. W.
M'Calmont, Captain J.
Mallock, R.
Manners, right hon. Lord J. J. R.
Marriott, rt. hn. W. T.
Matthews, rt. hon. H.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Mayne, Adml. R. C,
Mills, hon. C. W.
Milvain, T.
Mount, W. G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. Sir J. R.
Mulholland, H. L.
Muntz, P. A.
Murdoch, C. T.
Noble, W.
Northcote, hon. H. S.
Norton, R.
O'Neill, hon. R. T.
Paget, Sir R. H.
Parker, hon. F.
Pearce, W.
Pelly, Sir L.
Penton, Captain F. T.
Plunket, right hon. D. R.
Plunkett, hon. J. W.
Pomfret, W. P.
Powell, F. S.
Puleston, J. H.
Raikes, rt. hon. H. C.
Reed, H. B.
Ritchie, rt. hon. C. T.
Robinson, B.
Russell, Sir G.
Sandys, Lt.-Col. T. M.
Selwyn, Captain C. W.
Seton-Karr, H.
Sidebotham, J. W.
Sidebottom, W.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Spencer, J. E.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Stanley, E. J.
Stewart, M. J.
Swetenham, E.
Tapling, T. K.
Taylor, F.
Temple, Sir R.
Thorburn, W.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Tottenham, A. L.
Townsend, F.
Vernon, hon. G. R.
Waring, Colonel T.
Webster, Sir R. E.
Webster, R. G.
White, J. B.
Whitley, E.
Wolmer, Viscount
Wood, N.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wright, H. S.
Yerburgh, R. A.

TELLERS.

Douglas, A. Akers-
Walrond, Col. W. H.

Main Question again proposed.

GREAT BRITAIN—LOCAL HOME RULE.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL (Kirkcaldy, &c.): I believe it is the feeling of the House that the debate on the Address should not be prolonged; and therefore, in moving the Amendment which I have placed upon the Paper, I will only briefly explain its object. I should certainly not have placed it on the Paper if I had thought that the Government were likely to bring in any measure which would grapple with the difficulty I propose to deal with. And I may remind hon. Members that if I were to waive the present opportunity I should find it almost impossible to secure a day for its full discussion. My Amendment is couched in the following terms:—

> "But humbly to submit to Her Majesty that the affairs of the Realm have outgrown the capacity of this House; and humbly to pray of Her Majesty to invite Her Majesty's Ministers to consider and submit to Parliament Measures whereby great part of the special affairs of Scotland and of other parts of Great Britain may be relegated to bodies representing the several parts of the Kingdom, and the excessive burden on this House may be relieved."

I think, regarding the first sentence, there will be a general concurrence of opinion. It is quite manifest that it is impossible for a House of 670 Members to perform properly the whole of the Business it now undertakes, including an examination into all the minute details of four Kingdoms, and also the threshing out in Committee of every one of the measures submitted to it. The Business of the country which necessarily comes before Parliament is growing largely from year to year. We had, I think, sufficient evidence of that on the first night of the Session in the extraordinary number of Bills of the introduction of which into this House

Notice was given. The capacity of the House is totally unequal to undertake the whole of the Business brought before it. The Business of the Realm has outgrown the capacity of Parliament to grapple with it. I think that is a point which will be very generally admitted, and also that the time has arrived when some attempt should be made to provide a remedy. When we come to the question of the remedy, I admit that there are very great differences of opinion. I began by saying that if I saw any reason to hope that the Government would be able to deal with the question satisfactorily, I should be willingly prepared to leave it in their hands; but I see no evidence that they are prepared to cope with it. In the course of a private meeting one Scotch Member expressed a strong opinion that the time is inopportune for dealing with the question, because the proposals which Her Majesty's Government may have to make in regard to it are as yet unknown. But I entirely fail to find that the Government have any serious remedy to propose for the incapacity of Parliament to deal with the affairs submitted to it. If the proposed New Rules would increase the working power of the House, I should not have submitted this Amendment; but although those Rules may improve the Procedure of the House, they are not Rules that will increase the working power of the House. On the contrary, I believe they may have, so far as Scotch Business is concerned, a prejudicial influence, and that we shall have no prospect whatever of pressing Scotch measures forward, seeing that at the present moment it is a matter of difficulty to get them considered, even at 3 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to discuss the Rules of Procedure on this Amendment.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL: I must apologize for having infringed the Rules of the House; but perhaps I may be allowed to submit that the Rules of Procedure are not likely to provide a remedy for the special grievance of which I complain. What I desire is to see removed from the House, as a whole, a large amount of the Business it is now called upon to perform, and to proceed in the direction of handing it over to Bodies constituted on local lines. As I gather that you, Sir, would not permit me to go further into this matter, I will content myself with submitting, in the terms of the Amendment, that the excessive burden on this House should be relieved by relegating measures immediately concerning the special affairs of Scotland, and of other parts of Great Britain, to Bodies representing the several parts of the Kingdom. I have made the Motion in general terms, so that it does not require any hon. Member to pledge himself to any particular plan. Some prefer Committees, some local Legislatures. All I desire to affirm is the general principle that measures of the kind shouldbe submitted to some Bodies other than this House. I propose that the work shall be done by delegation—not a general delegation, but a delegation purely on local lines. It has been suggested that many questions might be submitted to Grand Committees. Now, I have had some experience of the working of a Grand Committee in a former Parliament; and I am satisfied, as the result of that experience, that if you submit Scotch Law Bills to a Grand Committee, in which Scotch Members are necessarily in a minority, they will be overridden by the English Members, and especially by English lawyers, who have no acquaintance with the principles of Scotch law, but who, of all persons, in regard to legal questions are most superstitious. Scotch laws, and especially Scotch Criminal Laws, are radically different from English laws; and I claim as a Scotchman, on the part of Scotland, that in order to do justice to my country the delegation should not be a general delegation, but should be carried out on local lines; otherwise the smaller nationalities of the United Kingdom must go to the wall. Scotchmen are, I should say, almost unanimous in not wishing to have for Scotland the kind of local government which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) proposed for Ireland. The Government of Ireland Bill excluded Ireland from all part in Imperial affairs; and although that was accepted by the Irish Representatives in the case of Ireland, Scotland has no wish to be cut off from the Imperial affairs of the country, and to be converted into a Colony. There is a strong feeling in Scotland that local government of that kind would not be suitable for the country. I have no desire to assimilate Scotland to the system of Home Rule which appears to be desired in Ireland. Therefore, I have so framed the Amendment as to be entirely neutral in regard to the whole subject of Ireland, and have confined it in general terms to the affairs of Scotland and other parts of Great Britain. I should have included Wales; but while I incline to believe that the people of the Principality wish that something should be done for them, they have not given me authority to speak on their behalf. I should have also liked to include the Metropolitan area as one of the areas in respect of which it is desirable that there should be some local Government possessing some power of legislation. But when I proposed that to the Scotch Members, they certainly expressed a strong feeling that the affairs of Scotland should not be put on the same footing as those of the Metropolitan area. Although I am a Scotch Member, I am also a resident of London, and I certainly entertain a strong opinion that there should be some delegation of the special affairs of London, as a whole, to a Body representing London. Many think that the Kingdom of Scotland is greater than the Metropolitan area. On the principle, however, that the population of the Metropolitan area is quite equal to that of Scotland, that the wealth of the Metropolitan area is probably much greater than that of Scotland—although the intelligence of the Metropolitan area is behind that of Scotland—and also on the principle that Scotchmen are largely represented in London, and assist very largely in levelling up its intelligence, I think I am not far wrong in comparing its demand for local government with the similar demand of Scotland. As a Scotchman, I have a selfish object in desiring to see a good representative Local Body for London. It is the capital of the Empire, and I do not see that Scotch Members abandon their country when they come to reside here; they only come up to the capital of their country. Therefore, as a Scotchman resident in London, I am anxious to see something in the nature of local government for London. Whatever the character of that local government may be, I should like to see it go further than a mere Municipality. I should like to see the Local Body possessed of some powers to deal with gas, and water, and similar questions. It would be almost a disgrace for the Metropolitan population to be ruled by a body that possesses nothing more than the ordinary powers of a Municipal Body. Of late years the tendency of Parliament has been towards centralization, to be jealous of local municipal authority, and to take away from the town and city municipalities of the country the power of local legislation by bye-laws. As an instance, the House will allow me to refer to the bulky Bill introduced into Parliament last year—the Burghs Bill—for Scotch Municipal Government, by which it was proposed, practically, to take away the local powers which the cities and towns of the country have hitherto possessed in reference to local affairs. I want to reverse the centralizing tendency of recent times, and to give all the cities of the Kingdom very considerable powers of local regulation; still more where you have to deal with some 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 people, such as you have in the Metropolitan area. My proposal is, in no degree, antagonistic to that of giving power to local areas to manage their own affairs. On the contrary, where I wish to see this system of Provincial government, I trust that it will be carried farther upon the same system. I should like to see this delegation of local government carried out on something like the American principle—first, delegation to the great Provinces; then within the Provincial areas there should be a delegation to municipalities in the Provinces, by which we would be able to secure a complete and ascending series of Bodies from the smaller to the greater. I feel that it would be impossible to hope that any practical result would follow my Motion at the present moment; but, at the same time, I think it is desirable that the subject should be ventilated, and the ground prepared for those practical plans which may be submitted hereafter. A great representative meeting of the Liberal Associations of Scotland met the other day in Edinburgh, and unanimously passed a resolution to the effect that they considered the time had come when a measure of Home Rule for Scotland should be pressed on and passed by the Imperial Parliament. This demand, as I have already pointed out, is not in the sense of Home Rule for Ireland; but simply a demand for the delegation of some of the powers of Parliament to a Local Body representing Scotland, so as to deal with the affairs of Scotland more efficiently than hitherto. Under present conditions we get no legislation for Scotland beyond one or two Bills in the course of a Session. We get, generally, no legislation at all, or scamped legislation, which we are obliged to take as the Lord Advocate is pleased to give it to us, and frequently without the healthy discussion which it would have received if there had been some kind of local legislation. I think there is a pretty general consensus of opinion in Scotland that the work of the country has outgrown the capacity of this House; that something should be done by way of delegation; and that the delegation should take a local form. I beg to move the Amendment I have placed upon the Paper.

Mr. FRASER-MACKINTOSH (Inverness-shire) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the 12th paragraph, to insert the words—"But humbly to submit to Her Majesty that the affairs of the Realm have out-grown the capacity of this House; and humbly to pray of Her Majesty to invite Her Majesty's Ministers to consider and submit to Parliament Measures whereby great part of the special affairs of Scotland, and of other parts of Great Britain may be relegated to bodies representing the several parts of the Kingdom, and the excessive burden on this House may be relieved."—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Dr. CAMERON (Glasgow, College Division): I should not like the debate to conclude without saying a word upon the Amendment moved by my hon. Friend (Sir George Campbell). My hon. Friend was careful to confine himself to the expression of a very moderate desire on the part of the Scotch people in favour of a more direct control over their own local legislation. As a matter of fact, I think he was a good deal too guarded. No one can be ignorant that there is an immense and rapidly growing feeling in favour of Home Rule in Scotland, and there is no mystery as to how that feeling has been developed. The fact is, that the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) has been extensively canvassed and thought upon, and the people, having considered its details, have come, in greater and greater numbers, to think that those details are applicable to the cases of other nationalities in the United Kingdom. [*Cries of* "No!" *from the Ministerial Benches.*] All I can say is, that in public meetings in Scotland every allusion in favour of Home Rule for that country is now rapturously cheered; and the reason is that the subject of Home Rule has been brought home to the people by the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian. The feeling in favour of Home Rule in Scotland goes very much further than my hon. Friend imagines; and it is felt by the people that what is wanted is a system very much on the lines of the measure proposed by the late Prime Minister for Ireland. They are anxious to see a separate Administration for Scotland. ["Oh, oh!"] That, at any rate, is my opinion, and I believe the Motion of my hon. Friend will have a valuable effect in educating this House to a knowledge of what is undoubtedly the growing feeling of the people of Scotland. I am speaking of that which I know; and I venture to say that at the next General Election the question of Home Rule for Scotland will be a test question. [*Cries of* "No!"] You may agree with the proposition or not; but I think it is desirable that Her Majesty's Ministers in this House should know what the state of public opinion in Scotland is upon the subject. I may say, further, that another reason which has led a large number of the people of Scotland, and which is leading them now to view favourably a proposal for Scotland similar to that which the late Prime Minister made with regard to Ireland, is this—that it appears to them the adoption of such a system in regard to other portions of the United Kingdom would immensely facilitate the working of the Irish scheme. One of the objections which have been urged against the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian for Ireland would never be urged against any proposal for giving Home Rule to Scotland. When the right hon. Gentleman brought forward his Irish measure, it was strongly objected that it would divide the United Kingdom and lead to a virtual breaking up of the Union, and it was boldly asserted that that was the idea which prevailed in the minds of the Irish Members. No such assertion can be made with regard to Scotland, and Scotland has as fair a claim for Home Rule as could be made for Ireland. The Scottish people are rapidly adopting the opinion that next to nothing will be done for Scotland in the shape of legislation until she receives some such measure of Home Rule as that which has been proposed for Ireland. Although the idea appears to be regarded somewhat contemptuously, it is an undoubted fact that within a recent period the question of Home Rule has come to the front in Scotland, and that there is now a genuine Home Rule movement there. Therefore, I think my hon. Friend, in submitting a proposition to the House which will facilitate the consideration of the question, is deserving of the thanks of the House, and I hope that, at any rate, the step my hon. Friend has taken will have the effect of convincing the House that the subject is one which is engaging the attention of the people of Scotland. The Scottish people know, at the present moment, that they are overtaxed, and that the questions which are of primary interest to Scotland are receiving a very small amount of legislative attention. My hon. Friend has told hon. Members that there is a superstition in connection with Scottish legislation in this House. That the Representatives of Scotland are always able to get what they want the moment they make up their minds what it is to be. Unfortunately, it is impossible always to ensure unanimity, and, owing to the paucity of legislation, and the scant attention otherwise which Scotland received at the hands of Parliament under existing arrangements, there is a strong feeling rapidly developing itself in that country in favour of Home Rule.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.): I rise to support the Amendment of the hon. Member (Sir George Campbell); but, in doing so, I must express some surprise and sense of disappointment. I felt very much disappointed with the speech of the hon. Member. When I saw his Amendment on the Paper, I thought that he intended to propose a large and comprehensive scheme; but in his speech he so whittled down the scope and area of the Motion that if he had gone on much further we should have required a powerful microscope to find out the part of the United Kingdom to which it was to apply. Not only was the area the Motion was to cover diminished by the hon. Member, but the power of the local self-government he proposed was so diminished that it seemed to me it would amount to nothing before he had done. It has always been the wish of the Party to which I have the honour to belong to relieve this House of many of its multifarious duties, and I support the Motion of the hon. Member, because I think it should be the policy of that Party to support every Motion going in that direction. We should do so not only for the sake of the country that we represent, but also for our own sakes individually; because we have to sit up here night after night as men who attend diligently to the Parliamentary work which they have in hand. We are obliged to sit up here night after night until a very late hour in order to get Irish Business passed—in order, indeed, to get Irish Business considered, and to aid and assist that Government in passing the Estimates which are necessary to carry on the Irish Government. Not only is it necessary that we should stay here until a very late hour at night to attend to Irish Business, but it very often happens that we sit up here late in order to pass Radical measures when the pronounced Radicals themselves are at home sleeping in their beds. Nay, we have often sat up here night after night to oblige Scotch Members, in order to pass Scotch Business, when many Liberal Scotch Members are at home and asleep. We, I hold, are the only true Liberal or Radical self-sacrificing Members of this House. We have sacrificed our own comfort in this Parliament for the sake of advancing the Business of Irish, Scotch, and English Radicals. I think, therefore, there is very good reason why we should wish to see the Business of this House distributed in such a way that it would be unnecessary for us to perform these self-sacrificing duties. But, Sir, I would take a higher ground than that. Personally, I have a great regard for this Parliament. I believe no man who has studied the history of this Parliament, the great amount of work it has accomplished, its struggles for liberty, its splendid machinery, but must have a high regard for it. Anything that would restore to it its ancient efficiency would certainly have the support of the

Party to which I belong. In that spirit, Sir, I support this Motion. This Parliament is a model which has been followed by all the Parliaments of every free people in the world. All the Parliaments of your Colonies have been modelled after the fashion of the Parliament of this country, and the old countries of Europe, when they have changed their institutions, have followed the example of this Parliament. The great American Republic, when it won its freedom, looked to this Parliament as the model for its institutions; and when I take all these things into account, my respect for this institution is increased, and my desire for its efficiency is also multiplied. We have heard a great deal during the past few days about obstruction to Business—about the difficulty of reaching the business stage of this Parliament. But what is the real reason for the delay which occurs? Why it is the great tendency that the world is showing for more talk. It is not this House alone that is hampered by that tendency. If the labours and the work of other governmental institutions in Europe and America are studied by Members of this House, they will find that it is with the greatest difficulty, and with daily-increasing difficulty, that the several Governments of these countries are able to carry out their business, except where their power is limited. Why, Sir, I was speaking to a gentleman last year who occupied at one time the Office of Prime Minister in the Government of Nova Scotia, and was at the same time Attorney General, and he told me a most extraordinary story. It was this—his Parliament consists of 28 Members, and there is connected with it a House of Lords which numbers, I think, 12 Members. Well, there was a most important matter before this very extraordinary House of Commons, consisting of 28 Members, and they debated the subject for two days and two nights, through Sunday morning and into the middle of the Sunday, and when the debate was concluded the Speaker put the Question. One Member of the House got up and protested against that course, stating that as it was Sunday Parliament could pass no law; but the Prime Minister rose and said that the Bill should be passed, and then if the question as to its legality were brought before him as Attorney General, he would decide it. Now, is it not extraordinary that in this small Parliament of Nova Scotia, consisting of only some 28 Members, a debate should have gone on for such a length of time? But does it not teach us a lesson? Does not the story carry its moral, and ought it not to teach hon. Members the necessity of agreeing to some such Motion as that of the hon. Member's (Sir George Campbell)? At all events, it proves my proposition that the tendency of the world is towards more talk, and that, therefore, the Members of this Legislature ought not to complain of the talk which goes on here. We have heard to-night a good deal about Scotch Home Rule. I wish the Members who represent Scotland would only show their earnest desire for Home Rule. From the Front Bench opposite last year it was held out to them by the late Prime Minister (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), that if the Scotch people would only indicate their desire for Home Rule, this Parliament and the people of this Kingdom would begin to consider the question. But whilst these differences exist amongst the Scotch people—["No, no!"]—well, I mean the differences referred to by the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), and those differences exhibited in this House this evening—whilst they exist the Scotch people will never come within a long distance of Home Rule. When Scotland asks for it, Scotland will have the support of hon. Members from Ireland. But a more serious question arises than Scotch Home Rule, and that is English Home Rule. For some time past I have been going up and down this country, and I have observed a growing desire on the part of Englishmen to see their business attended to in the House of Commons. The desire for English Home Rule is growing gradually, but surely, and that desire can only be gratified by this House agreeing to some measure of a larger and more comprehensive character than that proposed by the hon. Gentleman to-night. I began my observations by saying that it was the desire of the Party with which I act to see the labours of this House properly divided. I believe that it will soon be the aim and object of Members representing all parts of the United Kingdom to bring about that division of labour which will enable this House to continue the career which has been so glorious in the past, and which, I believe, will be glorious in the future.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): I do not know that many words are required from me or from the Government on this occasion. I cannot agree with the hon. Gentleman the Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) that the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) is well advised in bringing this Motion on. He can hardly have supposed himself that it could or would receive serious discussion on such an occasion, and the speech in which he advocated his proposal was certainly not of the kind to induce the House of Commons seriously to consider it. What object he can have gained I do not know. Whether he thinks—to use his own poetic phrase—he has well manured the ground by what he has said, I do not know, but I certainly think that, on consideration, he will agree with me that to expect this House seriously to consider at 12 o'clock at night on the 13th day of the Address the re-establishment of the Heptarchy in this Kingdom is to expect a great deal too much. Sir, the system that the hon. Gentleman wants to destroy has been, so far as England and Scotland are concerned, in operation to the general contentment of all parties, for 180 years; and, so far as Great Britain and Ireland are concerned, for the past 80 years. [Several Irish Members: Contentment! Oh, oh!] I grant that during the last few years the pressure of business in this House has become so great that all Governments from whatever side of the House they are drawn, and all Parties on whichever side of the House they sit, have turned their minds to devising some plan by which their labours can be diminished, but the hon. Gentleman himself in laying his scheme before us has not explained in the smallest degree what subjects these Bodies that he is going to establish are going to deal with, nor does he explain to us how the labours of Parliament are going to be relieved by the adoption of his proposal; and surely before the hon. Gentleman destroys a system of such antiquity, and which has been for so long the admiration of the world, he ought at all events to see whether the temporary evil we have suffered from for the past few years cannot be in some degree remedied, and will not be to a certain extent mitigated by the measures which Her Majesty's Government have announced that they intend to propose. Now there are in all four Measures mentioned in the Queen's Speech which have either some direct bearing upon the government of Scotland, or some direct relation to the relief of the pressure of business in the House. To begin with, there is the Bill for altering the position of the Scotch Secretary. Then there are the new Rules of Procedure. [*A laugh.*] I heard some hon. Member opposite laugh. At all events, I would suggest to him and his friends that probably the new Rules will be found not inadequate to meet the particular evil which the hon. Gentleman who last spoke particularly alluded to—an undue flux of talk, which he seems to think is a disease that attacks all modern Representative Institutions. Then there is the Local Government Bill, and finally, there is the Measure by which it is proposed to amend the system by which Private Bill Legislation is at present conducted. At least three of these Measures are directly concerned with remedying the evils to which the hon. Gentleman (Sir G. Campbell) called attention. So far as one could gather from the discursive and sometimes inaudible remarks the hon. Gentleman offered us, these measures are far more calculated to carry out the object he has in view than the proposal he himself submits. I admit that in criticizing his plan I am under the difficulty that I do not understand exactly what it is. I believe he proposes to hand over the affairs of Scotland to a Scotch Local Assembly, but that is only a small fractional part of the hon. Gentleman's scheme. He also wants to give Home Rule to London; he also wants to give Home Rule to Wales—[An hon. MEMBER: And to Yorkshire!]—an hon. Member suggests that he would also give Home Rule to Yorkshire, and I certainly would put in a plea for Cornwall, which differs in the origin and character of its population from the rest of the United Kingdom quite as much as those parts to which the hon. Member alluded. But the hon. Gentleman who has thus carved out his native country into these fractional divisions has not told us what these fractional divisions are to deal with when carved out, what these Local Legislatures are to do when created. Are they to deal with purely local parochial matters in a purely local parochial manner, or are they to deal with those larger questions of policy to which we in this House are accustomed to apply ourselves?

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL (Kirkcaldy, &c.): They will deal with the special affairs of Scotland.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: But what are the special affairs of Scotland? What are the special affairs of Wales, what are the special affairs of London, what are the special affairs of Yorkshire, of Cornwall? That is precisely what I want to know. Are they only strictly speaking local affairs or are they larger affairs of policy? If they are strictly local affairs then I think the demand the hon. Gentleman has made will be adequately met by the Local Government Bill the Government mean to bring forward, but if they are the larger questions of policy, such, for instance, as the Church of the land—[Sir George Campbell: "Hear, hear!"] Then the hon. Gentleman seriously comes down to this House and asks us in all gravity to pass a series of Measures by which London is to decide whether it is to have a National Church for itself or not, whether it is to have a separate Land Act for itself or not, or what the position of its landlords is to be. He asks this historic Assembly to consider seriously so wild and insane a proposal as that. The hon. Gentleman will forgive me for saying that the commentary he has just made by way of interruption to my speech is clearly a reason why we should entirely refrain from any further serious consideration to the proposal he has made. If there were no other reason for the advice I now give the House, I should find a reason for it in a sentence that fell from the hon. Gentleman himself. He informed us with that naïve candour peculiar to himself that if his Amendment were passed it would bind no one who voted for it to any particular Measure. Well, I believe this House will refrain from passing an abstract Resolution which binds no one who votes for it to anything in particular. I do not know what the hon. Gentleman thinks, but I am sure the House will agree with me that anything so venerable as the Constitution of this country ought not to be tampered with in a light spirit—that if we approach it to introduce changes, we should do so seriously with our proposals carefully considered, with the details of our proposals carefully marked out, and with all the difficulties which must ensue from a large change carefully weighed and balanced. The hon. Gentleman has done none of these things. We do not know from him what the relation is to be between these Local Bodies and the Imperial Parliament or how the powers of the Local Bodies are to be limited. When we are told that the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman will bind no one who votes for it to any particular Measure, I think I have given sufficient reason to the House why, at this stage of our proceedings, we need no longer consider the proposal which the hon. Gentleman, in this somewhat incoherent form, has laid before the House.

Mr. E. HARRINGTON (Kerry, W.) [*Loud cries of* "Divide!"]: I am afraid it is rather early in the Session for hon. Gentlemen opposite to practise this species of discourtesy. Besides, this is a Scotch question, and interruption of this kind is rarely practised on such occasions. I was a good deal struck by the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, and also surprised at the heat he infused into the discussion. ["No, no!"] Yes, it is undoubtedly evidence of a heated frame of mind to describe a proposal brought forward by so modest and moderate a Member as the hon. Gentleman the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) as an "insane" proposal. I am rather afraid that these epithets are too strong so early in the Session. If such insinuations are indulged in I very much fear that the progress we shall make with legislation will not be very great. Now, this Amendment is not one that should excite the ire of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. It really should not ruffle the feathers of the Minister for Scotland to suggest that his native land should have given to it a special opportunity for performing those functions which, by the common consent of those who have studied the history of Scotland, Scotchmen have from time to time evinced a special aptitude to discharge. The words of the Amendment, I think, claim for themselves a peculiar style of obeisance which should have calmed the wrath of the right hon. Gentleman. The second word of the Amendment is "humbly." Its phrases are thoroughly Parliamentary, and when we see before us an Amendment couched in such language as that we are compelled to draw a comparison between it and the speech of the Representative of the Government, largely to the advantage of the former. The Amendment read—

> "But humbly to submit to Her Majesty that the affairs of the Realm have outgrown the capacity of this House."

[*Cries of* "Divide!"] There is one inherent capacity in the House still, and that is the capacity of English Members to continually cry "Divide," in order to interrupt hon. Gentlemen who do not agree with them in politics when they are endeavouring to state their views. The Amendment goes on to say—

> "and humbly to pray of Her Majesty to invite Her Majesty's Ministers to consider and submit to Parliament measures whereby great part of the special affairs of Scotland and of other parts of Great Britain may be relegated to bodies representing the several parts of the Kingdom, and the excessive burden on this House may be relieved."

The right hon. Gentleman asked whether the Mover of the Amendment would allow these delegated bodies to have cognizance of such matters as Church affairs. I say "Why not?" The Scotch people already have special legislation on that subject. In this House we have had instances of it. I remember a whole Wednesday being devoted to the discussion of the Scotch Church by Scotch Members. I remember the day particularly because it was the day of our National festival. The whole of last St. Patrick's Day was occupied with the Question of the Church of Scotland in this House, and I do not think it too much to say in the spirit of this Amendment that we should delegate legislation on such a subject as that from this House—and I am speaking in an imperial and not in a local sense—to the Scotch Members. It is for the Scotch Members to say whether they should or should not maintain their Kirk as a State Institution. As I say, the subject was discussed here, and occupied the whole of a Wednesday sitting; but nothing came of it, and I do not think it is pressing the argument too far to say that the subject might have been as profitably discussed by a Scotch Assembly in Edinburgh as it was in the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. The right hon. Gentleman objects to our entering into the discussion of an Amendment of this kind at 12 o'clock at night; but I would say, with all respect to the House, that we have often addressed ourselves to more trivial matters than are contained in this Amendment long after 12 o'clock at night. The right hon. Gentleman says, further, forsooth, that, seeing that England and Scotland have carried on the existing arrangement for 180 years, therefore it is absurd to disturb it at the present time. There it is: the old policy of the Tory Party—stupid stagnation. Because a thing has existed for some length of time, it must remain for ever. That is the motto of the Tory Party. The Legislative Union between England and Scotland has existed for 180 years, therefore, it must not only be maintained, but sustained in every particular, and cannot be at all modified. But let the right hon. Gentleman who argues thus, just for a moment recollect that, though the union between England and Scotland has existed for 180 years, really, in this House, you have given Scotland Home Rule all the time. On great Scotch Questions, you always consult the Scotch Members. You do not divide them into two—you take both sides into your consultation. You examine, as far as possible, into what are their views on matters which are to come forward for legislation. That practice has existed for 180 years; and it appears to me that the Amendment of the hon. Member (Sir George Campbell) really means no more than to continue it. The hon. Gentleman proposes that you should give that practice which has so long existed in your Constitution a more formal methodical recognition by delegating primarily to the Scotch people certain Scotch Business which they could as sensibly, as effectually, and as practically transact in Scotland as you can transact it here. The Motion of the hon. Member was also met by the right hon. Gentleman with the announcement that there were four Measures adumbrated or foreshadowed in the Queen's Speech, which remotely, or intimately, or materially, one way or another, affects Scotland, or, if not Scotland, the United Kingdom. I believe I am fairly paraphrasing the remarks of the right hon.

Gentleman. It is because four measures are foreshadowed in the Queen's Speech that the people of Scotland are not to raise their voice, and they are not to approach Parliament on this question. I think, Sir, that is a very broad argument. If it were to be maintained, the result would be that a Ministry with a barren policy—any Ministry who felt their own incapacity—might come down to the House with a programme charged with four adumbrated measures that could never come into the domains of practical legislation. We have here, Sir, the whole argument which from time to time is put forward, not only in this case, but against us. I will not refer, in this debate, to the arguments advanced a few nights ago; but I say that this seems to be the stock-in-trade argument of hon. Gentlemen opposite and when once raised on the Treasury Bench it is re-echoed in melancholy monotony which seems to indicate the barrenness of intellect and argument for which the Tory Party is conspicuous. The argument opposed to the demand for Home Rule for Ireland and Scotland is the same always—"Will you re-establish the Heptarchy?" Why not? I say that if it suits the people of Great Britain we should re-establish it. After all, what is a system of local government but a modern translation of the Heptarchy? I doubt very much whether hon. Members opposite who so glibly use this argument in order to discredit the appeals made for this legislation, thoroughly understand how far it takes them—["Oh, oh!"]—because if they do, and the peculiar circumstances of Scotland and Wales require peculiar treatment in this House, or a special delegation of powers, why do they deny it to them? Let us take a practical issue, and suppose a deputation of Welshmen or Highlanders who could only speak their native tongue were to come as a deputation to the Ministry; and suppose for a moment that the right hon. Gentleman who represents the Scotch Department in this House, and who has spoken to-night with such an air of self-confidence as much as to say—"When I ope my mouth let no dog bark——"

Mr. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the House to the continued irrelevance on the part of the hon. Member, and direct him to discontinue his speech.

Mr. HUNTER (Aberdeen, N.): I agree, Sir, with one statement, and with one only, which has fallen from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour)—namely, that the present is not the time for discussing so important a subject as a measure of Home Rule for Scotland; and I will go farther and say that this is hardly the occasion on which it ought to be discussed. This is a Motion which proposes that a great part of the affairs of Scotland should be relegated to a Scotch Parliament. It does not say what part; so that a more indefinite Motion could hardly be brought before us; but, at the same time, I warn the right hon. Gentleman that in demolishing the arguments of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) he has by no means silenced or got rid of the question of Home Rule for Scotland. I believe that I am interpreting the sentiments of the Scotch Members when I say that on the present occasion is not one on which this subject can be adequately discussed, and I do not myself intend to discuss it this evening; but for the information of the right hon. Gentleman I wish to say that the question of Home Rule is one which has been attracting the very serious consideration of the people of Scotland. I have never in my lifetime known a political question that has advanced with such rapid strides as this has done. I am met by my own constituents with this argument—that if what I say with regard to Ireland is true, it is still more true with regard to Scotland. As far as my constituents are concerned, the general body of them have said that they felt the time had come when a measure of Home Rule for Scotland should be passed—a measure which would give to Scotland a Legislative Assembly of its own, which should have control of the Executive. Since the introduction of the Bill of the late Government, I have met many constituencies in various parts of Scotland—in Edinburgh, Galashiels, and Dundee, where enthusiastic meetings have been held, in which resolutions in favour of a measure of this kind have been unanimously passed. We do not mean by Home Rule for Scotland, anything that would diminish or destroy the Imperial Union of the two countries. So far as Imperial affairs are concerned the Union between Scotland and England has been, as the right hon. Gentleman had said, an unqualified success; but so far as legislation specifically affecting Scotland is concerned, it is the opinion of the Scottish people that its success has not not been unqualified. It is the opinion that the special business of Scotland has been neglected and that it is now largely in arrear. I make these observations, Sir, in order to warn the right hon. Gentleman not to imagine that this question has died. He will hear of it again, and under circumstances which I hope will afford a more favourable opportunity for discussion.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL (Kirkcaldy, &c.): Sir, I brought forward this Motion at a late hour with the assent of the right hon. Gentleman opposite solely with the view of saving the time of the House. I merely wished to give notice that this question is one which hon. Members for Scotland regard as serious and one which is coming to the front, as well as to elicit the views of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland upon it, of which the people of Scotland will now be able to judge. Having done so, I will now ask permission to withdraw my Motion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question again proposed.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Dr. Cameron.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

——o——

METROPOLIS MANAGEMENT ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2 BILL).

On Motion of Mr. Octavius Morgan, Bill to amend the Metropolis Management Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Octavius Morgan, Mr. Gilliat, and Mr. Kimber.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 166.]

ALLOTMENTS AND COTTAGE GARDENS COMPENSATION BILL.

On Motion of Sir Edward Birkbeck, Bill to provide compensation to the occupiers of Allotments and Cottage Gardens for crops left in the ground at the end of their tenancies, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir Edward Birkbeck, Mr. Finch-Hatton, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Gurdon, Viscount Curzon, Sir Savile Crossley, and Mr. Norton.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 167.]

House adjourned at twenty minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 15th February, 1887.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Church Sites (Compulsory Powers Repeal) * (22).

Second Reading—Glebe Lands (16).

GLEBE LANDS BILL.—(No. 16.)

(*The Viscount Cross.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Viscount Cross.*)

THE EARL OF POWIS objected to the individual trustees, as involving expense and trouble of renewal. He did not see why property now held by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners or Queen Anne's Bounty should not continue vested in them when re-invested, though the sale might be conducted by the Land Commissioners.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, he did not rise for the purpose of offering any opposition to the second reading. On the contrary, he sympathized with the object of the Bill; and he earnestly hoped that the Bill would become law, as nothing could be worse than the present position of the law respecting glebe lands. He, however, took the opportunity of reminding his noble Friend opposite (Viscount Cross) that, under the Act constituting sanitary authorities in rural districts, they were authorized to appoint a Committee which might exercise all the powers of the Board; and he doubted whether it would be satisfactory or safe that a Committee so appointed should be entrusted with the carrying out of the provisions of the Bill relating to allotments for labourers. As for the proposed County Authorities to whom the powers given by the Bill to Sanitary Authorities were to be transferred, he was not sanguine that an Act creating new County Authorities would be passed in this Session of Parliament. Even if such an Act were passed, he also doubted whether a new Central Authority would be a convenient body for exercising the powers to be given by the Bill. He did not think it would have the local knowledge of the persons to be benefited, which would enable it to judge what it was expedient and desirable to do in the matter of allotments; but perhaps this difficulty might be overcome by its delegating the duty to local Committees.

EARL STANHOPE thought the House would gladly accept this measure as a means of facilitating the sale of glebes. At the present moment of extreme agricultural depression, it was impossible for incumbents in many cases either to let, or sell their glebes, and all this time tithes were much depreciated. His noble friend the Secretary of State for India had stated, when introducing this Bill, that the two chief objects to be attained were cheapening of sale, and rendering the operation of sale more expeditious. As regards the first point, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners under the Ecclesiastical Leasing Act had sold many glebes since the powers had been conferred upon them, and at a low rate so far as their own solicitors' charges were concerned; but he (Earl Stanhope) despaired of seeing cheap transfer of land so long as the present cumbrous and complicated system of conveyancing continued. He thought the only remedy, which he hoped to see law some day, was compulsory registration of land. As regards speedy and expeditious sales, this would depend upon the rules laid down (under Clause 13) by the Land Commissioners. He was glad that the noble Viscount had introduced a clause that sales only should be sanctioned which would be for the future benefit of the living; otherwise we should have all impecunious parsons selling their glebes when we were, he hoped, at the bottom of the hill of agricultural depression. Believing that this Bill would be a relief to the clergy, he earnestly trusted the House would accord it a second reading.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW said, that the Bill was another step in the reform of the Land Laws, which had been mainly promoted by the Conservatives, having been initiated by the Settled Land Act which the late Earl Cairns succeeded in passing when he was in Opposition, an Act which enabled the owners of entailed estates to deal with them, precisely as if they were the owners of the fee simple. The Bill would remove another disability which interfered with the transfer of land, because it would enable the owners of glebes to sell as freely as laymen could sell. If the edifice of Land Law Reform should be crowned by the passing of the measure to be introduced by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack (Lord Halsbury), to enable all lands to be transferred cheaply, readily, and quickly, not only would the difficulty pointed out by the noble Earl near him (the Earl of Stanhope) disappear, but these reforms would remove the popular prejudice which existed in the minds of many persons that landlords were interested in maintaining an antiquated system of land tenure, in order to prevent the mass of their countrymen from having a share in that particular form of property from which most of their Lordships derived their income—the possession of land. He (The Earl of Onslow) did not think that the Conservative Party ever intended that this measure should be the only one to remove the alleged want of allotments. When the Conservative Party was last in Office, the statement was distinctly made that it was intended to embody in a County Government Bill, clauses dealing with the provision of allotments for labourers; and from the Speech from the Throne, it would be seen that it was the intention of the Government in the present Session to introduce a separate Bill dealing with allotments. He congratulated the noble Viscount (Viscount Cross) upon the improvement in this Bill, as compared with its Predecessor introduced in the other House last Session. It was proposed in the Bill of last Session, that the local authority to acquire land and sublet it in allotments should be the Board of Guardians; but he did not think that it would have been wise to entrust to such bodies the delicate and difficult duties of landlord to working men. The sanitary authority, moreover, proposed in the present Bill was in rural districts, only the Board of Guardians with another name; but he was glad to observe that the noble Viscount had gone a step further, and that the powers proposed to be acquired, and which were to be exercised by the rural or urban sanitary authority, should be handed over to the new County Authorities when elected. At present, he was satisfied that there was nobody exercising authority in the counties which commanded the confidence of the labourers.

Although it was possible that the County Authorities of the future would not be able collectively to deal with local allotments, they would be able to depute to local committees the duty of inquiring into local circumstances and making due provision for allotments. Their Lordships would remember that there was great anxiety as to the manner in which the agricultural labourers would exercise the vote, in the event of a momentous crisis arising. Well, such a crisis did arise in connection with the separation of the Empire, and the new electors had proved that they were not less to be trusted than the old. If they had trusted the agricultural labourers with the vote for the Imperial Parliament, why should they not be allowed a voice in the management of their own local affairs? There were, at present, a great variety of allotment authorities, and he hoped that, either in the Committee stage of this Bill, or in the proposed Allotments Bill, the noble Viscount would see his way to insert some provision which would consolidate all these bodies, and by which the rules of management in each might be assimilated. He must say, that although the Bill would be a very useful one, it would have been of much more use if it had been introduced a few years ago. Indeed, he was convinced that, if a forced sale of the glebe lands was to be made at the present time, they would realize very little more than the auctioneer's charges. He trusted, however, that if trade increased, agricultural prosperity and the value of land would increase also, and that the Clergy would avail themselves of the opportunities offered by the Bill, and that working men would invest their savings in allotments.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said, his feeling was one of deep regret that a Bill similar to this was not introduced many years ago, with the general consent of the clergy; because, if that had been done, the clergy would have been spared much of the serious loss and diminution of income which, he was sorry to say, had lately fallen upon them. According to the measure, the endowment trustees were to consist of the incumbent, the Bishop, and the patron; but he could not help thinking that among the trustees there ought to be one layman or more representing the parish. It would be in the true interests of the Church that its property should be identified with the parish as much as possible; and he would suggest that the additional trustee should be the churchwarden or some individual not elected by the incumbent. It was further provided that the securities relating to the property dealt with under the Bill should be kept by the trustees, and he would like to ascertain where the securities were to be kept. Their Lordships knew how parish records were often kept, and it seemed to him that if these securities were to be kept in the same manner, it was quite possible that some of them might be lost.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: I do not rise to oppose the second reading of this measure in any way; but I cannot but be sorry that it should be necessary, to enable the Church now to part with any of its real property—that property which, in the past, has always been held to be its substantial property—and still more grieved I am at the cause which seems to render this step necessary. It is impossible, however, to close one's eyes to the conviction which has been growing that the clergy, the holders of these glebe lands, are suffering more and more, and that a pitch has been reached when it is necessary to take legislative action. There is, however, this consolation in thinking about it, that if the sale is really made for the benefit of the benefice, as the Bill tries to provide, it will, in the long run, lead to the benefit of the whole Church. I will only ask of the Government that time enough may be given before the Bill goes into Committee for its various points to be fully discussed, and that communications may take place with those who are most deeply interested in it. That is most desirable. I may point out that there is not, in the Bill, any arrangement for ecclesiastical review. It may be said that in dealing with this question no ecclesiastical consent is required; that there is none in sales effected by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners; but then the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are themselves so familiar with Church affairs and Church property that no one would wish to introduce any further ecclesiastical consent. Now, however, in the Land Commissioners, a civil body is proposed, which has no connection whatever with the Church, so that we shall have a needy incumbent face to face with a civil body, unconnected with the Church, and able at once to conclude the transaction. I entertain some little doubt, whether it is possible to combine so entirely the interests of the buyer and the seller. The Land Commissioners are charged to sell, if possible, for the good of very small buyers; they are equally charged to consider the best interests, not of the seller himself only, but of his property in the future. I doubt whether two such interests can be guarded in one hand. This is a matter which deserves ample consideration. I entertain also some doubt as to endowments of so large an amount being in the hands of trustees liable to perpetual change. It is a mere A B C trust, and the Bank of England does not recognize such a trust. It would regard the endowment trustees simply as individuals. I think there should be a permanent body similar to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, or those presiding over Queen Anne's Bounty Fund, associated in the trust, for there will be frequent applications for the appointment of a new trustee, and constant trouble and expense would be incurred. There are some other technical points to which I might refer; but they would be better dealt with in Committee. This, I hope, will not be pressed on in a hurry, but postponed until those most deeply concerned have had an opportunity of considering the provisions of the Bill.

The Bishop of LICHFIELD said, it was laid down that the sale of the glebe was to be for the benefit of the living. He contended that land, which had been the property of the Church for a longer period than any property belonging to their Lordships, ought not to be so readily disposed of without a power of veto on the part of some ecclesiastical authority. He ventured to think that the Commissioners would not be the best judges as to what would be for the benefit of the living, and would therefore suggest that the Bishop of the diocese should have the power not only of expressing his opinion, and of exercising a vetoing power in regard to these sales of glebes. He also said that, under the Bill, the Commissioners were obliged to re-invest the money in the public funds and certain debentures. Now, he knew that a great deal was thought of the "sweet simplicity" of the Three per Cents; but he should be sorry to see any much larger portion of the endowments of the Church invested either in the funds or in railway stock. He thought it might be desirable to re-invest the money in land. No doubt, land was at present at a very low value, but things in that respect might hereafter undergo a change, and he trusted that they did not all take the pessimist view of that matter. It might, therefore, be desirable to give the Commissioners power to re-invest in land. The noble Earl (the Earl of Camperdown) had suggested that there should be some lay representative of the Church on the trust. He (the Bishop of Lichfield) quite agreed with him; and he thought that it was undesirable that the Bishop should be mixed up with this purely business matter. Therefore he ought to be out of the trust altogether; but only if he had the right of veto. He hoped that the noble Viscount who had charge of the Bill (Viscount Cross) would kindly give his attention to those points before the House went into Committee on the Bill. The provision of allotments for the labouring poor was, no doubt, an excellent object; but, unless the Sanitary Authority had power to purchase land from some of the other neighbouring landlords, it might appear as if that was a measure to provide allotments for the labouring poor at the expense of the Church, and that glebe lands were the *corpus vile* on which the experiment was to be made. He hoped that that would not really be the case.

Lord GRIMTHORPE said, that if any additional trustees were to be appointed, they should neither be the churchwarden of the parish nor any person to be chosen by popular election. The moment there is any power to be wielded it will be fought for, and churchwardens are elected by Dissenters as well as Churchmen. It would be far better to have a fixed body than a fluctuating one; one, for instance, such as the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, or Queen Anne's Bounty, would be far better because, at every change in a fluctuating body, there was some cost incurred, and one of the objects of the Bill was to diminish the cost of selling glebes. For that reason he should be sorry to see the introduction into the trust of any one possessing the churchwarden character—an arrangement which would also involve all the inconveniences attending a parochial election.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Viscount CROSS) said, he was glad to find that the principle of the Bill had met with universal assent from every quarter of the House; and that, with very few exceptions, all the objections that had been raised only referred to points of detail. As to the endowment trustees, the great object was to have a body of trustees who should, at all events, be local; and that, if there was a sale, the purchase-money should not be placed either in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners or of Queen Anne's Bounty, but that it should, to a certain extent, be localized in the diocese as far as possible. Then how were they to get a simple body of trustees? It had been thought wise to put in the Bishop, the patron, and the incumbent; but, after the observations which had been made, he would endeavour to see if the arrangement could be simplified in any way. He quite agreed with the noble Lord who had last spoken (Lord Grimthorpe) in the idea that the suggestion that a churchwarden should be included was open to the objection that they must have an election for the purpose. It was quite true that the incumbent and the churchwardens might be incorporated for that particular purpose; but against the incorporation of the trustees in a case of that kind there was the objection that, if they became incorporated, they would not be individually liable, and it was deemed desirable to maintain the individual liability of those who had to deal with that particular money. He would say, however, that the point urged by the noble Earl (the Earl of Camperdown) might well be brought forward in Committee. Turning to another point, it was intended by the Bill that anything that could really be held to be necessary for the convenience of the person who had the parsonage house should be retained, whether it was an outbuilding, a garden, or other appurtenance. Next, he agreed that the proposed power of the Sanitary Authority, so long as it remained, should belong to the Sanitary Authority as a whole, and not be confined to a committee. With regard to the cost of the conveyance under the Bill, when the Commissioners were satisfied about the sale, had received the money, and had given the purchaser a certificate, that gave him an absolute title the moment he took it to the Land Registry and registered it, without the least expense. That was a great simplification of the conveyance of the land, and it tended to cheapness. It was not quite fair to say, as the most rev. Prelate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) had done, that they provided no ecclesiastical check on the sale; because the application could not be made, in the first instance, to the Land Commissioners without notice being given, not only to the patron, but also to the Bishop. Therefore, the Bishop had the power of laying the whole case before the Land Commissioners, who would not sanction the sale unless they were satisfied that the objections of the Bishop, or the patron, were not such as ought to prevent it. The right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Lichfield) had suggested that the purchase-money should be re-invested in land; but as the object of the Bill was to facilitate the sale of those glebe lands, he did not think it would be well that the purchase-money should be re-invested in other land. What had happened in the case of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners? They had sold Church lands to the amount of £2,000,000. By Act of Parliament, they were absolutely bound to re-invest in land; but they had never made up their minds to buy the land. That he wanted to avoid; and, therefore, he objected to giving any power by that Bill to re-invest in land. By the Bill they allowed the money to be invested only in Government securities, or in railway stocks, under certain specified conditions, which afforded ample guarantees for its safety. With regard to the safety of the documents which were to represent the money invested in these new securities, that money could only be invested, and if the certificate were lost twenty times over it would not affect the securities, as it would only be necessary to go to the Bank of England, or to the Railway Company, as the case might be, to get the certificate renewed. He had been asked not to take the Committee on the Bill for some time, in order that it might be read and considered in the country by all who were interested in the matter. That he thought was a very reasonable request, and if it would meet the convenience of their Lordships he would fix the Committee stage for that day fortnight.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY said, that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were not bound to re-invest in land. They had a discretion to retain a considerable sum of money in stock, and though a large portion of the £2,000,000 which had been referred to so remained, yet a third at least had been invested in ground rents, tithe rent-charge, and the like.

Viscount CROSS said it might be as the most rev. Primate had said; but, at the same time, as regarded the Commissioners' obligation, he felt bound to adhere to his previous statements on the point.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* the *1st of March* next.

POLICE ACTS (IRELAND)—THE CORPORATION OF LIMERICK — EXTRA POLICE.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

The Duke of ST. ALBANS: I beg to ask Her Majesty's Government, What is the present position of the claim against the Corporation of Limerick for extra police; whether it can be legally enforced; if so, why this has not been done; and, if part or all of such claim has been relinquished by the Government, on whom this payment will fall; also to ask whether it is true, as reported in the newspapers, that the Corporation of Limerick has recently repudiated its liability to contribute to the repayment of the money advanced out of the Public finances for the purposes of the district lunatic asylum? I desire to point out that this is an old story, but I trust your Lordships will not consider that I have unduly trespassed on your attention in the Question which stands in my name. I have no wish to embarrass Her Majesty's Government in their very difficult task of governing Ireland in bringing this matter forward. The circumstances to which my Question refers occurred during the Viceroyalty of the noble Earl (Earl Spencer) and not during the Administration of the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) or of the noble Earl (the Earl of Aberdeen). I have no desire of seeming to censure the noble Earl (Earl Spencer) for his conduct of the early stages of this dispute, for which I suppose the noble Earl must be held responsible, but I think that what is known of this matter your Lordships will agree that it is a state of affairs eminently unsatisfactory. The cost of extra police was resisted by the Limerick Corporation during the Viceroyalty of Earl Spencer; the question dragged on during that of Earl Carnarvon and Earl of Aberdeen, and is still unsettled unless the Government has decided to abandon their claim. A contumacious Corporation had during this long time flouted the power of the Executive and the authority of the Courts of law, because I believe this claim has received the sanction of the Queen's Bench in Ireland. The facts were these—At the Summer Assizes of 1882, at the Spring of 1883, and Summer of 1883, the Judges of Assize fiated three several presentments for the cost of extra police to be raised off the city of Limerick, and amounting in the whole to £1,450 3*s*. 3*d*. The Corporation of Limerick, on whom had developed the fiscal powers of the Grand Jury, were bound peremptorily to raise that amount, but refused to do so. Proceedings were instituted in the Court of Queen's Bench by the Attorney General to compel them to do so. On the 14th of May, 1884, the Queen's Bench made an absolute order for a *mandamus* commanding the Mayor and Corporation to raise and pay over the amount. The Corporation met and resolved—

> "That this Council declines to comply with the *mandamus*, inasmuch as the Council are of opinion that the tax is unjust and tyrannical, and if now imposed illegal."

The return of the writ of *mandamus* was a copy of this resolution. At the Spring Assizes of 1884 the Judges fiated a further presentment for an additional sum of £466 4*s*., and on July 4, 1884, a second *mandamus* was obtained to compel payment of that amount. The Corporation, however, again refused and made a similar resolution and return. No further steps appeared to have been taken. The effect of this action on the part of the Limerick Corporation, and that no steps had been taken to follow up the *mandamus*—which, I am afraid, was the object desired—had brought the Government into contempt in Ireland. There could be no greater misfortune in the administration of the affairs of a country than that a Local Authority should be able to set at defiance the legal power of the Crown and jurisprudence of a country. I suppose it is a just claim, and, therefore, machinery should exist to enforce it, otherwise the only thing which surprises one is that any locality in Ireland has paid this extra police tax. As regards the latter part of my Question, it is founded on a statement in the Irish intelligence of *The Times* to the effect that—

> "The Limerick Corporation having been successful so far in their persistent refusal to pay the Government demands for a portion of the costs of extra police drafted into the city during the land agitation, adopted to-day a similar course of opposition with regard to the claim of the Governors of the Limerick District Lunatic Asylum. The Town Council for some years past have been petitioning the Lord Lieutenant for the time being for representation on the Asylum Board on the ground that large sums of money for the cost of the city patients are voted annually by the Corporation, and that the latter, through not having the power to appoint Governors, have no control over the expenditure of the institution. Acting on the statements put forward, the Mayor and his successors in office were appointed *ex officio* Governors, and some members of the Town Council were from time to time appointed Governors by the Viceroy. This, however, did not satisfy the Nationalist Members, who consider that the Corporation should be represented directly by members selected from the Town Council in virtue of their office, and as representing the city taxpayers. To-day it was proposed, and passed unanimously, that the Corporation should refuse to grant any more money towards the support of the asylum until the Lord Lieutenant granted the Town Council a representation on the Board of Governors."

Under these circumstances, I should like to ask Her Majesty's Government to say on whom the burdens the Limerick Corporation refused to bear would fall in the event of the victory remaining with the Corporation? Will it fall upon the broad shoulders of the British taxpayer, which seem to me to be both unjust and undesirable? I should also like to ask what the Government propose to do in the future to compel the Corporation of Limerick to meet their liabilities. If such a state of things as the present is to be tolerated, it seems to me that Government could not be said to exist in Limerick, and would retain its title, conferred by the late Earl of Beaconsfield, as the worst and weakest Executive in the world.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (Earl CADOGAN) said, he had paused before rising, because he thought that perhaps the noble Earl (Earl Spencer) would feel it his duty to reply to the noble Duke (the Duke of St. Albans). It was true that this was an ancient matter, the circumstances to which allusion was made having occurred between the years 1882 and 1884. The noble Duke had correctly stated what had taken place; but he asked what was the present position of matters, and what were the present powers of the Government with reference to the recovery of the tax for extra police, and which, undoubtedly, was still owing by the Corporation of Limerick? In reply, he (Earl Cadogan) might state that in December, 1884, the then Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant explained in the House of Commons that the only further legal procedure open to the Government was to apply to the Court of Queen's Bench for an order for the committal to prison of the defaulting members of the Limerick Corporation—an extreme proceeding that it was not then considered desirable to adopt. He (Earl Cadogan) was afraid that it was not more desirable now than it was then; but he might inform his noble Friend that the claim on the Town Council had not been formally relinquished by the Government; and that in the meantime the expenses of these extra police had been charged to the Constabulary Vote. The debt had not been increased for some time past, inasmuch as the proclamation under which the extra police were required had expired some 18 or 19 months ago. With reference to the second part of the Question, the refusal of the Corporation to present payment towards the district lunatic asylum, the facts were these—The Corporation had demanded on behalf of the ratepayers of Limerick a larger representation of the City of Limerick on the Board of Governors of the asylum than they now possessed, and they had adopted a resolution declining to present the maintenance of the asylum unless the demand was complied with. The Government, however, felt that the Corporation had no ground for making their demand, as an analysis of the list of the Board of Governors of the asylum showed that the city ratepayers—as distinguished from the county ratepayers—were already amply—if not unduly—represented, having regard to the population and valuation of the city and county respectively. Should the Corporation persist in their refusal to make the presentment, there was an express statutory provision under which the Judge of Assize could make an order for the levying of the necessary rate, and which will have the force of a presentment. With regard to the apprehension of the noble Duke as to the money having been advanced out of the public finances, there had been no such advance. It is not a matter of "repayment of money advanced out of public finances," but entirely one of local finance; the old system of Treasury advances for the maintenance of asylums having been given up.

Earl SPENCER said, he thought it was his duty to make some observations on the question which had been put by his noble Friend (the Duke of St. Alban's), and the answer which had been given on the part of the Government by the noble Earl opposite the Lord Privy Seal (Earl Cadogan). It was quite true that this unfortunate, and, he thought, disastrous incident occurred during the time that he (Earl Spencer) was Lord Lieutenant. He did not wish to trouble their Lordships by going over all the facts of the case. It was a very long and a very complicated history, and it would only cause weariness to their Lordships if he were to go through every stage of the proceedings. All he would say was this—that in consequence of the disturbed state of Limerick in 1882, when he arrived there he found that the Police Authorities in the city declared that they would not be able to fulfil the ordinary duties of the police without an extra force. There were two provisions under which this force could be provided under the Act of William IV. One of these provisions was that so many magistrates could petition the Lord Lieutenant for an extra force to be sent down; and the other provision was the 13th section, which said that the Lord Lieutenant, on the advice of the Privy Council, if he considered that the state of the town was bad and required extra police, should have power to send the extra force to the city, the moiety of the charge for such force falling on the city. It was his painful duty on that occasion to propose to the Privy Council, and on their advice to carry out, the Proclamation ordering a certain number of extra police for Limerick. From time to time that question was before him—indeed, hardly a month passed in which the Limerick police did not come before him. He was most anxious to come to an amicable arrangement with the Corporation on the matter; and at the earliest moment possible he took what steps he could to diminish the force. He diminished it first by 20 men, and then again by so many more, until, at last, the moiety the Corporation had to pay was for 10 men. Under another section of the Police Acts power was given to the Inspector General to send from time to time from one county to another, or from a county to a city in Ireland, extra police if it was found to be necessary. His Predecessor in the Viceroyalty had found it necessary to increase the force from time to time. When they found that the Corporation of Limerick were unwilling to pay this tax, it became a matter of grave consideration what should be done. He quite recognized the importance of getting Acts of this sort carried out, and of seeing the authority of the Government obeyed, and not set at defiance. The Irish Government proceeded in the ordinary way for obtaining payments of this kind. They applied to the Court of Queen's Bench, through the Crown Law Officers; and the Court, after going into the question, issued a *mandamus*. They had hoped that the result of these proceedings would have been that the Corporation would have paid an imperative tax. There was no question before the Court as to the legality of it. It was decided to be legal; and he had no doubt, personally, that the necessity was a great one for sending the extra force. Her Majesty's Government, seeing that the Corporation had refused to obey the *mandamus* of the Court of Queen's Bench, had to consider what should be done. His noble Friend opposite (Earl Cadogan) stated only part of the decision of the then Government. He stated that the ordinary course in the the circumstances was to apply to have the *mandamus* made absolute; but the only way of doing that, according to the advice of their Legal Advisers, was to attach the persons of the Council who took part in these proceedings—in other words, to take steps for the arrest of the Mayor and Corporation of Limerick. That would have been a very serious and grave act. Although he would not say that on certain occasions it might not have to be done; it was a step which would have created immense excitement, and it would not have brought the Government one whit nearer to obtaining the money owing by the Corporation. The matter was referred by him to the Cabinet in London; and the decision of the Cabinet was that, instead of proceeding by attachment against the persons of the Corporation, they should proceed by way of legislation, and obtain powers for the Government in such cases to levy the tax themselves. That was announced by the Chief Secretary (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) in the House of Commons, and it was stated that the Government would introduce a Bill on the subject after Whitsuntide. As their Lordships knew, the Government came to an end; but he maintained that, so far as the Government of which he had the honour to be the head in Ireland was concerned, they were not to be taxed with having allowed the matter to lapse; that they took every step they could at the time short of putting the whole Corporation in prison; and that they could not have acted in a different way to what they did. Then the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon) succeeded to the Viceroyalty in Ireland, and received a deputation from Limerick; and it was understood in Ireland that the noble Earl had practically dropped the whole case, and given up the claim against the town and Corporation.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (Earl CADOGAN), interposing, said, what the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) did was to suggest a compromise; he did not think Lord Carnarvon relinquished the claim.

EARL SPENCER said, he did not know what the compromise was—they could only judge from what they saw in the newspapers—but it was understood at the time that they had dropped the claim.

EARL CADOGAN said, he only wished it to be understood that the noble Earl (the Earl of Carnarvon) did not relinquish the claim.

EARL SPENCER said, he could only say that when the Liberal Government returned to Office it was understood—and he made inquiry about it—that the claim had been practically relinquished; and during the few months last summer when the Government remained in Office the question was never even brought up for disposal. He should like to say a word on the subject of the lunatic asylums. He disapproved of the manner in which the managers and governors of lunatic asylums were appointed in Ireland. It was one of the things that must one day or other be dealt with. Those governors were nominated by the Lord Lieutenant; and there was considerable dissatisfaction that the ratepayers, who had to pay towards their maintenance, had no voice on the governing body. He had himself had no little difficulty on this subject; because, while the Lord Lieutenant might be very anxious to carry out the wishes of any Corporation or other local body concerned in a lunatic asylum, it was impossible for the Government and the Viceroy to divest himself of responsibility for an appointment. It would be well, therefore, to alter the law in that regard. While speaking of these matters, he could not help referring to a case which had arisen in the Courts of Law in Dublin. A learned Judge in this country inherited property in Tipperary, of which a lease had been granted by his predecessor in title to the Local Government Board, the premises to be used for a lunatic asylum. The learned Judge two years ago failed to obtain any rent, and he accordingly applied to the Local Government Board, who refused to pay. Thereupon he applied to the Courts in Dublin to mark judgment against the Local Government Board. He (Earl Spencer) believed they did mark judgment; and the Local Government Board would, he presumed, have to pay the money out of the sum voted to them by Parliament. Now, that was a different case to the other, because here the Local Government Board had power to levy, although he did not say it was a power which it was desirable to enforce; but he was curious to know what the Government proposed to do with regard to it. He imagined that the guardians refused to levy the rate, and that in future it would be paid by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said, he was quite certain that the noble Earl (Earl Spencer) who had just sat down was fully justified in strengthening the police force of Limerick, and he was certain that any measure he could have proposed to take to collect the rate would have been supported by Parliament and the country. But what he wished to submit to their Lordships was this—that it was of very little public interest whether it happened under this or that Viceroy—this or that Government. What was important was, what was the position of the case now, and in what way did it reflect upon Parliament? What was the position? A rate had been levied upon the town of Limerick, and the Mayor and Town Council had undertaken not to pay it. The noble Earl said that the Government of which he was then a Member did not think it right to proceed to arrest the Mayor of Limerick, and the following Government took the same course; but how stood the case? What means were there of collecting the rate? They had just been told there were none except by attaching the Mayor and Corporation of Limerick, or some of them; and what he had to ask was whether the Mayor of Limerick was superior to the law of the country? If that was so—and it was apparently recognized both by the late and present Government—then he (the Earl of Camperdown) said that the position was a very serious one indeed. But let him leave that part of the question, and refer to the second Question brought forward by the noble Duke. It appeared that the Town Council had been petitioning the Lord Lieutenant for representation on the Asylums Board, on the ground that large sums of money were voted annually for the city patients by the Corporation. The Lord Lieutenant appointed the Mayor and his successor in office as town governors; but that did not satisfy the Nationalists, and on the 3rd February they passed a resolution that the Corporation refused to grant any more money towards the support of the asylum until the Lord Lieutenant granted the Town Council adequate representation on the board. The Town Council took up that position, not because they did not obtain representation, but because they did not obtain it in the precise manner in which they wanted to have it. He (the Earl of Camperdown) questioned whether it would have been legal for the Lord Lieutenant to have granted what they wished. If it was true that, under the circumstances, the Mayor and Corporation had refused the contribution for which the town was liable; and if, as they were told, the only means of enforcing the rate was by issuing a *mandamus* which the Corporation declined to obey, he would ask their Lordships if Parliament and the Government were going to allow the Mayor and Corporation of Limerick to defy the law? So far as he saw, it was without sufficient reason, for they did not contend that they had not obtained what they asked, but that they had not obtained it in the way they asked for it.

Lord FITZGERALD said, that the whole debt amounted to £1,800, and the question was whether the Corporation of Limerick should be permitted to repudiate legal obligations and defy the law. He did not propose to enter into the policy of the present system of imposing a tax for extra police in Ireland, although he had some doubts as to whether that policy was sound. At all events, it was the law, and the law ought to be obeyed, or, if it was erroneous, altered. In this case the Town Council of Limerick had refused to levy a rate to pay the demand made upon them for extra police employed during a period of alleged disturbance. The noble Earl (Earl Spencer) who had then been Viceroy had made every inquiry as to whether any injustice had been done, and on one occasion had invited the Corporation of Limerick to meet and confer with him, in order that he might see whether he could reduce the amount in any manner consistent with the law. The Town Council had put forward a somewhat contemptuous refusal, and the Government of the day could do nothing but proceed against them. Once that had been done, it ought to have been carried on to the end. A *mandamus* had been obtained from the Court of Queen's Bench, nobody appearing on behalf of the Town Council to show cause against it. The Town Council refused to comply with the *mandamus* on the ground, as stated in a resolution, that the tax was unjust and had been illegally imposed. To put such a document as this resolution upon the file was undoubtedly a great contempt of the Court of Queen's Bench, and the one answer to it should have been an attachment for contempt. He could understand, however, that the Government of the day had been very unwilling to single out any particular person. The only other remedy was to proceed by legislation, and to allow the

Government to make the rate themselves, and then send it down to the Local Authority to be collected. As he had said before, he had some doubt as to the soundness of the policy of the present law in regard to this question; but if the law was unwise or unjust, let it be altered, but they must have no paltering with the law, and they should allow neither repudiation or contempt of the law. In his opinion, legislation such as he had suggested was the only true method of providing against similar difficulties in the future.

ARMY—THE ROYAL ARTILLERY—RUMOURED REDUCTION OF THE FORCE.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA, on rising to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether a considerable reduction in the officers, men, and guns of the Royal Artillery has been in contemplation by the Government; whether Her Majesty's Government will reconsider any such contemplated reduction, seeing that our force of Artillery is at present below the strength necessary for our Army? said, they had heard rumours of large Artillery reductions; but they had not been brought before the public except in Regimental Orders. It was not with a view to embarrass the Government that he had put this Question, but rather in the hope that they might be induced to refrain from reducing a part of our most perfect armament, which took a long and careful training to bring to perfection, and the loss of which was sure to be followed, at no distant time, by increased expenditure, if by no greater evil. The effect of the proposed reductions would be that five batteries of our force of Artillery would cease to exist as batteries, and that 28 guns would cease to be Horse Artillery guns; while, with regard to men, more than 600 trained and skilled artillerymen would be taken from that important arm, and would have to revert to other duties which required much less training. He understood that the ground on which the anticipated reduction was based was that our Horse Artillery was in larger proportion to the Field Artillery than in any other European Army; and as a considerable reduction of guns was said to be intended, he presumed that the number of our field guns generally was assumed to be in excess of our requirements. He would, therefore, endeavour to show how the case stood. He took the number of our batteries, horse and field, from the published *Army List;* and though a considerable number of batteries had been reduced from six to four guns, yet he assumed that on emergency we might be able to complete them to six guns per battery. According to *The Army List*, then, we had 26 Horse Artillery batteries at home and abroad, and 80 Field batteries, giving a total of 106 batteries, or 636 guns. The troops, according to the Establishment, were—British Cavalry, 19,023; Infantry, 143,093; Indian Cavalry, 22,732; Infantry, 105,112; giving a total of 289,960. Our 636 guns would stand to them in the proportion of 2.2 guns per 1,000 men. It would be said that a large deduction of Infantry must be made for garrisons; but against that they had to set off the Militia and Reserve — let them say, 100,000 men. Now, the proportion which Napoleon laid down was three guns per 1,000 men, and that, for the present day, was a low estimate. According to that standard we should require 869 guns, or 233 more than we possessed. The German standard was now 3·6 guns per 1,000 men, according to which we ought to have 1,043 guns instead of 636. The German proportion of guns to their whole Effective and Reserve Force was 2·5. If we took the very moderate number of 100,000 men as our Reserve and Militia, our Artillery would be for the whole Force of 389,960 in the proportion of nearly 1·6 gun per 1,000 men. As to our Horse Artillery bearing a larger proportion to the Field Artillery than in any other Army in Europe, he might point out that it was true that the proportion was larger than that of the German Army, and slightly larger than that of the French Army; but he submitted that the Horse Artillery had no obligatory dependence on the Field Artillery. It was a question that depended on the circumstances of a country and the nature of its warfare. The experienced Artillery officers of the British Army were better judges of their requirements than any foreign officer could be; and he would ask how many experienced Artillerymen outside the Department had been consulted on this matter? The Horse Artillery had much closer relation to the Cavalry, with which it was so often connected, than with the Field Artillery. The Germans had 4·6 guns per 1,000 Cavalry; the English only 3·6 per 1,000 Cavalry. The Horse Artillery was required for rapid movement from one part of the field to another to strengthen an attack or to prepare the way for Cavalry charges. In the German Army lately a practice had been adopted which probably we might think it wiseto follow—namely, that of organizing a considerable body of Artillery which was called Corps Artillery. That Corps Artillery was separate and independent, and would be able in action to send aid to whatever point of a field of battle it might be required. It was the opinion of many German officers of repute also that Corps Artillery should be formed entirely of Horse Artillery, but that he thought would scarcely be possible, because no country would be able to provide a sufficient number of horses. The Field Artillery could not change ground rapidly for the purpose of strengthening an attack or preparing the way for Cavalry charges. The working complement of gunners might be carried on the limbers and waggons; but if they suffered heavy loss it took a long time for the Foot Artillery to come any distance to reinforce them. He would refer their Lordships to the testimony of Prince Hohenlohe, who had had great experience in active service on the Continent, as to the value of Horse Artillery in the field. In these days of rapid movements Artillery were required to move rapidly. We were even thinking much of Mounted Infantry; how could Field Artillery support them? It was the power of bringing up Horse Artillery at a gallop that enabled Lord Gough to complete the destruction of the Sikh army in its retreat across the Sutlej at Sobraon. Anyone who had seen Horse Artillery in the field would understand how many valuable qualities were required to fit a soldier for that service. Our Service was different from that of most other nations, spread about in every quarter of the globe. It was very often in countries little traversed by roads, where the lighter and more movable Artillery was required. Our Service was one of small armies and detachments, for which a larger proportion of Artillery was required, as it could not be subdivided like other Armies. In the present unsettled state of Europe, with a possibility of a demand from India or Africa, the reduction seemed untimely and a most wasteful and dangerous one, and he trusted the Government would reconsider it.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH said, he fully endorsed all that had fallen from the noble and gallant Lord who had just addressed their Lordships, considering that the statement just delivered deserved the serious consideration of Her Majesty's Government, for the following reasons—that from the existence of short service it would take about three years to replace these skilled soldiers—that is, by equally efficient ones—whose *esprit de corps* would not be enhanced by being removed from the *élite* of their corps, as it were, to the position of ordinary artillerymen; this applies more or less cogently to the reduction of Cavalry, since a lancer or hussar is not made in a day, which is further emphasized by the short service in vogue depriving us of the efficient non-commissioned officers available to make raw recruits into efficient soldiers. The effective use of Horse Artillery was evidenced in a marked degree on the the occasion referred to by the noble and gallant Lord at Sobraon on a retreating enemy crossing, and on the opposite of the river; and considering that this action was fought 40 years since, there are not very many to tell the tale when about 10,000 gallant Seikh soldiers lost their lives. And had it been otherwise, and also not been followed by a rapid march of Cavalry and Horse Artillery, the enemy would doubtless have made a stand halfway between, or at, Lahore, and thus prevented the gates of that city being seized by Cavalry—the 9th Lancers—supported by Horse Artillery, and the city consequently taken possession of without further bloodshed. This compelled him to say that the proposed reduction of Horse Artillery, coupled with the 24 Horse Artillery lieutenant-colonels, a few young subaltern officers were a poor substitute for the more experienced officers reduced; and, necessarily, the proposed reductions were the height of folly, considering the present state of Europe, since that was not the time, or desirable, to thus hastily part with such efficient soldiers as those composing what might be termed a portion of the *élite* of the Army. The deficiency of Horse Artillery was felt by the German Army in the late War, and was now being made good, and was further evidence for the retention of that efficient force, which could not be replaced in a day; and although not admitted, Parliaments and Governments acted as if money only had to be voted to produce an efficient Army, which notion led, and would lead, to a further waste of public money, the real economy being in the reduction of the civilian element of the Army and Navy.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Lord HARRIS) said, that the great experience and knowledge of the noble and gallant Lord who had introduced the subject (Lord Napier of Magdala) no doubt well entitled all he said on military affairs to the highest respect. The noble and gallant Lord, however, would not expect him to offer any opinion with regard to the proportion which our Artillery ought to bear to other arms of the Service as compared with the proportions in other armies. This was a technical matter, on which it would be unwise in him to enter into competition with the noble and gallant Lord. But he could not, in his present position, admit that the proposed changes merited some of the terms that had been applied to them, such as unnecessary, wasteful, and dangerous. He knew—and he thought the noble and gallant Lord himself must know—that the changes could not have been undertaken and brought forward by the Secretary of State without the closest consideration and full conference with his Military Advisers. He could assure the noble Lord that the closest attention had been given to the whole question; and he must also say that the noble and gallant Lord painted the reduction—as the change was in part simply a conversion—in rather too high a colour. The noble and gallant Lord seemed to be under a misapprehension as to the exact extent of the reduction. The actual reduction of the batteries was, in fact, only two; but there was a further conversion, he admitted, of 16 guns which were sent into store in order that these batteries should be on a peace footing, and not on a war footing. The actual reduction was, therefore, 12; in the other eight cases the batteries were placed on a peace instead of a war footing. This course was adopted, he understood, by most of the Continental armies when they put the Army Corps Artillery Establishment upon a peace footing. As regarded the officers referred to in the Question, there was a reduction, undoubtedly, of 24 lieutenant colonels; and this was because the proportion in that rank was far higher than it had been for a long time in the Artillery, and than it was in any other branch of the Army. He believed, however, it was in contemplation to reduce that reduction, to a certain extent, by increasing the number of subalterns. As regarded the Artillerymen, there was not, taking the whole Force, a reduction; but there was an increase of something like 300 men. There was a reduction as regarded Field and Horse Artillery; but a considerable increase as regarded Garrison Artillery, making the increase in the whole something like 300. The changes which were contemplated would not take place until the commencement of the next financial year. He could assure the noble and gallant Lord that these changes had been contemplated solely with the idea of placing the country in a better military position than it had ever occupied before, in order that two Army Corps fully equipped might be placed in the field, and that our garrisons at home and abroad might be thoroughly provided for.

CHURCH SITES (COMPULSORY POWERS REPEAL) BILL. [H.L.]

A Bill to repeal the provisions of the Church Building Acts relating to the compulsory purchase of sites for churches and burial grounds—Was *presented* by The Lord Bishop of Lichfield; read 1ª. (No. 22.)

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock,
to Thursday next, a quarter past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 15th February, 1887.

MINUTES.]—PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—East Huntingdonshire Water*; Newark and Ollerton Railway*; Sutton District Water.

Third Reading—Belfast Main Drainage, and *passed.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Merchant Shipping (Fishing Boats) Acts Amendment)* [168]; Waste Lands (Mining)* [169]; Parish Allotments Committees*[170

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

BELFAST MAIN DRAINAGE BILL

(*by Order*).

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

Mr. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): Sir, I have complained on previous occasions to the House that this scheme, introduced by the Town Council of Belfast, has been promoted and pushed forward without due opportunity having been afforded for its proper consideration by the ratepayers of the town. I think that after the few words which I propose to address to the House on the present occasion, it will be admitted that the complaints which I have felt it my duty to make were only too well founded. I received only a few days ago a Report on the sewerage of Belfast, which has been issued by the Lagan Pollution Committee. They say in that Report—

> "They approached the investigation of this scheme in the belief that if the works were completed the main object of the Bill would be effected. Further examination, however, convinced them that such would not be the case."

Now, what is the conclusion at which the ratepayers have arrived. They say that—

> "If this scheme is carried into effect the town will have expended £300,000 thereon, and it will not even then, according to the late and present borough surveyors, be healthy. Vast districts of it will remain unaffected by the scheme, vast quantities of sewage will flow into the Blackstaff and other streams, and thence into the Lagan; and, in the opinion of this Committee, the object of the Act will not have been gained, and the River Lagan will still remain polluted and unsanitary. The Lagan Pollution Committee, after long and careful consideration, and fortified by excellent legal and engineering advice, are convinced that the main drainage scheme would entail an enormous expenditure without any corresponding advantage. They are, therefore, compelled to offer the most strenuous opposition to the Bill in its present form."

They arrived at this conclusion for three reasons. First—

> "The Corporation may not discharge any sewage into the lough, except between the commencement of ebb-tide and 30 minutes after half ebb-tide; in other words, the discharge of the sewage is limited to three and a-half hours out of the 12, and the entire sewage of the town of Belfast will be locked up in a covered tank and sewer for at least eight and a-half hours daily and nightly. 'No doubt,' says the late borough surveyor, 'a system of sewer ventilation would abate the evil, but the town cannot be healthy while any deposit is suffered to accumulate in the sewers.'"

The Committee say—

> "No special system of ventilation is provided for in this scheme, and the ordinary ventilation grating would be continuously giving off poisonous gases."

I would ask the hon. Member for North Belfast (Mr. Ewart), whom I see in his place, how, in the face of this opinion, he gets over the fact that out of every 12 hours the sewage of Belfast will be locked up in a sewer and a covered tank for at least eight and a-half hours. The Lagan Pollution Committee say that no special system of ventilation is provided for in this scheme, and that the street ventilation gratings will be continually giving off obnoxious gases. The second reason is contained in these words—

> "Further, the scheme makes no provision for the Falls and Shankhill Road District, the most densely populated portions of the town."

Now, I happen to represent that district. I need not further identify it, because we have heard it very frequently in quite a different connection; but I may say, and I think that the hon. Member opposite will confirm me, that this division is inhabited by workpeople, that a great many manufactories are situated there; and that, so far as the public health is considered, this is the division of the town which requires the most close and constant administrative care. But if this scheme is carried into effect, the Falls and Shankhill Road District will still be drained into the Lagan. The borough surveyor, when the Bill was first promoted, gave evidence that if the scheme was carried out the River Lagan would be entirely free from the present discharges of sewage into it. The Pollution Committee say, however, that the Falls and Shankhill Road District will be still drained into the Lagan river, and, therefore, the main object of the scheme will not be effected. It appears that a further scheme is in contemplation by the Corporation of Belfast, because, although the borough surveyor last May told us that the River Lagan would be completely purified by this scheme, on the 27th of October, in a Report submitted by that gentleman to the Corporation, he—

> "Advocates an expenditure of £108,000, in addition to the cost of the main drainage scheme, and exclusive of the cost of taking lands and Parliamentary expenses necessary for the additional work involving this expenditure;"

and for what? His Report says—

> "The much-needed improvement of the River Lagan."

Then, are we to have another Bill next year with a similar clause? If for this reason it has been found that some such scheme was necessary, why was it not included in the present Bill? The Report goes on to say—

> "The waters of the Blackstaff and Pound Burn are utilized by many manufacturers and millowners along their courses. They have rights and powers existing and vested in them which prevent interference with the directions or levels of the streams, or interception of their waters. 'These streams' says the late borough surveyor, 'will never be in a satisfactory state so long as they contain weirs and obstructions, and the manufacturers foul them with refuse and warm and impure water."

The Committee add—

> "There is no power sought by the Main Drainage Bill, or existing in any Act of Parliament, authorizing interference with these rights to the extent of purifying these polluted waters which flow into the Lagan."

Therefore, the fact appears to be this, that if the present scheme be fully carried into effect, there will be a locking up of the deposited sewage in a covered tank and sewer for eight and a-half hours out of every 12, and that the River Lagan will not be entirely free from all discharge of sewage. Further—

> "That the waters of the Blackstaff and the Pound Burn, which are utilized by many manufacturers and millowners, will not be in a very satisfactory state so long as they contain weirs and obstructions; and the manufacturers foul them with refuse or warm and impure water."

These are three of the reasons which induced the Lagan Pollution Committee to arrive at the conclusion that the measure promoted by the Corporation of Belfast, and which comes before the House to-day, violates every one of the conditions which the borough surveyor has declared to be necessary. That is a brief statement of the case. I do not propose to divide the House on the present occasion; but I will conclude with this observation, that when I asked the House, and the House agreed, last Session to extend the municipal franchise in Belfast, from the very limited body who now possess it to the general body of the ratepayers of the town, I stated that I was convinced of the obvious justice of the case, but that I was not convinced of its necessity. If, hereafter, it should be necessary to take extreme action in order to secure an extended municipal franchise for the body of the ratepayers of Belfast, I shall not hesitate to do so; but, at the present time I will only say, and I think that men of all Parties will agree with me, after what I have said of the present scheme, that it will be absurd and unjust to entrust the Corporation of Belfast with the carrying out of important sanitary reforms involving the expenditure of large sums of money, and, at the same time, to forbid the townspeople, who are obliged by law to raise the money for executing them, from having any control over the expenditure.

SIR JAMES CORRY (Armagh, Mid): I cannot support the views which the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) has just expressed; nor do I think he is better informed as to the wants and necessities of the town of Belfast than I am, or of the circumstances which led to the introduction of the Bill now before the House. The fact is that this scheme has not only been approved of by the borough surveyor, but by one of the most eminent engineers of the day—Mr. Joseph Bazalgette. The whole matter was submitted to that gentleman and thoroughly inquired into, and he satisfied himself, from the investigation he gave to the subject, that the scheme now proposed is the very best which could be brought forward for the town of Belfast. The hon. Member has referred to the Report of a Committee called the Lagan Pollution Committee. Now, a number of the gentlemen who composed that Committee are personal friends of my own, and I have had an opportunity of hearing their reasons for putting forward a scheme of their own. They have stated, most distinctly, that they are not opponents of the main drainage scheme, but that all they want is some additional scheme, such as the hon. Member has referred to, for keeping the waters of the River Lagan banked up and made into a lake. Speaking personally, I should be glad to see something of that kind done, because I believe that it would be of great advantage to the town. At the same time I could not give any sanction to the scheme which has been proposed.

If carried out it would seriously interfere with the navigation of the river, and the Harbour Commissioners, who are themselves the conservators of the river, would certainly oppose any such scheme. It is quite unnecessary after what the hon. Member has stated that I should say any more on this subject. I am satisfied that the House will accept the opinion of the borough surveyor rather than that of any amateur engineers who have not had the same means of arriving at a conclusion, and that they will allow this Bill to be read a third time. There will be a further opportunity of dealing with the provisions of the Bill when the measure goes before a Committee of the House of Lords, and that I think would be the proper opportunity for entering into the details which have been referred to by the hon. Member.

Mr. DE COBAIN (Belfast, E.): I hope I may be permitted to say a word in reference to the question raised by the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) towards the close of his speech —namely, the question of the extension of the municipal franchise in Belfast. The Corporation of Belfast are asking by this Bill for large Parliamentary powers, and the hon. Member states that the whole of the people have not had an opportunity of expressing an opinion as to the propriety of conferring these powers upon the Corporation. I am not sufficiently familiar with legislation upon the subject to express concurrence with the hon. Member as to the effect of assimilating the municipal franchise to the Parliamentary franchise by incorporating an additional clause for that purpose in the Main Drainage Bill. Whether that would be the best way of carrying out that object or not I am unable to say, but if a distinct Bill is introduced to confer municipal privileges on those who are at present excluded from them in Belfast, I think that would be a better course than to deal with the question by a clause in a Main Drainage Bill, which might imperfectly define the conditions under which such privilege should be exercised. The main question raised by the Bill is one of engineering, and being an engineering question it is difficult for a layman to give any opinion upon it. The subject was investigated by an influential Committee designated the Lagan Pollution Commissioners, and I know that they put forward intelligent and strong grounds why the scheme they advocated should be adopted in preference to that which is provided in this Bill. As to the extension of the municipal franchise, I shall be quite prepared to act in concurrence with the hon. Member opposite, or with any other hon. Member or Party in this House who will seek to accomplish that just and necessary object by a general measure.

Mr. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): I am able to corroborate from my own personal knowledge the statement of my hon. Friend the Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton), that the present scheme is not at all sufficient for the purpose it is intended to effect. It is perfectly notorious that by far the greatest nuisance in connection with the sewerage of Belfast is to be found in that part of the district which is proposed to be dealt with by the Lagan Pollution Committee. That Committee proposes to purify the water in that part of the Lagan which lies above Belfast. Anyone who has the misfortune to pass over the River Lagan in that part of it which lies near the residence of the hon. Member for East Belfast (Mr. De Cobain), must know that it is a most painful nuisance. What occurs is this— every time the tide recedes the mud banks are left perfectly bare, and a considerable amount of noxious gases emanates from them. In point of fact, these banks are very much in the same position as the Thames used to be opposite the Houses of Parliament before the present Embankment was made. After the tide has receded the banks are left bare, and gases are emitted from them which are not only foul, but highly dangerous to the health of the inhabitants. I think the hon. Member for North Belfast (Mr. Ewart) is bound to declare that he will give every assistance in his power to the additional scheme proposed by the Lagan Committee, which I believe would only cost some £18,000, in addition to the £108,000 proposed to be expended under the present scheme. By that means the drainage of Belfast would be rendered far more complete, and the town would be placed in a proper sanitary condition. It certainly seems to me highly improper that we should assent to a large and expensive scheme which will only partially remedy the grievance complained of. When a scheme of main drainage is being proposed, I think it ought to be rendered fully adequate to the necessities of the case. The hon. Baronet (Sir James Corry) has referred to obstacles which may be thrown in the way of any thorough drainage for sanitary purposes in the town of Belfast, by the action of the Harbour Commissioners. Now, the Harbour Commissioners for Belfast are elected by means of an exceedingly narrow franchise—so scandalously and ridiculously narrow that it does not represent in the slightest degree the inhabitants of that town. In addition to that, it is notorious that there is more jobbery committed by them than by any other Corporation, except, perhaps, the City of London. It is supposed that the City of London may be found more than equal to the Corporation of Belfast in the way of jobbery, and in conferring special favours upon themselves. I do not charge the hon. Baronet opposite with having accepted personal favours; but I think he is called upon to promise, in the interests of the inhabitants of the town of which he is a native, and which he formerly represented, to do all in his power to insist upon the town being placed in a proper sanitary condition, and not being tied down by small and unimportant matters connected with the navigation of the River Lagan. My own opinion is, that it would be perfectly proper to make the River Lagan navigable, and at the same time to take satisfactory measures for rendering the sanitary state of that river much better than it is at present.

MR. EWART (Belfast, N.): I am glad to find that there is no difference of opinion either as to the necessity of passing this Main Drainage Bill, or as to the merits of the scheme before the House. After what has been stated by my hon. Friend the Member for Mid Armagh (Sir James Corry), I think I need not refer to the remarks which have been made by the hon. Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton), who has favoured the House with the opinions of a Committee, called the Lagan Committee, who have some other objects in view. In answer to the hon. Member who has just sat down, I have certainly no difficulty in saying that I shall be glad to support any Bill, no matter by whom it may be introduced, for the further improvement of the drainage of Belfast. Perhaps I ought to say a word in reference to the observations of the hon. Member for West Belfast with regard to the municipal franchise. I will remind the hon. Gentleman that in the last Parliament, when this Bill was before the House, I undertook, on behalf of myself and the other Members for the town of Belfast, that if the Bill were allowed to go through we would do our best to secure the passing of a Bill to assimilate the Irish franchise to that in England. That proposal of mine was rejected by the hon. Member for West Belfast, otherwise this Bill would have been passed early in the month of July last year, and these very necessary works would have been in effective operation some months ago.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork): I think a very strong case has been made out by my hon. friend the Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton). It is, however, satisfactory to find the hon. Member who has just sat down pledging himself, and the promoters of the Bill, to support any further scheme for rendering the drainage effective for the objects for which it is intended. I would appeal to the hon. Member to say whether or not he and the other promoters of the Bill will undertake, when this Bill goes to "another place," to give their support to any project which may be submitted to the House of Lords for extending the scope of the Bill and remedying the defects which have been pointed out by the hon. Member for West Belfast and the hon. Member for West Cavan (Mr. Biggar).

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Queen's *Consent* signified.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

SUTTON DISTRICT WATER BILL,
(by Order).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—*(Sir Charles Forster.)*

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): It may, perhaps, surprise some hon. Members that I, as an Irish Member, should oppose this Bill, which relates entirely to a suburban district of the Metropolis; but I think that if the facts which have come under my observation are made known to any unbiassed

Member, whether English or Scotch, he will feel it his bounden duty to object to the second reading of this Bill. The fact is that some months ago it was proposed by the Local Board of Health for the Sutton District, to obtain land for the formation of a cemetery, at a certain place called Rose Hill, that site overlaying the sources of the water supply of the district—the sources of the water supply of the Company promoting the present Bill. Such was the character of the site, and such were the circumstances of the district, that the Home Office was moved to institute an inquiry as to the desirability of sanctioning the cemetery. The inquiry was held by an officer of the Home Department —Dr. Hoffman—and, in consequence of his Report, the assent of the Home Office to the scheme was withheld. Upon that occasion Dr. Hoffman invited the Sutton Water Works Company to take part in the inquiry, but without effect, and the absence of any representative of the Sutton Water Company was commented upon in the course of the investigation. The Company were presumably as much interested as any other persons in preserving the purity of the water which they gathered, and which they distributed to the consumers, but they did not think it incumbent on them to protect the interests of their customers, and consequently the local people were obliged to act in their own defence. So strong was the case that they made out against this particular site that the Government sanction was necessarily withheld. Well, Sir, later on it was proposed to utilize another site for the same purpose, and learning the facts of the case, I ventured to put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, as to what the Home Office was prepared to do in the matter. In consequence of that Question, the right hon. Gentleman was good enough to cause another inquiry to be made, which was conducted, I think, by Mr. Harrison, a civil engineer, and an inspector of the Local Government Board. In consequence of Mr. Harrison's Report, the sanction of the Home Office was refused to this second site, which was called the Brighton Road site. On this occasion also the Water Company failed to be represented, or to take any part in the proceedings. Under these circumstances seeing that the present Bill is promoted by the Water Company, I thought it necessary to examine the provisions of the measure, and ascertain, if possible, what its object is. Now the object of it will be immediately understood by reference to the Act of 1871, whereby the present Company were incorporated. By that Act, the principal Act of this Company, the Sutton District Water Works Act of 1871, the Company was incorporated for the purpose of supplying with water certain parishes within the limits laid down by the Act, which, by Section 6, comprised the town and parish of Sutton, and the parishes of Cheam, Carshalton, Ewell, Beddington, &c., all of them in the County of Surrey. By the same Act, the Company was authorized to create an original share capital of £20,000, but with power to raise an additional capital of £40,000, more by the issue of ordinary or preference shares, or stock. They were also granted borrowing powers to the extent of 25 per cent of their paid-up capital. Now, the object of the Act of 1871 is very simple. It provides for the incorporation of the Company which is to supply water to a certain clearly defined and limited district. What is the object of the present Bill ? The present Bill proposes altogether to alter the character of the undertaking. Instead of supplying water to its own district, for which the present Company and their resources are amply adequate, it is proposed that—

> "The Company may from time to time enter and carry into effect contracts and arrangements with any urban or rural sanitary authority and the trustees of any turnpike or other road or any highway board or any surveyor of any highway and any railway company and any other companies bodies or persons with respect to the supply of water in bulk (without as well as within the Company's limits of supply as defined by the Act of 1871) as the Company think fit and every such contract and arrangement may be made for such period on such terms pecuniary or otherwise and conditions as the Company think fit and the Company may by agreement vary suspend or rescind any such contracts or arrangements and make others in lieu thereof and in addition thereto."

That is to say that whereas the original intention was that this Company should supply the district of Sutton with water for domestic and other purposes, they are now to be recast as it were, and to have power to supply from their Sutton resources water in bulk to an indefinite and unascertained area beyond the limits of their own original district whether the districts outside the limits are already provided for or not, or whether they are already supplied with water by any other Company. There is a proviso to the Clause 22 which further extends the power of the Company. That proviso is as follows:—

> "Provided always that the Company shall not supply water in bulk to any corporation body or person beyond the Company's limits of supply nor to any person within those limits for other than domestic purposes if and so long as in either case the affording such supply would prevent the Company from giving a full and efficient supply for domestic purposes within the Company's limit of supply."

The effect of that is simply this—that this Company asks power to draw upon the Sutton water resources, not only for their present wants within the district, but for the purpose of supplying water in bulk for domestic and other purposes outside their own district. They are not to be allowed to supply water in bulk if by doing so they trench upon the domestic supply of Sutton itself; but they are to be allowed, if they should think fit, to sell the Sutton water supply for the domestic consumption of districts outside the original limits, even though it be at the expense of the Sutton consumers themselves. Well, some such a proposal as that is not only novel, but perfectly monstrous. At present, the supply accorded to the people of the district is sufficient. There has been no complaint whatever of the inadequacy of the water supply of Sutton, and it is a very noticeable fact that the Company has not yet exhausted its borrowing powers. Therefor, it is clear that this Bill is not proposed in the interests of the ratepayers, or in the interests of Sutton itself. It remains to be ascertained in whose interests the Bill is promoted. I think it is not very difficult to see that one party, at any rate, will be very considerably benefited by the Bill, and that is the Company itself. At the present moment the Company is paying a dividend of 7½ per cent. They have an original capital of £20,000 extended under their first Bill by a further sum of £40,000 in share capital, and they have borrowed £9,000 out of the £15,000 they were entitled to borrow. Consequently, they have not exhausted their borrowing powers, and they are now paying, or did pay as their last dividend, 7½ per cent. The Company now seeks to obtain power to extend indefinitely the area which is to be supplied. It seeks to have the capital of the Company, not only increased, but absolutely doubled—to raise it, in fact, from £60,000 to £120,000 for these utterly unnecessary purposes. The condition of the issue of this new capital is that those to whom the shares are allotted shall receive a dividend of 7 per cent. What does that mean? It probably means this: that if the persons to whom the shares are to be allotted at par take them in the market at a guaranteed interest of 7 per cent, making each share worth £180 in the market, is given. That is the whole explanation of this Bill; and I defy anyone to show what possible good the measure can do to anybody, except to the promoters of it, in a pecuniary point of view. There is, however, another aspect in the case which is very important. I am precluded, by the Rules of Procedure, from going behind the Report of the Examiner of Private Bills. Now, the Examiner has reported to this House that all the Standing Orders have been complied with, and, therefore, I cannot question the fact that they have been complied with. The Standing Orders provide that certain notices shall be given in order that any scheme of this nature shall not be sprung with surprise upon the public. The Standing Orders technically have been complied with; but I maintain that the object of the Standing Orders has not been secured, inasmuch as this Bill comes on the inhabitants of Sutton and the surrounding district altogether as a surprise. [*Cries of* "No!"] The Local Board have had no information with regard to it. The Chairman of the Local Board had no information with regard to it until very recently, and that he obtained casually; the Clerk of the Local Board has never received any official information of the measure; he, also, has had nothing but a casual intimation, not from the promoters of the Bill, but from other parties. Although one of the Directors of the Company is a member of the Local Board, he never thought it incumbent upon him to state what was being contemplated by the Company. There is another point which I ought not to omit. If the Bill had provided for drawing water from the River Wandle it would, under the Standing Orders of this House, have been incumbent upon the promoters to give ample notice to the owners, lessees, and occupiers along that river. But the Bill does not provide for drawing water direct from the Wandle; it provides for power to sink wells over an enlarged extent of area. Now, the River Wandle is supplied, not by tributaries, or from certain waters, but by springs, and the effect of sinking wells in the Valley of the Wandle will be to cut off the water from the Wandle itself. But inasmuch as the water is not taken direct from the river, the necessity of giving notice to the owners, lessees, and occupiers was evaded, and the proprietors and occupiers along the Valley of the Wandle have only by accident ascertained the danger by which they are threatened. Then it is perfectly clear that if the Standing Orders of this House have, as they have been no doubt, technically observed, nevertheless the spirit of these Orders has been entirely evaded. Moreover, it will be within the recollection of some Members of this House that a Bill was promoted some years ago on a similar question, called the London and South Western Spring Waters Bill; but among the opponents of that Bill in 1882 was this very Company—the Sutton District Water Company, which now proposes to take the very same powers which they then objected to. The inhabitants of Sutton are desirous of obtaining the control of their own water supply. Sooner or later they will be in a position to do so, just as the inhabitants of London, we may hope, will be able to take over the water supply of London. It is a matter of immense concern to the inhabitants of the district that they should have the control of their own water supply, and that this House should not, without good cause, allow a large increase of the capital which has already been sunk in the water-works. Whatever the additional capital may be, it will be necessary for the locality to buy it out; and if it is artificially and without good cause increased now, so much the larger will be the amount which the inhabitants of Sutton will have to pay in the future. Sir, on all these grounds I think the Bill is not one which commends itself to the judgment or the conscience of this House, and I beg, therefore, to move that it be read a second time on this day six months.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any hon. Gentleman second the Motion?

Mr. RICHARDS KELLY (Camberwell, N.): Yes, Sir, I will second the Amendment. I represent a constituency which is very deeply interested in this scheme. It may be said that no Petition has been presented against the Bill from any Local Authority which has any interest in the measure. That I think is easily accounted for, and is not to be wondered at. On the 22nd of January last I find that a local newspaper announced that the Local Authority would meet, I think, to-morrow, for the purpose of considering the provisions of the Bill, and deciding whether it was necessary to oppose it. Therefore, I think I am justified in saying that, although the Standing Orders of the House have probably been technically observed, there has been a secrecy about this matter which requires some explanation. The hon. Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) has told the House that a Director of the Water Works Company is also a member of the Local Board of Health, but although he attended the meetings of the Board he never said a word about this scheme, although the Bill was deposited weeks and weeks ago. Surely there was some motive for that reservation. Certainly those who are deeply interested in opposing the scheme should have had an ample opportunity of knowing what the scheme was, and of eliciting the feeling of the inhabitants in regard to it. May I be allowed to remind the House that in the immediate neighbourhood of Sutton there is an important institution, which will be largely affected by this Bill, an institution which makes provision for 2,000 pauper children. If this Bill is allowed to pass, a very large portion of the water supply now enjoyed by this school will be absolutely taken away. As I understand, there are no persons in a position of authority who are opposing this Bill, and the Water Company will consequently be in a position to dictate whatever bargain they like. The Local Board of Health is no longer, I believe, in a position to oppose the Bill, and to say what the conditions shall be under which the Company are to carry on their undertaking. At present they propose to take power to sell as much water as they can —to sell to—

> "Any urban or rural sanitary authority and the trustees of any turnpike or other road or any highway board or any surveyor of any

highway and any railway company and any other companies bodies or persons with respect to the supply of water in bulk as the Company think fit."

There is a proviso which says—

> "Provided always that the Company shall not supply water in bulk to any corporate body or person beyond the Company's limits of supply nor to any person within those limits for other than domestic purposes of and so long as in either case the affording such supply would prevent the Company from giving a full and efficient supply for domestic purposes within the Company's limits of supply."

This is a peculiar and a somewhat suggestive provision. The Company who come here to ask for these extraordinary powers wish to appear in a favourable light, but I venture to think that they are attempting to throw dust into the eyes of this House. They have inserted a clause in this Bill which provides that—

> "The Company shall not under the powers of this Act without the consent of the Local Government Board purchase or acquire in any city borough or other urban sanitary district or in any parish or part of a parish not being within an urban sanitary district ten or more houses which after the passing of this Act have been or on the fifteenth day of December last were occupied either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring class as tenants or lodgers."

Now, the Company never could, under any circumstances, want to do anything of the kind, and it is well known that they are already in possession of land which would afford ample scope for any extension of their machinery or enlargement of their works. Therefore I say that this is an attempt to throw dust in the eyes of the House. Attention has already been called to the fact that the Company propose to raise an additional capital of £60,000 to that which they have already raised. This sum of £60,000 is to be raised at their own option by the issue of new ordinary or preference shares; but there is no provision in the Bill to prevent the present limited number of shareholders from appropriating the whole of the new shares to themselves. Now I ask the House why this Company with a monopoly already and a dividend of 7 per cent, should be allowed to secure a further monopoly which will deprive the governors of the Orphan School of their water supply without giving them compensation of any kind. I deny that there are any merits whatever in this Bill. I may be asked why I take the unusual course of seconding the Motion of the hon. Member for East Donegal for the rejection of the Bill. I say that, viewed in every possible aspect, it is a Bill of a most unusual character and one which cannot possibly recommend itself to any Member of this House.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months" — (*Mr. Arthur O'Connor.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. CUBITT (Surrey, Mid): I am sorry that I am compelled to ask the House for its indulgence for a few moments while I endeavour to answer some of the allegations which have been made by the hon. Member for East Donegal (Mr. Arthur O'Connor). I know that the House is anxious to pass to more important business, and therefore I will put what I have to say into the smallest possible compass. In the first place, it is a matter of some difficulty to find out what the ground of opposition is. There was a reference in the speech of the hon. Member to something which happened last year in reference to the proposed formation of a local cemetery. The Water Company have been charged with negligence in that case, but it is impossible to sustain such a charge, because the Committee communicated at once with the Home Office and requested that its assent might be withheld, if, after inquiry, it should be found that the proposed site would prejudicially affect the water supply. The hon. Member blamed the Water Company for not taking steps to guard themselves against any damage the formation of a cemetery in that position was likely to do. The answer of the Home Office to the letter of the Water Company stated that before approving of the site for the proposed Cemetery every proper precaution would be taken by the Secretary of State, and every representation that might be made on the matter would be carefully considered. In regard to the immediate question before the House, I have been given to understand, from all the information I have been able to collect, that this is an ordinary Water Bill; and that it does nothing except to ask for powers to raise additional capital for the purpose of placing Sutton in a proper position so far as its water supply is concerned. Now Sutton is a village which has rapidly grown into a town with a population of more than 10,000—or one-fifth of the population of the entire division. Therefore, it is only natural to suppose that the Water Company having fulfilled its duties in the past, now find themselves compelled to extend their operation. I may say also that this is a *bonâ-fide* Company. The chairman of the Company is an experienced man of business —the vice-chairman is also an experienced man of business, and the three other directors are local gentlemen living in Sutton. It would be impossible to bring a better Directorate before the House, and as I have said already, this is simply a Bill to authorize the raising of additional capital which contains no extraordinary clauses whatever. The hon. Members for East Donegal and North Camberwell have devoted some pains and a considerable amount of ingenuity to an interpretation of Clause 22. Now I am told by the highest authority I have been able to consult, that this is the usual clause inserted in nearly every Water Bill which is brought before this House. It gives no right of entry into places beyond the district, and there is nothing of a novel character in it, and it has not the wide scope which the hon. Gentlemen have attached to it. The hon. Member for East Donegal says that this Company is ambitious to supply one half of London with water. Their powers, however, are limited to supplying water in bulk to adjacent Local Boards. That disposes, I think, of the second allegation of the opponents of the Bill. As to the purity of the water, that has recently been certified by competent analysts. On these grounds I appeal to the House to read the Bill a second time. The hon. Member for East Donegal not being able to find any fault with the provisions of the Bill as they stand, has endeavoured to imply that the promoters have gone behind the provisions of the Standing Orders, and have done something which, although technically regular, practically amounts to a contravention of those Standing Orders. In reply to that accusation, I may say that there has been no secrecy whatever in regard to the promotion of this Bill. On the contrary, the Examiners have reported that the notices by advertisement properly insisted upon by the Standing Orders have been duly given, and the advertisements themselves quite put out of the question any notion of secrecy. I wrote a letter to the Chairman of the Sutton Local Board as to the course which was intended to be taken to-day. I told him where I should be during the day, but I have received no communication from him. Therefore I do not think the Bill is likely to be very strongly opposed by the Local Board. But I make this appeal to the House to read the Bill a second time on higher grounds. I believe it is the wish of this House that questions of Local Government shall be removed from the consideration of the House. I would therefore appeal to the House to know whether the hon. Gentleman is wise at a time like this when the House is so greatly embarrassed by a pressure of business in raising a discussion of this sort upon a Motion for the second reading of a Private Bill. I would appeal also to the Chairman of the Committee of Standing Orders, and to my right hon. Friends on the Treasury Bench, to know if this is not a proper view to take of the matter. With these remarks I am perfectly prepared to leave the question with full confidence to the judgment of the House.

SIR TREVOR LAWRENCE (Surrey, Reigate): I had the honour to represent the district in which these works are situated for a considerable number of years up to the election of 1885, and as I am intimately acquainted with all the circumstances of the district, I will venture to trouble the House with a very few words on the subject. The hon. Member for East Donegal (Mr. A. O'Connor) has told the House that the present water supply is fully adequate for the wants of the inhabitants. Now, that is not so at all. It is not adequate for the inhabitants at present supplied; and there exists a necessity for making provision for a largely increased supply for the increasing numbers of inhabitants the Company are required to supply. When I first had the honour of representing this part of the County of Surrey, the population was less than one-half of what it is now. Everyone who is acquainted with the neighbourhood of Sutton will be aware that house building has been going on at a very rapid rate ndeed, and that there has been a remarkable increase in the number of inhabitants. So far as the Directors of the Water Company are concerned, I am personally acquainted with them, and I do not think the House will be at all inclined to doubt that they are all of them good men of business and perfectly honourable and straightforward men. With regard to the Sutton Local Board of Health, I, like my right hon. Friend the Member for the Epsom Division of Surrey (Mr. Cubitt), have been in communication with the Chairman, who informs me that there undoubtedly exists an idea that some day or other the Local Board may find it necessary to purchase the Water Works; but the chance of this should not be allowed to interfere with the Company's desire to secure all the means of supply for the district that it is possible to obtain. I think the Local Board would be extremely remiss in the discharge of their duty, if in a place like Sutton they did not take cognizance of everything done by the Company or any other Public Body. But it is a matter of public notoriety that no Public Company can conceal what it is doing in a small neighbourhood like this, and therefore the fact that the Water Company were introducing this Bill and applying for increased powers under it, has been for a long time notorious in the town. [Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: No.] The hon. Gentleman says "No." I am a resident in the neighbourhood, which he is not, and I think I am better acquainted with the facts of the case than he is. Then again in regard to the remarks of the hon. Member for North Camberwell (Mr. Kelly), what he said in reference to the wells of the Orphan School is a matter of pure imagination. I do not believe that the water which the Company desire to take and distribute will affect those wells in the slightest degree. As to the sources of the River Wandle, that also is a mere imaginary evil on the part of the hon. Member opposite. So far as those who are interested in the Wandle are concerned — and I have a personal interest in that river myself — we are all of us anxious to retain it as a trout stream—one of the few which now exist in the neighbourhood of London. Those who are interested in the preservation of the Wandle are, however, perfectly satisfied that no injury will be done to it by the provisions of this Bill. If any injury is done, those who consider that they are likely to suffer will have a *locus standi* to be heard in opposition to the measure. I appeal, then, to the House to read the Bill a second time and refer it to the proper tribunal, upstairs, for considering its details. I venture to think that this House ought to be very chary indeed how it prevents a growing neighbourhood from taking measures to provide itself with an adequate supply of water, when it is established that there is an urgent necessity for an increased supply. For these reasons I hope that the House will reject the Amendment and consent to read the Bill a second time.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. COURTNEY) (Cornwall, Bodmin): I desire to offer a few observations to the House before a Division is taken. I certainly hope that the Motion for the second reading will not be rejected, but that the House will adhere to its ordinary rule in regard to Bills of a similar character to this—namely, to send it to a Select Committee upstairs, where the allegations contained in it can be properly investigated. There are, however, one or two things which I think it would be as well to clear up at once. The hon. Member for East Donegal (Mr. A. O'Connor) preferred a charge against the Water Company in reference to the course which they pursued last year when a proposal was made for the formation of a cemetery on a site which forms part of their source of supply. An answer has already been given to the charge by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Epsom Division of Surrey (Mr. Cubitt)—namely, that the Water Company did write to the Home Secretary, who replied that the subject would be carefully considered, and who ultimately decided upon refusing its sanction to the proposed site.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: What I said was that the Water Works Company was not in any way represented upon the inquiry.

MR. COURTNEY: The Company took the most efficacious means of securing the careful investigation of the matter, and in the end the site suggested was not approved of. Then the hon. Member says that the Company is seeking to enlarge its original sphere of operations. I think that was the main point of the hon. Gentleman; but it is an entire mistake. The area of the Company is not enlarged at all by the present Bill. It will remain as before, in its own area, and will have no power to break up roads and lay mains outside their present area. All that the Company asks for is power to supply water in bulk outside its present limits, and the clause they propose is one which is frequently inserted in Water Companies' Acts. It does not enlarge the district, but it grants power to the Company to sell the water outside the existing area. The hon. Member for North Camberwell (Mr. Kelly), who spoke with such energy upon the question, accused the Company of having attempted to hoodwink both the public and this House. The hon. Member has acted with the greatest simplicity in the matter because the clause to which he objects is one which is absolutely essential and insisted upon, and one which the Company could not avoid putting into the Bill. Then some difficulty has been raised as to want of notice. Now, I have here *The London Gazette* of the 30th of November last, in which full notice—which is a notice to all the world—is given of the intention of the Company to introduce the Bill. Further, the Examiner has reported that all the Standing Orders have been duly complied with. Under these circumstances I hope the House will not hesitate for a moment in reading the Bill a second time.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I think that the statements of my hon. Friend the Member for East Donegal (Mr. A. O'Connor) are such as to require the serious attention of the House. Let me take the first of those statements. I think when the House considers it, it will be induced to pause before giving a serious support to the progress of this measure. My hon. Friend has pointed out that the effect of passing this Bill will be to enable a limited number of gentlemen to put £40,000 or £50,000 into their pockets. The hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Committees has not controverted that statement at all, nor did the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cubitt) who spoke earlier in defence of the Bill. It is broadly asserted that if the House passes the Bill it will put £40,000 or £50,000 into the pockets of a certain limited number of gentlemen who are promoting it. This property has already been able to pay 7 per cent, and the Bill will enable the Company to offer nominally in the market, but really to a certain number of themselves, additional shares in regard to which a dividend of 7 per cent is to be guaranteed, so that if they obtain this bargain they will be able to realise a handsome sum of money. What is the importance of that? The importance of it is this: This question of the supply of water is one that is becoming very important throughout all the communities of the country, and it is becoming more and more important every year. We are fast approaching the time when Local Boards in different parts of the country will insist upon securing a supply of water for the benefit of the ratepayers, and will further insist upon that supply being entirely under the control of the ratepayers. I find that already, according to the hon. Baronet the Member for the Reigate Division of Surrey (Sir Trevor Lawrence), who spoke in favour of the Bill, there is a movement in the district of Sutton for securing the water supply of the neighbourhood, and placing it in the hands of the town authorities of Sutton. The Local Board say that they are considering the question, and it would be most unfortunate if they should be prevented from taking action in the matter without being compelled to pay £40,000 or £50,000 more than they would be called upon to pay now, which sum would clearly go into the pockets of a limited number of persons. I maintain that it is monstrous to put the town and the ratepayers of Sutton to a prospective cost of £40,000 or £50,000 before they are able to get into their own hands the control of the water supply of their district. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Epsom Division (Mr. Cubitt) says that a feeling is growing up in this House in favour of removing questions of a local character from the discussion of the House of Commons. I am sorry to say that the right hon. Gentleman on a recent occasion did not express any extreme amount of willingness to relieve the House of a large portion of its Business. At the same time, I gladly welcome the right hon. Gentleman as approaching to some extent the character of a Home Ruler in this House. What the right hon. Gentleman does not see in this case is that the tendency of feeling and intelligence out of the House is not only towards placing the decision of these matters, but the entire control of them into the hands of local bodies instead of dealing with them in an Assembly like this. And the right hon. Gentleman, by proposing to push through a Bill like this, is endeavouring to postpone the advent of that happy day when the entire water supply of the country will be in the hands of the ratepayers. I feel bound to support my hon. Friend in opposing this Bill. I will only make allusion to one point which was raised by the Chairman of Committees (Mr. Courtney). The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Epsom (Mr. Cubitt) did me the honour to consult me with regard to the prospects of this Bill, and I urged him not to secure the advocacy of the Chairman of Committees. The advocacy of that hon. Gentleman has been universally fatal to the cause he has supported. Allow me to call attention to one or two points which have been referred to by the Chairman of Committees. He has told the House that this Bill does not enlarge the existing powers of the Water Company. Let me call attention to the clause on which my hon. Friend the Member for East Donegal relied for the statement which he made—Clause 22 of the Bill—

> "Subject to the provisions of this Act the Company may from time to time enter into and carry into effect such contracts and arrangements with any urban or rural sanitary authority and the trustees of any turnpike or other road or any highway board or any surveyor of any highway and any railway company and any other companies bodies or persons with respect to the supply of water in bulk (without as well as within the Company's limits of supply as defined by the Act of 1871) as the Company think fit and every such contract and arrangement may be for such period on such terms pecuniary or otherwise and conditions as the Company think fit and the Company may by agreement vary suspend or rescind any such contracts or arrangements and make others in lieu thereof and in addition thereto."

Therefore this Company can go outside its own limits and supply water in bulk to other districts; and in that way prevent the formation of other waterworks in other localities. This Bill, in fact, gives to this Company one of the most valuable and one of the least excusable monopolies ever asked for even by a Water Company from an Assembly like this. This 22nd clause gives the Company power to job away its water to Companies outside, and it is perfectly monstrous that such a Bill should be allowed to come before the House. The right hon. Gentleman opposite gave the House ample reason for believing that the local authorities of Sutton have not been consulted; and we have had it from the hon. Member who represents the division of the county in which Sutton is situated that the Town Board has not yet discussed the matter, but that it will meet for the consideration of it for the first time to-morrow. Under these circumstances, are we asking the House too much if we ask it to postpone its judgment until the Town Authority have had the opportunity of considering the measure. I feel quite justified in moving that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. MOLLOY (King's Co., Birr) seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 99; Noes 224: Majority 125.—(Div. List, No. 7.)

Original Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.): After the decision which has just taken place I cannot blind myself to the fact that I have no hope of securing a majority in favour of the rejection of the second reading of the Bill. I will therefore ask, with the leave of the House, to withdraw it. I understand that it is the intention of an hon. Member who sits on these Benches to move an Instruction to the Committee, which may in some degree limit the preference which would be given under the provisions of the Bill in regard to the disposal of the new shares of the Company.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. MOLLOY (King's Co., Birr): Am I to understand that now is the proper time for moving an Instruction to the Committee upon the Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill must in the first place be read a second time, and the hon. Member may then give Notice of an Instruction.

Original Question put.

Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

QUESTIONS.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND) MR. L. H. JAMES, LATE OFFICIAL ASSIGNEE.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, How it happened that the existing powers of having the accounts of Official Assignees in Bankruptcy audited were not exercised in the case of Mr. Lucius H. James' accounts; and, whether they are at present being availed of as regards the accounts of the existing Official Assignees?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): This Question refers to a matter as to which I have no special means of knowledge. I believe, however, that an audit is now, and has always been, had in each bankruptcy proceeding; and if it has proved inadequate in some cases, this must, I think, have, to a great extent, arisen from the assignee nominated by the creditors and his solicitor not having used due care and attention.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION—SALES OF HOLDINGS—RESERVATIONS.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) (for Mr. O'DOHERTY) (Donegal, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether numerous sales of holdings in Ireland have been sanctioned by the Irish Land Commission, in which all bogs and turbaries have been reserved to the landlord vendor; whether it has been repeatedly decided in Ireland that such a reservation reserves also the subsoil on which the bog or turbary rests; whether many of the holdings sold are almost entirely covered with bog or peat; and, whether public money is being advanced for the purchase of land which is by the reservations contained in the contract retained by the vendor?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin Univerity) (who replied) said: The Land Commissioners report that, as a general rule, all the estate and interest which before sale the landlord has in the holding is upon the sale vested in the tenant purchaser. Occasionally the holding may include uncut bog, upon which other tenants had before the sale limited rights of turbary. Such rights would, upon the sale of the holding, be preserved for such tenants. No advance is made for the purchase of any holding unless the land comprised therein is, for agricultural or pastoral purposes, in the opinion of the Commissioners, ample security for the sum to be advanced, and advances are never made for the purchase of the privilege of cutting turf where the soil is retained by the vendor.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Will the right hon. and learned gentleman inquire whether in Donegal and other counties in the West of Ireland the bog often represents 75 or 80 per cent. of the total holding?

[No reply.]

LAW AND JUSTICE—CITY OF LONDON COURT.

MR. O'HANLON (Cavan, E.) asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether the City of London Court insist on having receipt stamps on sums under £2, but made up to that amount by the expenses of the said Court; and, if so, whether the Government will interfere in the matter?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (SIR RICHARD WEBSTER) (Isle of Wight): In reply to the hon. Member, I have to state that the proceedings and fees charged thereon in the City of London Court, as well as in the whole of the County Courts of England and Wales, are at present regulated by the County Court Rules and Treasury Orders, 1886, and I am informed by the officials of the Court that they act strictly in accordance with those Rules. If the hon. Member will give me the particulars of any case in which he has reason to believe that these Rules have not been followed, I will take care that inquiry is made into the matter.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS—LOSS OF THE "KAPUNDA."

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N. W.) asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether it is purposed that an official inquiry should be held into the circumstances attending the loss of the S.S. *Kapunda*, on her passage to Western Australia; and, if so, within what period it may be expected that such inquiry will be commenced?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth) (who replied) said: An inquiry has been ordered into the circumstances attending the loss of the *Kapunda*, and will be held as soon as the survivors and the crew of the vessel with which she was in collision have arrived in this country.

INDIA—REFORM IN THE INDIAN TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.

MR. KING (Hull, Central) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, What steps are being taken by the Secretary of State in Council to carry out the reforms in the Regulations of the Indian Telegraph Department which have been repeatedly urged on his attention; whether the Indian Government has called the attention of the Secretary of State to the urgency of the case for reform; whether the Government of India is understood to have admitted the justice of the complaints of the members of the Indian Telegraph Service, and the necessity for a speedy redress of those grievances; and, if so, what reasons there are for delaying to remove these grievances; and when a decision may be expected?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): A scheme relating to the Telegraph Department in India was prepared by the late Secretary of State in Council and transmitted to India on July 8, 1886. The Government of India was authorized to give effect to it if, after obtaining the views of the Commission which is now considering the possibility of effecting reductions in the public expenditure, they should think it right to do so. The Secretary of State has recently requested the Government of India to obtain a Report on the subject from the Commission. Until the decision of the Government of India has been received, it is impossible to give information to the House as to the nature of the communications that have taken place.

CRIME AND OUTRAGE (IRELAND)—ASSAULTS IN WEXFORD COUNTY.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether three emergency men employed on the Brooke estate in County Wexford and one of Mr. Brooke's keepers, named Harris, attacked a man named M'Donnell, on his way home at night, a short time since; whether they were heard to say, before he came up, that "they would do for this fellow," and whether the police authorities mean to prosecute them, and when; whether they have attacked other people; and, if so, how often; whether these men are continually about the roads in a state of semi-intoxication, armed with rifles and revolvers, insulting the people they meet, and endeavouring to provoke them to breaches of the peace; and, if so, how long are they to be permitted to do; and, whether they have licences for the rifles and revolvers they carry?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University) (who replied) said: I am informed that in the discharge of their duties Mr. Brooke's under-agent and gamekeeper are constantly walking about the estate, and that they have licences for the arms they carry. They are sometimes accompanied by one emergency man employed by Mr. Brooke. The police have no information to substantiate the allegation that these men are in the habit of acting in the unlawful and unruly manner attributed to them in the Question. With regard to the alleged threatening of a man named M'Donnell, it appears that he made no report of it; but a week after the alleged occurrence the police heard of it, and they are making inquiries on the subject.

IRELAND—COLLECTOR OF RATES' OFFICE (IRELAND).

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What work is performed in the Collector of Rates' Office; if there are 10 clerks employed there, with salaries ranging from £150 to £700 a-year; and, if a lieutenant of Militia has been lately appointed to assist them, what his salary is, and what his occupation?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University) (who replied) said: The work of the Department is that imposed upon it by the statute—namely, the collection of the various rates imposed within the City of Dublin. The work could not be described in detail within the limits of the answer to a Question. The office staff consists of nine clerks, with salaries ranging from £90 to £400 a-year. To meet a temporary pressure, an assistant clerk has been employed for a period not to exceed two months. He is conversant with the work of the office, having been employed there before in a similar capacity. This gentleman holds a commission as lieutenant in an Irish Militia regiment; but there is no likelihood of his duties to his regiment interfering with his limited official engagement.

HARBOURS AND PASSING TOLLS ACT, 1861—GUARANTEE OF LOANS.

Mr. C. T. DYKE ACLAND (Cornwall, Launceston) asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Government will entertain the question of the expediency of extending to county rating authorities the powers already possessed by municipal authorities of guaranteeing the interest of loans granted under the provisions of "The Harbours and Passing Tolls Act, 1861;" and will insert in the Public Works Loans Bill for this Session a provision for this purpose?

The SECRETARY (Mr. Jackson) (Leeds, N.): I fear I cannot promise to insert a provision such as the hon. Member refers to in the Public Works Loans Bill; but the suggestion made by the hon. Member shall be borne in mind.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—MILLSTREET PETTY SESSIONS — SERGEANT MORONEY.

Dr. TANNER (Cork Co., Mid) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is true that two car drivers named Riordan were summoned by Sergeant Denis Moroney at the Millstreet Petty Sessions, held on the 8th February, and fined for an alleged refusal to give road to the police; whether the alleged obstruction was caused by a procession accompanying the Member for Mid Cork on the occasion in question; whether the police are bound by their rules to give way to the public on such occasions; whether the gravamen of the offence was, that a young boy played *Harvey Duff* upon the cornet; whether Sergeant Moroney is the same individual who had damages for false arrest recently given against him at the Macroom Sessions; whether it has been the usual and almost invariable custom during the past few months for a car-load or two of police to follow Dr. Tanner while visiting his constituency; whether, on the occasion in question, they were following him as usual; and, whether he will have the case investigated?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University) (who replied) said: From the reports submitted to the Government, it appears that a party of police returning off duty overtook a procession accompanying the hon. Member. The procession consisted of four common carts, two side cars, and a number of people on foot. The drivers of the cars refused to make way to allow the police car to pass. For this obstruction they were summoned, as stated. The playing of *Harvey Duff* on a cornet had no connection with the prosecution. Damages, to the extent of 3*s.*, were recently given at Macroom Quarter Sessions against the sergeant named, for wrongful arrest.

STATE OF IRELAND—"BOYCOTTING" AT MITCHELSTOWN.

Mr. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been drawn to the following placard, which has been extensively posted throughout the district of Mitchelstown:—

"Boycott! Boycott!! Boycott!!!

"Fellow Countrymen,

"Be not deceived, boycotting is not done away with. Disregard the language of cowardice no matter by whom uttered. Stand firmly by your homes, by our wives and little ones! Strike at your tyrants! All your hopes and fortunes are centred in this fight. Strike 'now or never, now and for ever,' at every one who assists Anna Kingston, Lady Kingston, to recover oppressive rents, or who pays them.

"Boycott that disgrace to her sex—Anna Kingston, the grass widow, the hard-hearted.

"Boycott Frend, the agent, the pig-headed representative of the Church Body, who dismissed the labourers.

"Boycott Bulldog 'Maria' O'Grady, solicitor, who betrayed every client who had the misfortune to be associated with him.

"Boycott Benson, the insolent whelp, whose insolence and extortion all of you have experienced.

"Strike at the outposts of the Castle; you know who they are.

"Boycott Jim Neill, the hangman, and family; Neddy Kelly, the ex-farmer; Dicky Fitzgibbon, clerk of the Union, the only land-grabber in the district, and his brood of upstarts; Gombeen man Couche and his apostate wife, the only associates of Benson and all bailiffs on the estate. Shun them. Let others, too, take warning and beware of their fate, or their turn will surely come.

"By order of the Vigilance Committee.

"N.B.—John Coughlan, of Flemingstown, has paid his rent. Boycott him, and his short-horns and dairy farms. Dairymen beware!"

and, whether the Government will take such steps as may be necessary to ensure the protection of the Law to the persons thus threatened?

MR. M'CARTAN (Down, S.): Before the right hon. and learned Gentleman answers the Question, may I ask whether he can inform the House whether this placard was not printed and posted in the interests of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin, University) (who replied) said: The notice quoted in the Question was posted during the night of the 5th instant, in the outlying district of the Kingston estate near Mitchelstown, and was torn down by the police. The police have trustworthy information as to its origin, and are following up their inquiries. The persons named are given all possible encouragement and support and protection when required.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—THOMAS SCULLY AND ROBERT KELLY.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether two young men named Thomas Scully and Robert Kelly have been returned for trial at Bantry on a charge of threatening to shoot a gamekeeper to the Earl of Kenmare, named Keohane; if the alleged offence had been committed six weeks previous to the depositions of Keohane having been taken; whether Keohane, who is the principal witness for the Crown, is a man of bad repute, having been imprisoned for 18 months on a charge of homicide, and six months for sheep stealing; and, whether, considering the character of Keohane, these young men will be admitted to bail?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): It is the fact that Thomas Scully and Robert Kelly have been returned for trial on a charge of threatening to shoot a man called Keohane; and, this being so, I must decline, pending the trial, to give any opinion as to the character of the witnesses, or otherwise to discuss the case.

THE LAND (IRELAND)—REDUCTION OF INTEREST ON MORTGAGES, &c.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If Her Majesty's Government will bring in a measure to reduce the interest on charges and mortgages on Irish estates in the same proportion as the rents have been reduced; and, whether the Government will allow the payments in respect of tithe rent-charges, quit rents, and Crown rents to be reduced in the same proportion?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University) (who replied) said: This matter, which is, undoubtedly, of great importance, has been under the careful consideration of the Government, especially with reference to family charges on estates; but I am not at present able to give any pledge as to legislation upon it.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND)—DEATH OF A PRISONER IN CALTON GAOL, EDINBURGH.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) asked the Secretary for Scotland, Whether it is true, as stated in the published Reports of the inquiry into the death of Robert Hume, an untried prisoner in Calton Gaol, Edinburgh, on the 2nd instant, that the prisoner in question, described as maniacal, confined on a charge of shooting, and at times requiring four men to hold him, was locked up for 48 hours in a cell with two other prisoners; whether, on the first night of his confinement, he was discovered "very violent," and "on top of the other prisoners;" whether, on the second evening, he was again found "very violent," and having torn the clothing off one of the other prisoners; whether, on the second night, he became "extremely violent," "shouting and bawling" from 12 till 4 in the morning, when he fell asleep, and that three hours later, his appearance having alarmed his fellow prisoners, he was discovered to be dead; whether there is an infirmary attached to the Calton Gaol; and, if so, why Hume was not sent there; whether the men shut up with Hume were untried prisoners; and, whether it is in accordance with the Prison Rules to expose prisoners to the dangers and annoyance incidental to confinement with violent and maniacal persons?

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour) (Manchester, E.): I am informed by the Prison Commissioners that Robert Hume was received into Calton Gaol, Edinburgh, about 3.30 p.m. on January 31 last. He was examined by the medical officer of the prison. No symptom of insanity appeared until late on the evening of February 1. He had been associated—*i.e.*, placed in a cell with other prisoners—by the medical officer's orders from the time of his reception, as he appeared to be suffering merely from the effects of drink. He was quiet during the first night of his confinement. About 9.30 p.m. on the second night he was suddenly attacked with acute mania, and assaulted one of the prisoners in association with him, when a canvas restraint jacket was put upon him. He was violent from 12 till 4 a.m. on the second night, and then fell asleep, from which he did not awake. He was under frequent observation by an officer all this time. There is a room in the prison used as an infirmary. Hume was not sent there, as he was not considered a case for it till the attack of mania began; and the medical officer, who was for some time on the staff of a district asylum, did not then think it prudent to remove Hume to the infirmary, as he would have disturbed other patients, one of whom was seriously ill of heart disease. There is no padded cell in the prison; but the building is not yet completed, and the Commissioners propose to provide such a cell. Two of the three prisoners shut up with Hume were untried. The prisoners whom the Board have been able to question say that they had no objection to be left with Hume and were not frightened. One of them had acted as assistant hospital nurse in Perth Prison. Prisoners, as a rule, are placed singly in cells; but are associated when the cells are full, or if it is so ordered by the medical officer.

BOARD OF TRADE (MARINE DEPARTMENT)—WRECK OF THE "TALLY HO"—ROCKET STATION AT EASTBOURNE.

Admiral FIELD (Sussex, Eastbourne) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether the subjoined reply from his Department to the Deputy Coroner at Eastbourne, respecting the "rider" of the jury present at the inquest on four sailors drowned at the wreck of the *Tally Ho*, because, in their opinion, no life-saving rocket apparatus was available, really embodies the views of the President of the Board of Trade and his own—

> "Board of Trade (Marine Department), London, S.W., 31st January, 1887.—'Life-saving Apparatus.'—Sir,—With reference to the inquest recently held by you on the bodies of the four seamen, part of the crew of the *Tally Ho*, wrecked near the Redoubt, at Eastbourne, when the jury expressed an opinion that the lives would have been saved had there been a life-saving apparatus at Eastbourne, I am directed by the Board of Trade to state that they have caused careful inquiries to be made, and are advised that probably no life would have been lost had the crew known how to make use of the lines, of which there were plenty at hand; and that the rocket apparatus would have been of no assistance on the occasion, as the vessel was not more than 10 or 15 yards from the shore. The Board desire me to add that the rocket apparatus station at Eastbourne was abolished in December, 1878, because no services had been rendered by it during a period of 30 years; and they are advised that the probability of the usefulness of the rocket apparatus at Eastbourne is not sufficient to warrant the expenditure which the re-establishment of the station would entail.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, Thomas Gray.—E. Hillman, Esq., Deputy Coroner for Sussex, Lewes."

And, whether, in consequence of such lamentable loss of life within easy reach of the shore, he will at once give instructions to supply the usual rocket apparatus for future use when required, seeing that there is an excellent Coastguard Force at Eastbourne to take charge of the same, and that such appliances are generally to be found at all coast towns?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The letter referred to was written with the authority of the Board of Trade, and they see no reason to depart from its tenour; but if the hon. Member will confer with us, possibly an arrangement may be come to in concert with the Admiralty and Local Authorities.

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)—MYLES MARTIN, CROFTER, A PRISONER IN INVERNESS GAOL.

Dr. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the following certificate as to the mental condition of Myles Martin, a crofter, at present undergoing three months' imprisonment (in addition to two months' confinement previous to trial) for having been one of a crowd guilty of mobbing and rioting—

> "Manse of Kilmuir, December 4th, 1886.
>
> "Myles Martin, now in the prison of Inverness, and indicted to stand his trial in the High Court of Justiciary on the 13th, is a weakling and the son of a weakling, and a pauper the son of a pauper. A deceased uncle was a reported lunatic.
>
> "Certified at Kilmuir, this fourth
> "day of December, 1886, by
> "Jas. Grant,
> "Minister of the Parish and Chair-
> "man of the Parochial Board;"

whether Mr. M'Phail, Free Church minister at Kilmuir, corroborated this by a written statement, dated 3rd December, 1886—

> "That Myles Martin is a poor weak-minded lad, who has been regarded as imbecile from his birth, and has been supported by the Parochial Board of the parish;"

whether these Certificates had been communicated to the Crown authorities when they authorized Martin's prosecution; and, whether, considering that Martin committed no act of violence, and if an imbecile could hardly be supposed to understand the law of mobbing and rioting, he will, if he finds the facts stated in the certificates to be well founded, take steps for the remission of the remaining term of his sentence?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): I have seen the certificates in question; and I am informed by the Lord Advocate that they were intimated to the Crown Authorities four days before the commencement of the trial. An inquiry was at once ordered by the Lord Advocate, and was undertaken by a medical officer of long experience and high reputation, who reported that there was no ground for holding the prisoner to be imbecile or unfit for trial. It also came to the knowledge of the Lord Advocate that this same man had a short time previously conducted his own defence in a trial for theft in the Summary Court very intelligibly and successfully. I concur with the Lord Advocate in thinking that there was no reason to believe the prisoner was not fully aware of every act he was doing, and I can advise no interference.

DR. CAMERON asked, whether any evidence had been tendered as to the man's condition before the decision was pronounced?

MR. MATTHEWS said, that, so far as he was aware, no such evidence had been tendered.

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—DRAINAGE DISTRICTS IN KILKENNY

MR. MARUM (Kilkenny, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is aware of the state of things in reference to the extensive Drainage Districts of Erlingford, Johnstown, Cullohill, and Durrow, in North Kilkenny, embracing some 24 miles of the county of Tipperary, Queen's County, and the county of Kilkenny; that the tenant farmers of these localities promoted an arterial drainage scheme, about four years ago, at their own serious expense; that, thereupon, the engineer of the Local Government Board reported favourably of the project, to the extent of the expenditure of £32,000; that, owing to the present defective Drainage Code, under which "statutory termors" are excluded as "owners" of Drainage Districts, a small proportion of the percentage of "assents" is needed to ensure the technical formation of a Drainage District in the above locality, inasmuch as two land proprietors have withheld their cooperation; that, to remedy the deficient legislation, a Land Improvement and Arterial Drainage (Ireland) Bill has been introduced by successive Governments, but has not been passed; that a representation to this effect has been made on behalf of the above-mentioned tenant farmers to the Royal Commission of Inquiry as to Harbours, Arterial Drainage, &c., with the request that they would inspect the locality or receive evidence upon the subject, but they have not acceded to either course; whether he is able to state the reason for this refusal; whether the scope of the inquiry of this Royal Commission extends to arterial drainage in Ireland generally, or is limited to the same only where it affects "the improvement or preservation of any necessary facilities for inland navigation," or is such the interpretation or was such the intention of Her Majesty's Government; and, whether, in the latter case, the Government are prepared forthwith to bring in a Bill amending the Drainage Code, and to sanction there under advances by the Treasury for Arterial Drainage at 3¾ per cent, same as under the Public Health Act?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University) (who replied) said: Such a scheme has been promoted in the matter stated by the hon. Gentleman. I understand it is not intended to hold a special inquiry into the scheme; but if the hon. Member desires it, an arrangement can be made for examining witnesses in London in about a week from the present date.

DISTRESS IN THE METROPOLIS—UNEMPLOYED DOCK LABOURERS AT POPLAR.

Mr. W. ABRAHAM (Glamorgan, Rhondda) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he is aware that 600 starving dock labourers applied for some relief at the Poplar Workhouse on Wednesday last; whether any relief was afforded to these destitute persons; whether he is aware that thousands of dock labourers are out of work, with no reasonable hope of employment in the near future; whether, since November last, 200 of the children of these men have been daily supplied with breakfasts by private charity, administered by Rev. James Chadburn, Poplar; and, if the Local Government Board will take any steps to insure that none of these destitute men, women, and children shall perish from hunger?

The PRESIDENT (Mr. Ritchie) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I understand that from 200 to 300 persons attended at the Poplar Workhouse on the 8th instant, when the Relief Committee were sitting, and requested that a deputation should be received for the purpose of placing before the Guardians the opinions held by the unemployed as to the measures necessary for the relief of the congested labour in the district. The Guardians received a deputation of six. They made no application for Poor Law relief, and expressed themselves as fully aware that the Guardians had no power to start works; but they urged that the Guardians should do what they could to induce those who had the power to provide them with employment. I learn from an Inspector of the Board who attended the Relief Committee at Poplar this morning, that there were no able-bodied applicants for relief. The Board do not doubt that at the present time, especially in connection with dock labour, there is a considerable number of persons out of employment. I am assured, however, that every application which has been made to the Guardians has been attended to; and I have no reason whatever to doubt that any person who applies for relief, and whose destitution is such as to entitle him to receive relief from the Guardians, will be duly received by them. It is the case, I am glad to say, that breakfasts are given by private charity to a number of children in this district, as in other districts in the East End.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—DISTRICT INSPECTOR GREENE.

Mr. W. ABRAHAM (Limerick, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether District Inspector Greene, now stationed in Bruff, County Limerick, is the same officer with reference to whom Colonel Forbes, R.M. gave evidence before the Royal Commission in Belfast, to the effect that he "invariably neglected his duty by not having his men on duty in proper time;" and, if so, will District Inspector Greene be retained in his present responsible position in Limerick County?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University) (who replied) said: No, Sir; District Inspector Greene, now stationed at Bruff, County Limerick, never served in Belfast.

FREE LIBRARIES AND MECHANICS' INSTITUTIONS — SUPPLY OF PARLIAMENTARY REPORTS.

Mr. C. WRIGHT (Lancashire, S.W., Leigh) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he will provide in the Budget for the expense of supplying, in accordance with the terms indicated by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the 9th of September last, Parliamentary Reports of Education, Crime, Pauperism, County Expenditure, and other Returns connected with County Government, also Returns of Army and Navy Estimates, to Free Libraries and Mechanics' Institutions?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. GOSCHEN) (St. George's, Hanover Square), in reply, said, that his Predecessor had promised to submit a Vote to the House to enable the House to decide whether a gift should be made of Parliamentary Papers to Free Libraries. He would submit a Vote to the House for this purpose, in some form; but, in the meantime, as only seven libraries had applied, and each set of Parliamentary Papers only cost about £15, he thought that the amount might be furnished by economies in the Stationery Office, and a reduction in the cost of distributing Parliamentary Papers.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—ORANGE PROCESSSIONS IN NORTH ANTRIM.

MR. PINKERTON (Galway) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether there was a procession of Orange bands in Ballymoney, North Antrim, on Saturday night; whether windows were broken in the houses of leading supporters of the Liberal candidate; Whether the Resident Magistrate (Mr. Rutherford) had a sufficient force under his charge to maintain order; and, what steps, if any, were taken to prevent injury to property, and bring the perpetrators to justice?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University) (who replied) said: This Question is down without Notice, and cannot be answered without local inquiries.

BURMAH (UPPER)—THE RUBY MINES.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, From whom the communication was received, and at what date, in consequence of which the Secretary of State for India telegraphed the Viceroy, 18th November, 1886—

> "Ruby Mines. I gather that arrangements are not finally concluded;"

and, whether those words referred to arrangements for leasing or working the Ruby Mines, and with whom such arrangements were then being negotiated?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The result of answering these Questions would be that the hon. Member would draw from me information respecting negotiations not yet concluded, which I stated a few days ago could not, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, be conveniently made public. When the Government of India has ascertained its rights in the Ruby Mines, and has determined how it will make use of them, I shall be happy to answer any Questions which may be put.

BURMAH (UPPER)—THE RUBY MINES—MILITARY OPERATIONS.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether, after 28th November, when, in consequence of the greater probability of resistance to the Ruby Mines Expedition, General Stewart's command of 1,100 men and four guns was strengthened, there was any Report from General Stewart prior to 24th December; and, whether the whole of the Military Reports as to the Ruby Mines Expedition are included in the Papers already circulated?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The answer to the first Question is No; to the second, Yes.

MADAGASCAR—EXPULSION OF —— WILKINSON.

MR. F. S. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is true that Mr. Wilkinson defied the Malagasy Government by returning from Mauritius to Antananarivo; and, if so, whether the Foreign Office has instructed the British Consul to support the Malagasy authorities in this matter or otherwise?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.): Mr. Wilkinson's expulsion was held by the Supreme Court of Mauritius not to have been justified by the terms of the Treaty between Great Britain and Madagascar. In consequence of this decision, which is binding on the British Consular officers, he returned to Madagascar. The British Consul has supported the Malagasy Authorities throughout these proceedings. Since the return of Wilkinson he has been charged with a crime more grave than that for which he was before expelled, on conviction of which he would be liable to expulsion under the Treaty.

DISTRESS IN LANARKSHIRE.

Mr. CUNNINGHAME GRAHAM (Lanark, N.W.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, in view of the great distress amongst the Lanarkshire miners, Her Majesty's Government will take any steps to relieve it, either by appointing a Royal Commission or otherwise?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): I have heard with very great regret of the existence of distress among the Lanarkshire miners; but there is no ground for thinking that it arises from causes that will be permanent, or with which it is in the power of this or any other Government to interfere.

ARMY—MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Sir GUYER HUNTER (Hackney, Central) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in the recent Army Warrant, any alteration has been made in the relative rank, position, or titles of medical officers to those heretofore held by them?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. E. Stanhope) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Relative rank has been abolished for all departments; but medical officers retain all the privileges heretofore attaching to it. In other respects their status is unchanged.

ARMY WARRANT—CYPRUS MAIL SERVICE.

Sir EDMUND LECHMERE (Worcestershire, Bewdley) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether Her Majesty's Government have taken into consideration the expediency of renewing the mail service with the Island of Cyprus, which was interrupted in December, 1884; and whether Her Majesty's Government will also consider the expediency of capitalizing the annual rent (£92,800) paid to the Sultan?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir Henry Holland) (Hampstead): The subject of re-establishing weekly mail communication between Cyprus and England is under consideration; but it is not proposed to renew the service on the same footing as that referred to in the Question. With reference to the second part of this Question, I have to state that Her Majesty's Government have had under their careful consideration proposals for lightening the burden of the tribute of £92,800; but the subject is surrounded with considerable difficulties, which at present Her Majesty's Government have not been able to overcome.

THE NORTH SEA FISHERIES—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

Sir HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, When the Report of the Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Trade to inquire into the depredations by Foreign on English fishermen in the North Sea will be laid upon the Table of the House?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I hope to lay the Report of the Committee referred to by the hon. Member on the Table of the House early next week, certainly as soon as possible.

TRADE AND COMMERCE — INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE SUGAR BOUNTIES.

Mr. KIMBER (Wandsworth) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether any further Correspondence has passed, or steps taken, with Continental Governments, with a view to an International Conference on the subject of the Sugar Bounties; and, whether there are any further Papers he can lay upon the Table, if moved for?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Certain Governments have been approached upon this subject, and some have replied not unfavourably. The proceedings are not, however, at such a stage that any statement can be made at present, nor can any Papers be laid on the Table.

COAL MINES—EXPLOSION AT THE WOOD END PITS, LANCASHIRE.

Mr. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the Special Report of Her Majesty's Inspector, on the circumstances attending the explosion of fire-damp which took place in the Crumbouke Mine, at Wood End Pits, in Lancashire; and, whether, seeing that that explosion is proved to have occurred by gas liberated from the strata, "in consequence of props being drawn," he will issue instructions to Her Majesty's Inspectors to prevent, as far as possible, such a dangerous practice, in mines known to contain fire-damp, while the miners are at work?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): I have seen the Report of the Inspector, and I think that the point raised by the hon. Member is an important one. The Inspectors of Mines will hold their annual meeting next week, and I have asked them to consider whether this matter had better be dealt with by general or by special rule.

EGYPT—PORT DUES ON SHIPPING.

MR. T. SUTHERLAND (Greenock) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to demand relief for shipowners from the very heavy dues they are now called upon to pay in Egyptian ports, in contravention of the arrangements entered into between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the Khedive (wherein it was declared that the tariff should be increased or lowered according to the state of the Lighthouse Budget); whether approximately the dues thus levied amount to about £90,000 per annum, while the total expenditure falls below half that sum; and, whether the dues in question ought, according to the terms of the said agreement, to be less than half the amount at present levied on British shipping?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Her Majesty's Government have not lost site of this question; but they do not feel justified in pressing a reduction of the Light Dues in view of the present state of the Egyptian Revenue and of the urgent claims upon it arising from the military necessities of the situation in that country. But the earliest favourable opportunity will be taken to remind the Egyptian Government of the arrangement referred to by the hon. Member. From the Lighthouse Accounts that have been received, it would appear that the receipts and expenditure are practically as stated in the second and third paragraphs of the hon. Member's Question.

THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE — DOCKYARD SUBSCRIPTIONS.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether his attention has been drawn to the following Letter in *The Western Daily Mercury* of the 14th instant, relating to the collection of subscriptions to the Imperial Institute:—

> "The Jubilee and Dockyard Constraint.
>
> "Sir,—Whatever may be said in favour of Admiral Grant's action in the Dockyard, many of us feel that we are constrained to act in a way with which we have no sympathy. It may be wrong, but we cannot help the impression that if anyone refuses to contribute he will be at once a marked man. . . . . There are hundreds in the yards who have no sympathy with the movement. Then why should they be marked men if they act up to their convictions?
>
> "(Signed) A GRUDGING GIVER."
>
> "Devonport, Feb. 12."

Whether it is the fact that the leading men of the Dockyards have been furnished with collecting cards; whether such collecting cards have written upon them the names of all the men employed under such leading men; whether the names of those who subscribe are marked off on such cards and the amount subscribed written against each name, and the cards then returned to the head officials; and, whether he will issue instructions to the Military and Naval authorities at all our Dockyards, directing that the canvassing of the *employés* shall be discontinued?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): There is no truth whatever in the allegations that any pressure or influence has been brought to bear upon the *employés* of the Dockyard at Devonport to contribute towards the Imperial Institute. The Admiral Superintendent informs me that an open meeting of the workmen was held last night; that the workmen, by a large majority, decided to contribute to the Imperial Institute; and that all arrangements connected with such contributions are in their hands and under their control.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford, W.) thought officers of high position should not interfere with the *employés* of the Dockyards in this matter, as it would deprive their action of all spontaneity.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said, he saw no reason whatever for interfering with the action of the Admiral Superintendent. He merely gave the opportunity to the Dockyard *employés* to decide whether they should subscribe to the Institute or not.

MERCHANT SHIPPING—THE "ANDREW JOHNSON" AND THE "THIRLMERE."

Mr. PROVAND (Glasgow, Blackfriars, &c.) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, How it is that no Board of Trade inquiry has yet been made into the running down by the British vessel *Thirlmere* of the American vessel *Andrew Johnson,* by which 17 lives were lost, in October 1884; and, when it is intended to hold the inquiry?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The *Andrew Johnson* was an American ship; the *Thirlmere* was a British ship. The collision took place in the South Atlantic; this is outside the limits of British territorial jurisdiction. We have the statements of the master and extracts from the log of the *Thirlmere.* We have no statements from the *Andrew Johnson,* and have no means of getting any. It is not possible, therefore, to hold inquiry by a Wreck Court with the evidence of only one side, and no inquiry will, therefore, be held into the collision. Certain allegations have been made involving imputations of the fitness of the master to hold a certificate. Whether investigation will be ordered, or a prosecution ordered, by this Board in the matter involved in these imputations, is a separate question, and will depend on the action "Smith *v.* Labouchere" now pending.

THE PARKS (METROPOLIS)—BATTERSEA PARK.

Mr. SEAGER HUNT (Marylebone, W.) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether the amount due for arrears of interest on the Battersea Park debt represents interest actually unpaid; if so, to whom, and from where, are these arrears due; and, why the interest has been allowed to accumulate to its present enormous amount?

The FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. Plunket) (Dublin University): The arrears of interest on the Battersea Park debt mentioned in the Question remain unpaid. They are due from Her Majesty's Office of Works to the Public Works Loan Commissioners. The Battersea Park Estate was the security upon which the money was advanced. The interest was allowed to accumulate, because the income derived from the sale or letting of parts of the estate were for many years not sufficient to pay that charge; but it more than suffices now for that purpose, and the arrears of interest are being gradually reduced.

LAW AND JUSTICE—GRANT OF QUARTER SESSIONS TO BLACKBURN.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON (Lancashire, Rossendale) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he can give the House any information as to the grounds on which the grant of separate Quarter Sessions was given by Her Majesty's Privy Council, on the 27th August last, to the borough of Blackburn; whether any, and, if so, what, number of Petitions were presented against the said Grant by the County Justices, Boards of Guardians, and other Local Authorities; whether the said Petitioners had an opportunity of appearing to state their grounds of opposition before the said Grant was made; and, whether he is prepared to bring in or support a Bill to remedy the injustice caused by the said Grant of Quarter Sessions, whereby the Borough of Blackburn is relieved from county rates, exceeding £3,200 per annum; that additional amount of rates being thrown upon the Poor Law Unions of Haslingden, Burnley, Clitheroe, Preston, and other parts of the county of Lancaster?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.), in reply, said that the step referred to in the Question was taken on the recommendation of his Predecessor in July last. The grounds upon which the Grant was given were the size and population of the borough, and certain considerations relating to the administration of justice. Numerous Petitions were presented against the Grant. It did not appear that any deputation of Petitioners was received at the Home Office; but all the Petitions were considered. The points to which the last paragraph of the noble Marquess's Question referred would have to be considered in connection with the County Government Bill; and it was not necessary to anticipate the provisions of that measure by the introduction of a special Bill.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—CONTRACT FOR CARTRIDGES FOR QUEENSLAND.

MR. HANBURY (Preston) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, At what dates, and in what quantities, the respective instalments of their contract for cartridges are to be completed by Messrs. Latimer Clark, Muirhead, and Co.?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): One hundred and twenty thousand cartridges are to be delivered by February 25, and the same number will be delivered weekly until the contract is completed.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—RELIGION OF JURORS.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether the "due inquiry" which Crown Solicitors in Ireland are directed to make in reference to jurors includes inquiry as to the religion of jurors?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): The rule under which the Crown Solicitors act itself indicates the matters to which the inquiry is to be directed, and these do not include the religion of jurors.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—WINTER ASSIZES.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether in England the Act enabling offences committed in counties of cities or counties of towns, to be tried in the adjoining counties, does not apply to the Metropolis; whether he is aware that the said Act was originally passed in England because of the restricted nature of the jury panel available in certain English counties of cities and towns; whether the Government recently caused the Winter Assizes for six Irish counties to be held in the city of Dublin; and, whether the Government propose to assimilate the Irish Law to the English by excluding the Irish Metropolis and the centre of the Irish legal system from the operation of the said Act?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): I cannot undertake to say what was the reason of the enactment of a statute that became law about 90 years ago. That Act does not apply to the City of London, the City of Westminster, or the borough of Southwark; but it applies to many populous places, and it is not the intention of the Government to make proposals for any change in this respect in the existing law. The Winter Assizes for several neighbouring counties were recently held in the City of Dublin. This was in accordance with law and precedent.

MERCHANT SHIPPING — DETENTION OF THE "TELEGRAPHO" BY THE DOMINICAN GOVERNMENT.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Dublin Co., S.) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, What is the amount of money payable by the Dominican Government in respect of the detention of the *Telegrapho*; how much of this sum has already been paid; and, what were the circumstances under which the *Telegrapho* was detained?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir JAMES FERGUSSON) (Manchester, N.E.) (who replied) said: The *Telegrapho*, a British vessel, was seized in 1870, on the ground of piracy in Dominican waters. The charge being disproved, the Dominican Government was called on to pay damages. A compromise was agreed to, and the whole amount has now been paid off.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (SCOTLAND)—POLLING PLACES.

MR. THORBURN (Peebles and Selkirk) asked the Lord Advocate, Whether he is aware that many voters in the parishes of Ettrick and Yarrow, in the county of Selkirk, have to travel from 17 to 20 miles to record their votes at Parliamentary elections, in consequence of the law being that they must vote in the parish in which they reside, although there are polling stations within a few miles of their residences; and, whether, in such circumstances, which are not peculiar to the county of Selkirk, he will take steps to remedy what is a very great inconvenience to voters so situated?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities), in reply, said, that he was aware that in some parts of Scotland the voters had a long distance to go before they could reach the polling stations in their own parish, while they would only have to go a short distance if they were allowed to vote in the neighbouring parish. He promised to consider the subject, with a view to the introduction of a remedy.

METROPOLIS COAL AND WINE DUTIES CONTINUANCE BILL.

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) asked the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, When the Coal and Wine Dues Continuance Bill will be in the hands of Members; whether the Bill has yet been approved by the Metropolitan Board itself; and, whether it is not the fact that many members of the Board are strongly opposed to the Bill?

The CHAIRMAN (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg) (Middlesex, Hornsey): I beg to inform the hon. Member that the Coal and Wine Dues Continuance Bill has received the approval of the Committee of the whole Board, who were authorized by the Metropolitan Board to deal with it, and I trust the Bill will be in the hands of Members of the House in a few days. It is not the fact that many members of the Board are strongly opposed to the Bill.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): Are any members of the Board strongly opposed to the Bill?

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG: I am not the keeper of the consciences of my colleagues; and, therefore, I cannot say.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: Might I ask the hon. Gentleman if any hon. Members of the Board have expressed their hostility to the Bill?

[No reply.]

INLAND REVENUE—A RATING CLAUSE FOR HOARDINGS.

Mr. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he will introduce into any Bill this Session a Clause to rate for Local and Imperial purposes hoardings on vacant lands let for advertising?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Goschen) (St. George's, Hanover Square): The profits derived from hoardings on vacant lands let for advertising would, for the purposes of Imperial Taxation, come under Schedule D. of the Income Tax; but the Question of the hon. Member is probably intended to refer to the decision in "Reg. *v.* The Assessment Committee of St. Pancras." In that case the Court held that a person, by reason of his having a licence in the nature of an easement for the mere temporary use of land for the purpose of advertising, was not an occupier of land who was liable to be rated. The case does not afford any ground for supposing that if land were let for an advertising station so that the tenant became the occupier, he would not be liable to pay rates in respect of such occupation.

BURMAH (UPPER)—REPORTED CHINESE INVASION.

Mr. LEGH (Lancashire, S.W., Newton) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether there is any foundation for the report that Chinese troops have entered Upper Burmah?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir John Gorst) (Chatham): No information has been received at the India Office corroborating the report that Chinese troops have entered Upper Burmah.

Mr. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked, whether information had not for some time been in the possession of the India Office, showing that Chinese troops were being massed on the frontier?

Sir JOHN GORST: So far as I know, there has been no such information in the possession of the India Office; but if the hon. Member gives Notice of a Question, I will answer it.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM — CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether he has made inquiries to ascertain whether it is the fact that Crown Solicitors in Ireland, when a jury has disagreed in any criminal case of a particular character, cause inquiries to be made to ascertain the names of the jurors in favour of an acquittal, and afterwards exclude such jurors from serving on criminal trials by ordering them to stand by; and, if not, whether he will do so?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): I have already stated, from my own knowledge of the business of my Department, that no such practice exists, and I have made no inquiries from individuals. If a written communication containing specific statements is made to me, I will give it the fullest consideration; but I shall not institute an inquiry involving an implied censure of certain public officials, upon the suggestion of an allegation of which I have never heard, and in support of which not a single fact is stated.

MR. HEALY: If the right hon. and learned Gentleman did not make any inquiry into the subject, will he inform me how it was that he was able to assure the House that no such practice existed?

MR. HOLMES: I have stated that, from my own knowledge of the Department, no such practice exists. I have made no inquiry from individuals, nor shall I do so, unless a specific charge is brought against them.

IMPERIAL AND COLONIAL DEFENCES—COALING STATIONS IN THE EASTERN COLONIES.

SIR WILLIAM CROSSMAN (Portsmouth) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he will state the amounts that have been voted by the Colonial Legislatures of Hong Kong, Singapore, Ceylon, and Mauritius, for the defences of the coaling or naval stations in those Colonies; how much has been expended by the Imperial Government for the armaments of the defences of those stations; how much will be required to complete those armaments; how much has been expended by the Imperial Government on the other coaling stations for Her Majesty's Fleet abroad; and, how much will be required to complete the defences of those other stations?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) (who replied) said: I hope the hon. Member will understand that it is not desirable to give complete details as to the several stations; but I can say that the Legislatures of the Colonies named have voted £270,820 towards their defences. The Imperial Government, for the armament of those defences, has expended £183,530, and contemplates a further expenditure of £206,555. On other coaling stations the Imperial Government have spent £192,164, and expects to spend a further sum of £513,306.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION—LEGISLATION.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, When the Report of the Commission on Irish Land will be completed and presented to the House, and how soon he expects that the Government will be able to introduce the Irish Land Bill announced on Friday last by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I am informed that the Report of the Royal Commission will be delivered at the Home Office on Saturday next. It is, of course, impossible for me to say when it will be laid on the Table of the House, as the Government must have some little time for its consideration; but I can promise that there shall be no delay. As the right hon. Gentleman asks when legislation will follow upon the Report, it will be impossible for me to say now when that Bill will be introduced.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): Might I ask if the Report will be accompanied by the Evidence taken by the Commission?

MR. W. H. SMITH: That I am not able to say. No doubt the Evidence will follow soon; but I have a letter from the Chairman of the Commission stating that the Report will be signed and delivered at the Home Office on Saturday.

BULGARIA—THE CORRESPONDENCE.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, When further Papers containing the Correspondence relating to Bulgaria during the months of November and December will be presented; and particularly the communications which have passed between Her Majesty's Government and the Governments of Austro-Hungary, Germany, and Russia subsequent to the declarations of the Marquess of Salisbury made upon 9th November of last year?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): In answer to the Question of the right hon. Gentleman, I have to say that, having regard to the present condition of the negotiations in reference to the Bulgarian Question, it is not in my power to say when the further Correspondence to which the right hon. Gentleman refers can be laid upon the Table.

DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND AGRICULTURE—COST OF THE COMMISSION.

Mr. H. GARDNER (Essex, Saffron Walden) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he can state to the House the probable cost to the nation of the late Commission on the Depression of Trade and Agriculture?

The FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H Smith) (Strand, Westminster): The Expenditure in respect of salaries, &c., has been as follows:—Salaries, £468; travelling and incidents, £535; shorthand, £558—total, £1,561. To this has to be added the cost of stationery and printing, which at present can only be estimated at £1,500—total, £3,111, or, speaking generally, £3,000.

RAILWAY RATES AND CHARGES BILL.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY (Forfarshire) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade when the Railway Rates and Charges Bill would be introduced?

The SECRETARY (Baron Henry De Worms) in reply, said, the Bill would be introduced in the House of Lords. He could not exactly say when.

NOTICES OF MOTION.

Ordered, That the Order for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Address have precedence this day of the Notices of Motion and Orders of the Day. — (*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—o—

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [FOURTEENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January.]—[See page 84.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

CROFTERS (SCOTLAND).

Dr. CAMERON (Glasgow, College), in rising to move, as an Amendment, at the end of the 12th paragraph, to insert the words—

> "And humbly to represent to Her Majesty that recent events in Skye and Tiree, and the general administration of justice in the Highlands, have caused serious concern to the people of Scotland, and demand full inquiry,"

said, that he had made the scope of his Amendment sufficiently wide, in order that the discussion might not be interrupted by any technical rules. The Amendment he proposed to move covered a wide field; but, as he had a large number of facts to marshal, he would in his observations confine himself to the case of the expedition by Her Majesty's Government to the Island of Skye. That expedition afforded an illustration—by far the most convincing and cogent proof—of all the grievances to which he should have to call attention, and into which he thought an inquiry was needed. Hon. Members who had seats in the last Parliament would recollect that a large portion of the time of that Parliament was taken up in the passing of the Crofters Act, a measure which had been described by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) as having conferred on the crofters of Scotland advantages greater than those enjoyed by the occupying class in any other portion of Her Majesty's Dominions, or in any part of the civilized world. When Parliament passed that Act it knew that rents were excessively in arrear; it knew the circumstances of the Highlands, and that in many cases there had been resistance to the service of writs; it knew that collisions between the crofters and the authorities had been frequent in connection with the service of these writs; and yet, with a full knowledge of these facts, it had passed the Act to which he had referred. Recognizing that the question of land tenure lay at the root of the difficulty, it enacted fixity of tenure subject to fair rent. It appointed a Commission to say what the fair rent should be, and it gave that Commission power to adjudicate on arrears, to remit them altogether or curtail them as it thought proper. In the interests of the landlord, Parliament made bankruptcy a bar to enjoying the benefits of the Act. For the protection of the tenant, however, it placed a provision in the Act authorizing the Commission to stay proceedings for the recovery of rent and arrears until it could commence its operations. But, owing to the defective drafting of the Act, and the absence of any machinery for calling this power into operation, this provision had been a dead letter; but the fact that it was in the Act left no doubt as to the beneficent intentions of Parliament in the matter. The Act was passed by the authority and with the sanction of both Parties in this House, and he held, therefore, it was the duty of Her Majesty's Government to assist in its loyal administration. Parliament had prescribed a remedy for a chronic state of disorder, and it was the duty of the Government to avoid interference with its operation, especially by applying any counter remedy hostile to its spirit, such as the application of physical force or martial law. But, without excuse, the Government chose the very moment almost preceding the sitting of this Commission to send a military expedition to Skye to assist in the service of writs; the result of which was either to compel the crofters to pay arrears, and thus to withdraw them from the scope of the Commission, or to compel them to become bankrupt, and thus rob them of the benefit of the Act. They put that expedition in the charge of a gentleman whose antecedents made it clear that he was utterly unfit for the post, and who adopted tactics that were calculated to drive law-abiding subjects to resistance. They exercised that irresponsible power which the law of Scotland entrusted to the Lord Advocate and his subordinates with an ostentatious violence and severity—with a disregard to the Constitutional rights of the lieges —calculated to render law regarded as an engine of tyranny and oppression than as the handmaid of justice and fair play. During a large portion of the time this expedition lasted Skye had been described, and rightly described, as in a state of siege. Whole villages were ransacked by the police—sometimes at midnight—without warrants. The presence of sickness or death was no stop to the proceedings, and constituted no protection. Something akin to the curfew law was established, under which peaceable citizens, going about their business after nightfall, were arrested. Marines were marched and counter-marched throughout the Island, gunboats were manœuvred round its shores, military demonstrations were made, suspected offences of speech and publication were visited by arbitrary imprisonment, medals were promised in commemoration of the campaign, proclamations were issued, and, in short, a travesty of pomp and circumstance of glorious war was set up. This action of the Government on Skye, to his mind, constituted a most dangerous precedent for the administration of criminal law in any civilized country, and demanded the impartial investigation which it was the object of his Amendment to secure for it. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland received a deputation in regard to these proceedings in November last, and as the right hon. Gentleman referred them to the expedition sent to the Island of Skye in 1884 by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), the then Home Secretary, he (Dr. Cameron) imagined that would be quoted to-night as a precedent for the expedition of last year. But the circumstances were totally different. What were the principles which the Liberal Government had laid down as applicable to military intervention in civil administration in the Highlands? In 1882 the state of matters in Skye was very bad. Numerous deforcements of police had taken place in connection with the service of writs. Repeated application had been made to Government for military aid, and in November, 1882, the then Lord Advocate (Mr. A. J. Balfour), by direction of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), the then Home Secretary, wrote a letter to Sheriff Ivory —who was throughout the medium of negotiation for the military—in which was laid down the proper principles which should guide the Government in dealing with such a request. The duty of the County Authority, it said was to provide a Police Force for the service of writs, and recourse should not be had to military aid unless in cases of sudden riot or extraordinary emergency, where the Police were unable to cope with it. The Liberal Government refused to send military aid to the Authorities, stating that if they had not sufficient Police Force they had better increase it. The result was that the Commissioners of Supply at Inverness were obliged to put their hands in their own pockets, and increase their Police Force at a cost to themselves of about £3,000 a-year. Public opinion was aroused, and the proprietor whose obstinacy had caused so much trouble came off his high horse. The dispute about Benlee was amicably settled in about a fortnight. But in 1884 a Force was sent, and under what circumstances? Papers had been laid before the House which showed the precise nature of the circumstances. It appeared that the Chief Constable of Inverness-shire had reported that for months past the Island of Skye had been in a lawless condition. Grazing grounds had been seized, and secret societies were rumoured to exist for the purpose of committing outrages. On August 18th a terrible incident had taken place in the shape of a visit made by Mr. Macfarlane, then Member of Parliament for Carlow, accompanied by the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Richard Power), the Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) and Professor Blackie. On the recommendation of the Police Committee, the Police had had 50 revolvers served out to them, and 1,000 rounds of ammunition had been laid in store. A wire fence had been broken, a stack had been set on fire, and a No Rent manifesto had been published; and, finally, a detachment of police had been deforced. Considering these circumstances, the Police Committee came to the conclusion that the Police were incapable of dealing with the state of matters, and they applied to the Government to send a gunboat to be stationed at Portree or some other port in the neighbourhood, with such a number of Marines as would be sufficient not only to protect the Police in the performance of their duty in preserving the peace—there was not a word said about the serving of writs here—but of quelling any riots with which the constables might have to contend against. Sheriff Ivory forwarded that application to the Government. He backed up this application of the Commissioners, for he wrote the letter to the then Lord Advocate of the Liberal Administration, asking for the immediate despatch of a gunboat and Marines to Skye to protect the Police, and assist them in protecting the property and persons of the lieges of the Island—not one word was said about writs for rents. For these reasons the Military Expedition was sent. The House had therefore seen that the ground on which the Government refused in 1882 was that it was the duty of the Local Authorities to provide whatever police might be necessary for the service of writs and the services of summonses by the Supreme Court; that military aid should not be employed unless in cases of sudden riot or extreme emergency. They had seen in 1884 they granted the military assistance on the ground that the utmost emergency existed—that life and property was in danger—that a reinforced and armed police force was utterly unable to cope with the state of lawlessness, and on that ground only. It was nothing to the point, he should remark *en passant*, that the reports of outrages had been found to be grossly exaggerated. Not one of the thousand rounds of ammunition was ever fired in anger; no policeman received injuries more serious than a kick; and the real motive which had induced the Local Authorities to ask for assistance was almost universally believed in Scotland to have been in order that they might put down the Crofter agitation, and give assistance for the serving of writs. That fact, however, had nothing to do with the principle which guided the Liberal Government in one case or the other. And then, in 1885, the Conservative Government came into power. Now, they had a perfect right to reverse the policy which had guided their Predecessors; they had a perfect right to say that they considered land contracts sacred, and that if rents could not be collected military aid should be afforded. They had a perfect right to do so at that period, because the Crofters Act had not been passed. The Conservatives held Office until February, 1886; but let them see what the Conservative Government did during their tenure of Office. They found Sheriff Ivory demanding military, and the Lord Lieutenant, writing to the then Minister for Scotland, backing up his application. Then they had a letter, addressed by a Mr. Davidson to the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) then in Office, in which that Gentleman stated that—

> "From personal observation, he was convinced that since the preceding year—1884—the state of lawlessness in Skye had been intensified. Recently," he said, "there had been instances of incendiarism—a crime until then unknown in the North. The resolution to pay no rent had become almost universal throughout Skye. And while the whole crofter rental of the island was only about £10,000, there were arrears amounting to about £20,000, which the crofters said it was their intention never to pay,

and notwithstanding the police force had been doubled, order could not be maintained."

Now, this was the state of matters in 1885. Repeated applications were made to the Conservative Government, but they did not think fit to comply with the applications, and no expedition was sent. After the Election they still adhered to the policy of their Predecessors, but in 1886 the Island of Skye was probably more tranquil than it had been for years. Meanwhile Parliament, with a full knowledge of all the facts, had passed an Act in which arrears were recognized, and a Commission appointed for the purpose of curing the causes that had led to the disturbances in the Island. But now one new condition had presented itself. The landed proprietors were also the Local Authorities. Seeing that it was futile to ask for military aid on the ground of disturbed law and order, or on the ground of arrears of rent, they had set themselves to work to devise a new plea. They determined to bring the Government to its senses by organizing among themselves a strike against the payment of rates, which would bring local public administration to a standstill. Now, there must be two parties to such a strike. There must be the parties who refused to pay and the Local Authority which refused to enforce payment. The refusal of the insular proprietors to pay general county rates affected the pockets of the Commissioners of Supply, and the strike was soon brought to a close by the threat of legal proceedings. But it was a different matter in Skye. The Local Authorities there were parochial boards, and the landlords controlled the parochial boards, and the duty of collecting the poor and school rate devolved upon the parochial boards. The landlords were fortunate in the fact that at the head of these parochial boards was a gentleman named Mr. Alexander MacDonald—popularly known as the "King of Skye." That gentleman was a landed proprietor in the island, and was the factor of most of the landed proprietors, and occupied many prominent posts. He was a member of all the parochial boards in Skye. He was chairman of three out of the six school boards. He was law agent and clerk to the whole lot of them. He was local Clerk of the Peace. He was clerk and treasurer to a number of school boards, a distributor of stamps, a collector of income-tax, a captain of Volunteers, a banker, solicitor, and notary-public. With a Local Authority so constituted, and an officer so accomplished and many-sided as he had described, it was easy for the landlords of Skye to carry on to a successful issue their ingenious Plan of Campaign. It came, however, to the notice of the Board of Supervision, who, on January 5th, 1886, issued a circular, which pointed out the irregularity of the landlords' contentions that they might refuse the payment of rates because their rents had not been paid. The Board of Supervision pointed out that it was the duty of the local parochial boards to use every means against the defaulters. Now, 90 per cent of the sum in arrears to those local authorities were due by proprietors and large tenants, from whom a threat of legal proceedings would at any moment have sufficed to extract payment. As a solicitor, Mr. MacDonald must have known that; but it did not suit him to knock on the head the game he was bent on carrying out. He (Dr. Cameron) could quote abundant extracts from the speeches of Justices of the Peace, Deputy-Lieutenants, and noble Lords, and the circulars issued by their factors, to show that they made no secret of their policy that they refused to pay rates in order to force the Government to send an expedition to Skye. In a report which Sheriff Ivory laid before the Commissioners of Supply, dated April 27, 1886, he said—

"Emboldened by the success of their agitation, and the failure of the Government to provide means for the due enforcement of the law, the crofters have now very generally refused to make payment of the poor-rates and school rates due by them. The total arrears of poor-rate and school-rate due for the year ending 14th May, 1886, amounts to about £5,000. Numerous applications have been made to me for the aid of police to enforce payment of these rates, but as the police were quite inadequate to perform the duty, unless supported by a Government force, I laid these applications before the late and the present Administrations, stating the necessity of employing a Government force; but the applications were invariably refused by both Governments. The result of this state of matters, if it be allowed to continue, will necessarily be that the poor will be deprived of the necessaries of life, and many of the schools in Skye will be closed."

Now, if language meant anything, this language meant that the crofters, through their refusal to fulfil their legal obligations, were responsible for the state of matters described and yet a Parliamentary Return giving information up to the very date had been laid before the House, showing that at the time, out of the total arrears of £5,200 for poor-rates and education rate, the proprietors were in arrear £3,600. The larger tenants —the tenants over £30 a-year—owed £1,000, and the crofters owed £590. In other words, of the £5,200 in arrear, £4,600 was due by substantial and solvent men, whose debts would have been paid immediately Mr. MacDonald, the "King of Skye," allowed his sense of public duty as law adviser of the Parochial Board and Clerk of the Peace to override his leanings as factor and as landlord. The £600 owed by the crofters included a very considerable sum of irrecoverable debts, money owing by dead men and men who had left the district, and it included a larger percentage due by persons so poor that in any other part of Scotland they would have been excused from the payment of rates on the ground of poverty. But were these poor people to be blamed for their arrears into which they had fallen? Why, only a few days before the date of Sheriff Ivory's Report last quoted, Mr. Peterkin, an officer of the Board of Supervision, had penned an official Report, in which he declared they were not to blame. He pointed out that there were no facilities given to the ratepayers for paying their rates. They had to travel many miles, and it was absurd and unreasonable to expect them to go the distance, to suit the convenience of the collector, who sat in his office, and then to accuse them of not paying their rates. Mr. Peterkin said he thought it hardly fair to censure ratepayers for non-payment of rates until more facilities were afforded for paying; and he laid it down as the duty of collectors of those rates to make personal demands for them, and if they did not make those demands, it was impossible to say that proper or any diligence had been used. As to the case of the landlords, Mr. Peterkin showed that the total rents received from Skye was £44,000 a-year, the arrears due from crofters only £15,400, those only which were payable £28,600, and that in respect of these, as well as of the others, the landowners refused to pay their rates. Before any expedition had been determined on the right hon. Gentleman ought, at least, to have informed himself as to who were the persons in arrears of rates to the Local Authorities. He (Dr. Cameron) had asked the right hon. Gentleman a question the other day intended to extract from him the information as to how much was due from the crofters when he determined to send the expedition? In answer to questions put by him (Dr. Cameron) and the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay), as to how much the expedition had squeezed out of the crofters; but they were told that it was no use to ask further questions, as the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland said he had no information to give. It was his duty, before sending the expedition, to ascertain how much was owing by persons from whom the arrears could have been extracted by the threat of legal proceedings, and how much was due by the crofters, who might require to be made to pay by means of the expedition. However, he (Dr. Cameron) thought it was an important point, and he got the best information he could. He was told that, in the interval between the date of the return from which he had quoted, and the time of the expedition, the larger tenants had practically wiped off their arrears, that the crofters had largely reduced theirs, and were not owing more than about £300, and that the landowners alone carried out their No Rate policy.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. Balfour): At what date?

Dr. CAMERON: The date on which the right hon. Gentleman decided on sending the expedition, or before the expedition was sent.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

Dr. CAMERON: The right hon. Gentleman then has information on the point. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman candidly tell us he knew when we asked him the question? The landed proprietors paid at last. They had a meeting when their object had been served—when the expedition was in sight of their shores—and then they paid. On September 10th there was a meeting of the Parochial Board. The question of Lord Macdonald's arrears came up for discussion. They were £126. A question was raised as to the propriety of enforcing payment; but Mr. Alexander Macdonald, the agent, the "King of Skye," the factor of Lord Macdonald, chairman of the Parochial Board, said Lord Macdonald would only pay when his rents were paid; and that if the Board took proceedings apart from the rents arrested in the hands of the crofters, the only effects belonging to his Lordship which could be laid hold of were his household furniture, and if that were seized what a stir it would make in the country. He owed £126, a fourth of the total amount owed by the crofters in March. That amount could be recovered by the mere threat of legal proceedings, or by the seizure of the furniture, but the tender-hearted local authorities would not inflict so much pain on his Lordship's feelings; and yet at their request the right hon. Gentleman sent a military expedition, by means of which a few hundred pounds were raised out of the seizure of the effects of hundreds of families. Hundreds of houses were invaded, and the last farthing wrested from the unfortunates who were called upon to contribute. By way of contrast to refusing to seize Lord Macdonald's furniture, he would read one or two extracts to show how the result of the expedition, in which the right hon. Gentleman appeared to take great pride, as clearing off all the arrears in Skye except £60, was brought about. He quoted in all these cases from the correspondent of the *Glasgow Herald*, who accompanied the expedition, and he quoted that gentleman because the paper with which he was connected had betrayed a strongly anti-crofter bias. The first case was that of a widow Mackintosh, against whom and her son—the joint tenants of the croft—they claimed for 9*s.* 8*d.* When the officer knocked at the door it was opened by a young woman, who stated that her mother died the week before, and the only money in the house was 10*s.*, which had been sent for the purpose of paying for the old woman's coffin. The young woman, with tears, handed over the money in payment of the arrears. Again a distressing spectacle was witnessed at the house of widow Flora Nicholson who owed £1 1*s.* The woman—who was very old—was found lying on the ground in front of her house, and said she could not move in consequence of an accident to one of her legs, and her husband had been dead for 16 years. When the writ was handed to her the woman cried bitterly, and she was left lying on the grass with some of her neighbours beside her. Then there was the case of the Widow Stewart, an old and terribly emaciated woman, who was asked to pay 31*s.* 6*d.*, who pleaded, in a weak piping voice for mercy, being 87 years of age. A paper was, however, handed to her. A terrible picture of poverty was presented at the next house—that of a man named Donald MacInnes. He said he had had no money for nine months; that everything had gone all wrong since his wife died, and that his "bonnie lassie," as he termed his daughter—a young girl 18 years of age—was insane. The whole family were starving. The only asset he possessed was a dun cow which was seized. He (Dr. Cameron) asked the House to contrast the leniency of treatment dealt out to Lord Macdonald in respect of his arrears with the Shylock-like severity meted out to these four families in respect to arrears, amounting in all to under £3. Having decided that this expedition was necessary, he (Dr. Cameron) supposed the Government had no choice but to send at its head Sheriff Ivory. To his mind, the system was a most execrable system, under which a Judge, in whose Courts trivial cases arising in connection with the expedition must be tried, should be allowed to act as accuser, arrester, and hunter-up of evidence. Sheriff Ivory—on a former occasion—had been tried, and found wanting in every qualification requisite for such a post. He had not only arrested men without warrant or instruction, but he had written to the Lord Advocate condemning as guilty men who were subsequently proved innocent. He had published his libels broadcast in the newspapers, and he had been a party to a gross breach of the law in order to obtain evidence against persons he suspected, and had committed many other unjustifiable acts. Any Administration worthy of the name would have known that the mere fact of Sheriff Ivory being placed in charge of the expedition was sufficient to arouse indignation and distrust throughout the length and breadth of Scotland. The expedition started. The first thing that occurred was a quarrel with the Chief Inspector, who was dismissed. A correspondence had taken place on the subject, and it had been stated that the Government had reprimanded Sheriff Ivory. In reply to a Question the other day, however, the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland had stated that the communication of the Government did not amount to a reprimand——

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I said it did not contain a reprimand.

Dr. CAMERON said, they now knew something negative, and should like to know something positive about this communication. Sheriff Ivory, having dismissed the Chief Constable, took personal command of the expedition. He renewed his promise of a medal to every policeman engaged in the campaign who captured a crofter. He (Dr. Cameron) would like to know whether that was done by the authority of the Government? [Mr. A. J. Balfour dissented.] If it was not so, then he (Dr. Cameron) would like to know what the Government thought of the proceeding from a strategical point of view? Sheriff Ivory misconducted the expedition in a manner that led to the most cruel, the most unConstitutional, and the most exasperating results. One of the officers in the expedition was a Mr. M'Donald—a man of notoriously rough methods. A few weeks before he had burnt down a house after an eviction under circumstances officially pronounced unwarrantable, and according to which he had committed a crime, from the consequences of which the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate absolved him by a reprimand. He is also reported to have been reprimanded by his employers for having served a writ upon a woman an hour after she had given birth to a child, and having threatened her that if she did not pay he would burn her house down. Yet this man who had made himself so unpopular in Skye was allowed to go out serving writs in remote districts, without an escort, when the police and military sent to protect him were lying idle. The result was that the man was mobbed. He was not ducked in a pond, as he would have been in law-abiding England. He did not suffer any bodily harm, but a threat was made by the husband of the woman whose house he had threatened to burn down, that he would break his head with a stick; and this was made the excuse for a series of armed raids upon the villages, one of them at least at midnight. The men who had been forewarned of these expeditions fled to the hills, but the houses were entered and every room ransacked—in every case, so far as he was aware—without warrant. He (Dr. Cameron) desired an Inquiry into the irregularity of these proceedings. The offence for which these men were wanted was a trivial and technical offence, which occurred entirely through the neglect of those in charge of the expedition to use the force provided for their protection. He did not want to excuse the action of the people; but it was unjustifiable to make this paltry offence the excuse for a series of armed raids on the villages. He wanted an Inquiry into the question as to the authority upon which these proceedings were taken. It might be said that these domiciliary visits amounted to nothing; but he maintained that they were no light matters. There was a case in which a sick woman was subjected to gross indignities; and another case in which an old woman was frightened, by a midnight visit from the police, into a protracted swoon. In another case another man on his deathbed had his last hours embittered by one of these unauthorized intrusions; and these were not the only proceedings against which he protested. A man named M'Kay was arrested and sent to prison on a charge of slandering Sheriff Ivory. It appeared that the man called Sheriff Ivory a "liar." He (Dr. Cameron) knew that the word "liar" was not a nice one, but it was one that Sheriff Ivory was fond of using, and he had never been called to account for it. But what in a Sheriff's but a choleric word, that in a crofter is rank blasphemy. M'Kay was arrested and sent to prison. Another man wrote a letter to the Secretary for Scotland, calling Sheriff Ivory a "judicial monster."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Does the hon. Member mean to say that a letter, privately written to me, was sent by me to the newspapers?

Dr. CAMERON: No. The letter was sent to the right hon. Gentleman, and was published in an Inverness paper. I never imagined it was published by the right hon. Gentleman. Very probably it was sent by the author. This letter was published in the newspaper *The Highlander*, in the same way that

Sheriff Ivory's confidential reports to Ministers were published in the newspapers. Well, while nothing was done to Sheriff Ivory, this man was sent to prison. There was the case of the Rev. Mr. M'Callum, Established Church minister, and of John M'Pherson, a leading man among the crofters. They were present at a meeting in October, and a report of that meeting appeared, in which it was stated that a resolution was adopted inciting the crofters to resist the administration of the law. A month after the alleged offence these gentlemen were arrested by warrant. They were not invited to surrender; yet an expedition of gunboats, Marines, and police were sent round to Mr. M'Callum's manse. The rev. gentleman was not at home. They found he had gone to preach elsewhere. The police ransacked his papers. The rev. gentleman complained that they did not read his sermons, from which they might have derived much benefit. Mr. M'Callum was gone to preach somewhere else, so the expedition turned tail and steamed after him. Mr. M'Callum was arrested on the Saturday night, and they took him 20 miles to prison, where he was kept until he was bailed. Mr. M'Pherson was arrested in a similar manner, and was kept in prison for seven days. He was denied access to his solicitor. He was liberated at 10 o'clock on Saturday night, and left to find his way as best he could to his home, a distance of 34 miles. It was only after the arrest that it occurred to the authorities that it would be well to look up evidence, and about two months after these proceedings they thought it necessary to procure the manuscript of the report which appeared in *The Highlander*, and which formed the ground for the arrest; and when they got the manuscript they found it so manipulated by the editor before insertion that it was susceptible of a considerably different interpretation from that put upon it. It was not only of these arrests that he (Dr. Cameron) complained. He complained of the way the accused persons were treated in connection with being brought to trial. Accused persons in Scotland had none of the safeguards that existed in England, where the accused person was allowed access to his solicitor, and had the safeguard of the Grand Jury, and could only be convicted by the unanimous verdict of the jury who tried him. In Scotland, on the other hand, a man might be kept in prison for a week, and was denied during the whole of the time access to his friends or his legal adviser. He had not the safeguard of the Grand Jury, and the verdict of a majority of the jury was enough against him to suffice for his conviction. In Scotland the criminal authorities exercised an autocratic power which was not allowed in England, and which in Ireland was only conferred by some Coercion Act. They had a power of secret investigation. They decided the Court where the cases were to be tried, and they had power to change the venue, and could do it in such a manner as to debar poor prisoners from bringing forward evidence for their defence, and that was practically what the right hon. Gentleman did in connection with these trivial cases. Not one of these cases involved life or limb or property. In the case of no single one of the prisoners had a blow been struck. These are precisely the sort of cases that should be tried before a local Court, so that the poor could be afforded facilities for bringing witnesses. Local courts had ample power of punishment. In only two or three cases was this course pursued in regard to Skye prisoners, while from Tiree and Skye some 30 men and women were dragged to Edinburgh for trial. They were so poor that it was absolutely impossible for them to organize a proper and well-arranged defence or to bring witnesses, and in some cases sentences were imposed that he was perfectly certain would never have been imposed if the prisoners had had fair play and been able to bring forward evidence for the defence. He had, for example, that day asked a question regarding the case of Myles Martin, who was imprisoned — along with others — for rioting, a certificate was sent to show that the man was an imbecile by the Free Church Minister, who had known from his birth that he was an imbecile. The certificate was handed to the Crown Authorities, who, if they had been moved by any feelings of equity, justice, or humanity, or if they had had any care for their own reputation, would have withdrawn the man from trial, but they handed over the certificate to the prison doctor, who pronounced him to be fit to take his trial. The certificate was never produced at the trial, and no evidence was given on behalf of the prisoner as to his imbecility, and he was condemned to the same sentence as those along with him who were of sound mind. He (Dr. Cameron) would next mention the case of Garalapain. He interested himself in that case, because some of the arrests appeared to be conducted with absurd and unnecessary severity and cruelty. He thought the proceedings showed the prisoners would not get fair play, and he instructed a solicitor that if he believed them innocent to defend them. The solicitor reported that in three of the cases the prisoners appeared to him to be innocent, and these were defended accordingly. There was no time to bring witnesses from Skye, and the solicitor reported that witnesses were afraid in this case, as he believed had been stated in connection with another case, to come forward lest they might be arrested.

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald): Does the hon. Member mean to say that that was stated in Court by any responsible person on behalf of the prosecution?

Dr. CAMERON said that was his impression, but he would not insist upon it. The case came on. One woman, who was arrested under exceptionally hard circumstances, was placed in the dock, but not proceeded against. Two of the men who, he believed, were innocent, and who were defended, were proved by the Crown witnesses not to be in the mob until some time after the deforcement had taken place, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman withdrew the case against them. Although their counsel was debarred from replying, and the Lord Advocate had made an eloquent speech in prosecuting—fancy the right hon. and learned Gentleman wasting his eloquence on such a paltry case—the jury acquitted the whole batch. Two other persons were connected with this deforcement. They were tried locally, where evidence could be easily obtained, and where they could be tried fairly. One of them was acquitted, and one it was thought sufficient punishment to send to prison for one month. Here they had an example of a community subjected to a series of domiciliary visits. They had 11 people arrested out of this village. Nine were dragged to Edinburgh. The cases were tried by two separate counts—one by a jury, and one by a Judge sitting alone—and the only conviction was followed by one month's imprisonment. Did that manifest any careful administration of the law in these matters? In the case of the men tried locally, he had no doubt that full justice was done, while the cost to the prisoners and the State was nothing. The cost of the defence of the prisoners tried in Edinburgh was £30, which it was impossible for 10 crofters to have produced, even though they had had to be hung, drawn, and quartered. Was there any necessity for the severe sentences imposed in the Edinburgh Court? Before the expiration of their sentences, eight of the prisoners had been released. About 30 altogether stood their trial. One-third, who were fairly defended, were acquitted; one-third sentenced to unnecessarily long periods had been set free; and the rest remained in prison—one the most heavily punished was an idiot. That, surely, was sufficient to raise grave doubts as to the justice of the sentences. Meanwhile, other cases were pending. One was that of a man who was charged with libelling a Judge. There was the case of the Rev. Mr. M'Callum, and the case of John M'Pherson. His (Dr. Cameron's) Amendment asked for inquiry into a system the effects of which he had given only in a few cases. He feared that in stating them he had trespassed on the time of the House; but his excuse must be his conviction of the importance of the subject. To his mind, these matters affected nothing less than the decent and impartial administration of justice in Scotland, the maintenance of the methods of civil administration as against the methods of military law, and the securing of the Highland population in those rights and privileges which Parliament, by its recent legislation, unquestionably intended them to enjoy. The hon. Member concluded by moving his Amendment.

Dr. R. McDONALD (Ross and Cromarty), in seconding the Amendment, said, he must compliment the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) on having traversed the ground so fully. There was one point he (Dr. McDonald) wished to specially press. It was this. Under the Crofters' Act, if a crofter became bankrupt, he lost not only his house, but all the improvements he had made upon it. It was the ambition of the crofters at this moment not to become bankrupts; but the Law Officers of the Crown and Sheriff Ivory had gone behind the Act, and had decided that all arrears due to the landlords from the crofters were payable before the Commission had time to deal with the cases, and that the ordinary processes of law could be employed to enforce the decrees of Court. What would be the result of dealing in this way with arrears? The result had already, to some extent, become apparent. Decrees had been granted in the Court at Portree for £1,700, and on the Duke of Sutherland's estate decrees were given for a very large amount. The consequence was to render the Act null and void in a large number of cases. Let him call the attention of the House to the way this matter had been conducted. The Crofter Commission had decided that all Skye should be included as a crofting parish. Rumour said the Secretary for Scotland took three weeks to decide whether that should be allowed, and on the 18th of November the Secretary for Scotland decided that Skye was all a crofter parish. But on the 21st of November a Court was solemnly held at Portree to decide about arrears of rent, and that Court decided the Act did not apply to Skye. Decrees were given at that Court for £1,000 arrears of rent. He (Dr. R. McDonald) and his Scotch Colleagues in Parliament maintained that those decrees were illegal; and he himself had publicly advised the people not to pay a penny of those arrears if they could help it, because Parliament had decided that their rents should be fixed by the Crofters' Commission, and not by any local Court. But Sheriff Ivory refused to allow a mere Royal Commission to deal with cases of arrears. As the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone) recently said, could anything be more monstrous than to appoint a Royal Commission to ascertain whether people could pay their rents, and immediately allow the people to be turned out? That was exactly what was going to take place in the Highlands if the landlords were allowed to enforce their rents before the Commission had time to consider the cases. The Commission had already intimated that, in deciding what were to be fair rents or not fair rents, they would, in making allowance for tenants' improvements, have to consider the benefits already derived from these improvements. But surely that was neither sense nor justice. The Crofters' Commission had no right to take that into consideration. He would give the House one or two instances of the reductions of rents granted by the Commission. John Bruce, Ormisdale, was formerly rented at £6. The present rent, fixed by the Commission, was £4 2*s.* 6*d.*; and, although the Commission decided that he had been paying about £2 more than he ought to have been paying, they insisted on his paying the arrears that he owed. In another case—that of D. Mackenzie—his old rent was £7 10*s.*; and the Commission, after inquiry, reduced that to £2 10*s.*—only one-third of the original rent. Did the House suppose that he had his arrears forgiven? Nothing of the sort. They saw this man owed £13, and he must pay £5, although, by their own admission, he was paying three times what he ought to have done. He did not see how such proceedings as those could be called just; and he thought it desirable to lay it before the House and the country; for if the Commission went on in this way, half the crofters would soon be made bankrupt, and would lose the benefits of the Crofters' Act, and they would have to emigrate, or something of the kind. With regard to Skye, he was a native of Skye himself, so that he knew what he was talking about. As to the non-payment of rent, he knew, and could assert distinctly, that it was a common practice for the factors there to include the rates along with the rent, so that, in a great many instances, the arrears of rent given were fictitious. That was how it appeared that the Skye crofters were made to appear to owe so much. In some parishes no one knew how affairs stood, because the nominal collector of rates ran away, and nobody knew what had been received. He could give many instances where rates had been demanded from people who did not owe them at all. In one case the Sheriff Officer asked payment of rates against a man named John Stewart, who for many years previously had been in New Zealand. In another case, at Waternish, the officer had a writ against a man for three years' arrears of rates. The man maintained that he was only owing two years' rates, which he was willing to pay; and, on looking over the books, the collector confirmed his statement that there were only two years standing against him. With regard to the alleged defaulters, he found that in the parishes of Upper and Lower Hamara, among 42 crofters, there were only four defaulters; and when the rate collectors went round three out of those four produced their receipts, and only one out of the 42 was found not to have paid, and this was a woman of over 80 years of age. With those instances before them, he thought the House would see that a great deal more noise than was necessary had been made on the subject of arrears of rates; and it certainly was not necessary to send a fleet to collect rates from people who had paid them, and who did not offer any resistance. He would also point out that not one single case could be brought forward in which the Sheriff had been attempted to be deforced for the collection of rates. If, then, the expedition had been confined to its proper purpose the collection of rates, so much could not have been said about it; but when it came to the collection of rents, he thought the Government would find they had made a very serious blunder indeed. There had been a great deal of trouble and noise made about the expedition; and he thought they had brought a hornet's nest about their ears in order to collect £200 for two or three landlords. That was all the expedition had done, while the cost to the country was more than the people know of. After quoting one or two other cases to show the character of the people from whom rates were demanded, the hon. Member said the subject might be dry in detail; but he hoped even on the other side of the House people had hearts to feel for the poor, as they had on this side. What he wanted them to do was to assist in getting the Government to grant an Inquiry to look into the matter, to see that justice was done to those poor people. If the facts which he and the hon. Member for Glasgow had given were true, how was it possible for the Government to withstand an inquiry? He said it was the bounden duty of the Government to grant the inquiry, and to see whether something could not be done to see that nothing but justice was meted out to those poor people—to see that they should be treated as rational human beings, and not as cattle, to be surrounded with police and driven to gaol. He thanked the House for having listened to him, and would second the Amendment with much pleasure.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the 12th paragraph, to insert the words—" And humbly to represent to Her Majesty that recent events in Skye and Tiree, and the general administration of justice in the Highlands, have caused serious concern to the people of Scotland, and demand full inquiry."—(*Dr. Cameron.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. SUTHERLAND (Sutherland) said he claimed to have a peculiar qualification to speak to this Amendment. Their contention was that justice in the Highlands was not administered in the same spirit as it was administered in England and the Lowlands of Scotland. Unfortunately, in the Highlands, those who had the dispensing of justice belonged to a different social class from those to whom justice was dispensed; and it was their interest to interpret the law so as to give the advantage to the class they themselves belonged to, and with whom they were associated. Last September, when a debate was raised on this question, they foresaw, and he, himself (Mr. Sutherland) pointed it out to the Secretary for Scotland, that, in the then state of matters, there was bound to be a straining of the law, and they wanted an assurance from the Government that so far as they had control over the Executive, they would see that the law was administered in a spirit of fair play and justice to all concerned. The House would remember that at that time the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland stated—and his statements were then the cause of some complaint—that one of the reasons why he was anxious that the Crofters Act should be passed was, that it would furnish him with an excuse for enforcing the law as it is at present stood. It would be readily understood that from the important position the right hon. Gentleman occupied as Secretary for Scotland, the remainder of the Executive would take their action from the note he sounded on that occasion; and what he (Mr. Sutherland) and other hon. Members had foretold would happen had actually come to pass, in the disturbances in

Skye and Tiree, and other parts of the country. He contended that, had they been listened to on that occasion, and the Government done what they were frequently advised to do, they would have been saved a good deal of the, no doubt to them, unpleasant work they had to perform since Parliament last sat. Now, there had been disturbances at Tiree and Skye; but the people he represented on the main land had had some troubled times as well. He did not mean to say that disturbances had occurred in Sutherland of the same character as those which had taken place in Skye; but the House would remember that last year the Secretary for Scotland said—"Even in Sutherland crime is rampant." He (Mr. Sutherland) repudiated that statement at the time, and he was glad to be able to say now that there was less crime in Sutherland than in Skye and Tiree. Still, they had had troubles in Sutherland, and though they had not been so unfortunate as to have such a valuable judge as Sheriff Ivory, still they had had men who tried to emulate him in their own little way. There was one case he must mention in that connection. There was a meeting held at Bonar Bridge, in Sutherlandshire, the object of which was the perfectly legitimate purpose of calling attention to the unfortunate state of the Land Laws in the Highlands. In the neighbourhood of the place there had previously been a most iniquitous eviction, in which two women were turned out of a house which belonged to their father, who built it. They had all the resources of civilization which had been called into force at Glenbeigh. They lacked the petroleum and the lucifer matches, certainly; but, at any rate, the house was levelled to the ground, and he believed that the women, who refused to leave, improvised a dwelling in the ruins. The farm and farmhouse, which was in the state he had described, was taken from them, and added to the farm of the factor. A number of people from a distance, who attended this meeting, went in procession to see this illustration of the beneficent operation of the Land Laws, and some of them were arrested, and brought before the Sheriff-Substitute at Dornoch; and, though the substance of the Chief Constable's evidence was that he saw nothing like a riot, yet the men were nevertheless convicted, and sentenced to pay fines of 30*s*., and bound over to keep the peace for six months. Indeed, so eager was the Sheriff-Substitute to convict that he went farther than his power justified, and bound over one man for twelve months; but an appeal was taken, when the decision was set aside, and it was held by the Court of Session that the Sheriff had gone beyond his powers, and could only bind over for six months. It was a notorious fact that the Procurator-Fiscal of Sutherlandshire was physically incapacitated for the office he held, being over 80 years of age. Although there had not been such flagrant cases in Sutherlandshire as in Skye and Tiree, they were not without cause of complaint; for in the administration of justice the Sheriffs throughout Scotland had undoubtedly taken their cue from what was said in the last Parliament by the right hon. Gentlemen the Secretary for Scotland. Extracts from the Report of the Crofters Commission served to show that the members of that Commission—and especially the Chairman of it, Lord Napier—were conscious of the possibility of Sheriffs being embarrassed and prejudiced in the discharge of their duties by the exercise of social influence. The House had heard many allusions to the crofters; but, in old times, there were no crofters in the Highlands. There was no such word in the native language. The crofters and the position which they at present occupied were the result of the bad Land Laws. It was all very well for the Secretary for Scotland to protest his affection for the crofters; but he (Mr. Sutherland) was not aware of it, and the crofters and their friends would like to see his affection translated into action. He appealed to the Secretary for Scotland and to the Lord Advocate to use their influence in this House on behalf of their unfortunate countrymen. If they would only show that there was a determination on the part of the Government to do justice, the Highlands would be the most law-abiding portion of Her Majesty's dominions. No part of Her Majesty's dominions had furnished so many soldiers to the British Army to build up the British Empire, and what was the result? They were tied hand and foot, to be used in the way that the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) had just described to the House. If Her Majesty's

Government were emulous of the fame of Irish officials, and wanted a similar result in the Highlands to what had been brought about in Ireland, he could see no better way of bringing about that result than to continue to pursue the course that they had hitherto adopted. On the other hand, the demand of the Amendment was a very moderate one, and he hoped the Government would agree to the facts being investigated. He was as anxious as any Gentleman on the opposite side of the House could be, that the people of the Highlands should retain their character for orderliness and lawfulness; and it was for that reason that he should like to see the obstacles that stood in the way of their being law-abiding removed. In the meantime, that could only be done by Constitutional agitation. There was no doubt in his mind that the object of the Government in the course they had pursued, was to put down a lawful and Constitutional agitation; but if the Government thought that, at that time of day, they were able to put down a Constitutional agitation, they reckoned without their host. The people of the Highlands would no longer submit to be the play and the sport of the landlords, who had removed them from the districts they formerly inhabited, and put sheep and deer in their place. It was notorious that the present disturbed state of the Highlands had arisen from the power that had been placed in the hands of the landlords. Let it be seen that that state of matters was going to be reversed, and he would give his personal guarantee to the Lord Advocate that lawlessness would cease in the Highlands. He was not prepared to admit that lawlessness had existed to the extent that some people would have them believe; indeed, he was very much surprised that greater acts of lawlessness had not occurred. But he appealed to the Government to grant the Inquiry asked for in the Amendment, if they wished to allay the ill feelings that they had raised against them in the Highlands of Scotland, and to avoid future troubles in those districts.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Mr. MAHONY (Meath, N.): My only object in rising to take part in this debate is to express my sympathy as an Irish Member with the Scotch Question which the Scotch Members have so ably brought before the House. I do not see how an Irish Nationalist Member who represents the people of Ireland can possibly refuse his sympathy in respect of the scenes which have been depicted to us this evening. Why, Sir, if the names were omitted, we might have fancied throughout the whole of the evening that this was an Irish debate, and that we were hearing a description of scenes that have taken place in Ireland. But besides the actual description of the scenes themselves there are many points of similarity between the grievances from which the Scotch crofters have suffered, and the grievances from which the tenant-farmers of Ireland have suffered. The present position, as I understand it, of the Scotch Crofter Question is mainly due to the fact that the Government, last Session, refused to listen to the advice or to heed the warnings of Scotch Members who understood the question. Exactly the same state of things has prevailed in regard to Ireland. Her Majesty's Government have refused to listen to the advice or to heed the warnings of the Irish Members, and then as regards the actual legislation from the effects of which the crofters are at present suffering, exactly the same course has been pursued as that in regard to Ireland. We are suffering from the defects of the Act of 1881, and why are we suffering? It is because the advice of the Irish Members who understood the matter was not taken. Why are the crofters suffering in Scotland from the defects of the Crofters' Act? It is because the advice of the Scotch Members who especially understood the question was not taken at the time the Crofters' Act was passed. When that Act was before the House class influence made itself felt in the Highlands of Scotland as it has done for 87 years in Ireland. Then, again, the Crofters' Act has failed in its administration. The Courts of Law in Scotland have given decisions, as I understand, which are entirely contrary to the spirit of the Act. Exactly the same thing has happened in Ireland; the greatest benefits which the Act of 1881 was intended to confer upon the tenants have by the decision of the Law Courts which have interpreted the provisions of that Act been held to be in direct contradiction to the opinions of the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. W. E. Gladstone), who framed and succeeded in passing that Act. Then there is another point of similarity between the condition of the Scotch crofters and the Irish tenants, especially in regard to the condition of the poor tenants of Mayo, Donegal, and Galway. Although they got the Act to improve their future condition they were still left with a millstone of arrears of rent hanging round their necks. Impoverished as they are by circumstances over which they have no control, by falls in the price of their mountain stock they are utterly unable to cope with that millstone of arrears which the paternal Government has left hanging round their necks, and unless those arrears are dealt with the benefits both of the Crofters' Act and of the Irish Land Act are only a delusion and a snare. Then we have had another picture drawn in regard to these Scotch peasants, very similar to what we have in Ireland. We have seen wretched peasants dragged up from the Isle of Skye to Edinburgh for trial, just as wretched peasants have been dragged up from Galway to Sligo in order to be tried by packed juries. I cannot help appreciating the manner in which the grievances of the crofters have been brought forward this evening by the Scotch Members; but in spite of the moderation of their demands, and this is merely a demand for inquiry into the matter — how have they been met by Her Majesty's Government? Have they been met with a single expression of sympathy? No; for my part, I do not expect any expression of sympathy, and if they do get it I do not think it will amount to any remedial Act that is likely to be carried out by a Tory Government. If the Scotch crofters do not realize that fact yet, they will in the future. I can assure them that they will receive no sympathy from the present Government—a Government which is founded on class prejudices, and which derives its power from the propertied and privileged classes of Society—those classes who do not know what the struggle for existence means, and who have no means of manifesting their sympathy. Indeed, no chord of sympathy exists between them and the great mass of the people. If they do possess any such chord, it is a somewhat curious fact that they have exhibited so little interest in the debate to-night. For a considerable period in the course of the debate there were only 9 Members on the Benches opposite, from which Benches the government of the country is at present supposed to proceed. At the time those 9 Members were seated on the Benches opposite, there were 29 on these Benches. The 9, however, a a little later on in the evening dwindled down to 3, and, of those 3, 1 was a Liberal Member. That is the amount of sympathy which the present Government and their Supporters have shown, as yet, for these grievances. My belief is that the Scotch Members must make up their minds that they will get no sympathy from the present Government, and that they will have to appeal, as we have had to do, to the democracies of Great Britain for sympathy and support. They must lay their case before the people before they can bring it to a successful issue; and if they do so I can promise them support of the most hearty nature from the people of Ireland; and from my experiences of the people of England, I believe they will get their support as well. I am certain that they will receive the support of the people of Wales. They must know themselves that they will obtain the unswerving support of the people of Scotland; but in order to do so they must lay their appeal before the people, so as to reach the masses, who have human hearts and are touched by human sympathies, who know what the struggle for existence means, and who will be able to show sympathy for the poor people of the Highlands who are struggling to eke out the means of subsistence by their own industry. To my mind, the Government have treated the Scotch Members in a manner which is most discreditable. Although many Scotch Members have spoken this evening, and although they have entered fully into their case—although their demands are of a most moderate nature, no single Member of the Government has risen to express the slightest opinion upon the subject, or to give them a single word of comfort. That being the case, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): I beg to second the Motion, and I do so on the principle which has been shadowed forth by my hon. Friend who has just sat down

(Mr. Mahony)—namely, the manner in which this debate has been treated by Her Majesty's Government. Although there are three Representatives of the Government who specially belong to Scotland—namely, the Secretary for Scotland, the Lord Advocate, and the Solicitor General for Scotland—not one of them was in the House to listen to the early part of the debate. I moved, early in the evening, that the House should be counted, in order to afford the Government an opportunity, if they were so willed, to put in an appearance and learn what the nature of the grievances brought forward by the Scotch Members was. I do not propose to go into the merits of the Crofter Question, but I do think that the crofters are a class who require attention and consideration at the hands of the Government. They have only recently inherited the franchise; they live at a distance from the seat of government, and they have no means of knowing the advocacy which is brought forward on their behalf. I do not think that the Government should show such utter callousness to the claims of these unfortunate people, because they are a class who, to judge from the men who represent them in this House, ought to be heard; and I have no doubt that their influence will be more widely felt as time goes on.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Mahony.*)

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I have heard with some surprise that the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Meath (Mr. Mahony) is of opinion that the Government have not treated the House or the hon. Member who moved the Amendment with sufficient respect. Now, the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) sat down only a few minutes before 8 o'clock. You, Sir, shortly afterwards went out for a few minutes; my right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate, and my right hon. Friend the Secretary for Scotland had both been here watching the debate with the closest attention, and with the intention, when the House is filled, of making the statement on the part of the Government which the hon. Member wishes to have made. But, Sir, the House and the hon. Member himself must feel that it is far better that that statement and that answer should be given when the House is full rather than when it is empty. Under these circumstances, I hope the hon. Member will not put the House to the trouble of a Division on the question of adjournment. If the Division took place, it would take place on a perfectly side issue. I feel that the question is one of great importance, and one which demands the fullest consideration from Her Majesty's Government.

DR. CAMERON: I also rise to express a hope that the hon. Member for North Meath (Mr. Mahoney) will not put the House to the trouble of a Division upon the question of adjournment, although I think he was quite justified in criticizing the fact that the House has not heard any reply from the Government as to the specific statements which have been made from these Benches. It is not as if Scotland was simply represented on the Front Bench by one official Member of the Government. There are several Ministers there who are quite able to speak upon the question, and it appears to me that the Government by allowing the debate to go on without indicating what their defence is will encourage a great amount of irrevelant talk. If the Government would only put forward their case, I have no doubt that a good many observations and arguments which may be otherwise brought forward will be rendered unnecessary. As there are several Scotch Representatives in the Government, I hope some one or other of them will come to our assistance and show us what the course is which they propose to take.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member for North Meath withdraw his Motion?

MR. MAHONY: No.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): I suppose that I am one of the Ministers connected with Scotland who ought, in the opinion of hon. Members opposite, to have taken part, before this, in the debate. Let me point out to hon. Gentlemen that the course which has been taken by the Government has really been the most convenient for everyone. My right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate and myself have listened with the greatest attention to the whole course of the debate. It has been confined strictly to the limits of the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron). It has, so far, entirely dealt with the legal aspects of the case, and, therefore, the proper person to reply is my right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate, who will do so in the fullest and most complete manner; but I would ask whether it is convenient to hon. Members that my right hon. and learned Friend should make that reply in an empty House, or will it hasten the conclusion if the adjournment which the hon. Member for North Meath advocates is carried. My opinion is that it would only lead to a waste of time. If my right hon. and learned Friend were to get up in the course of half-an-hour or an hour and reply to all the allegations which have been made, leaving me to say something further by way of closing the debate, I think the convenience of the House would be perfectly consulted. Therefore, I hope the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Meath will withdraw his Motion. The convenience of the House will certainly not be consulted if the proposal of the hon. Gentleman is carried. On the contrary, the House would be put to considerable inconvenience; and, as far as I can see, neither the crofters nor the advocates of the crofters would have gained any advantage whatever. Therefore, I will add my appeal to that of my right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Treasury to the hon. Member for North Meath, in the interests of the crofters themselves, to withdraw the Motion which he has made for the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, Camlachie): I desire to say one word upon this subject. I think it would only have been a courteous proceeding on the part of the Government to have made some reply to the statements which have been made by the Scotch Members. Surely, in a case of this kind it will be necessary that more than one Member of the Government should take part in the debate. I desire to show why it is that we support the crofters upon this question—I desire to bring their civil rights strongly before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I must remind the hon. Gentleman that the Question before the House is the adjournment of the debate, and that the Main Question is not at present under discussion. Does the hon. Member for North Meath withdraw his Motion?

Mr. MAHONY: No.

Mr. HUNTER (Aberdeen, N.): If the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate would at once rise for the purpose of addressing the House, I see no reason why the Motion for the adjournment of the debate should be pressed; but I think that a very powerful case has been presented to the House, and one that it may be very difficult for the right hon. and learned Gentleman to answer. I think it is most objectionable that the Scotch Members should have been required to sit here for all these hours without having received any answer at all. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland has adverted to the condition of he Benches behind him.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No; to the state of the House.

Mr. HUNTER: Who is responsible for the state of the House? Unless some right hon. Gentleman on the Government Bench is prepared to make a defence for the Government at once I shall certainly support the Motion for adjournment.

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): I think that I owe an explanation to the hon. Member who moved the adjournment of the debate of the fact that I was not in the House at the time he made it. It is impossible, I am afraid, for any Member to be in this House all night long, listening to the debate, and being prepared to discharge his duty, without partaking of some slight refreshment. I may state that I experienced some little difficulty, during the temporary retirement of the Speaker, in obtaining refreshment in the dining-room, a particular waiter having forgotten me for a quarter of an hour. I am sure the hon. Member and the House generally will sympathize with the exigencies of the position I occupy. Having to answer on behalf of the Government the very strong case stated by the other side, I certainly required some physical sustenance in order to enable me to do it. There has been no desire on my part to display the slightest discourtesy towards hon. Gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MAHONY: I never accused the right hon. and learned Gentleman of discourtesy to me, because I never supposed that I had a claim to be heard on a Scotch subject; but I said that the Government had displayed a considerable amount of discourtesy towards the Scotch Members generally.

Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD: I can assure the hon. Member that there has been no question of discourtesy either to him, or to the Scotch Members as a body. It is obvious that the reply to a Motion of this kind, pressed as it has been upon the attention of the House by the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), should be made by a Member of the Government; but it would have been most unsatisfactory if I had risen to make a reply in a House which was practically empty.

Mr. P. J. POWER (Waterford, E.): No doubt, Members of the Government are naturally anxious to speak in a full House; but I think it ought to strike hon. Members opposite that the advocates of the crofters are animated by a similar desire. They certainly wish to have a fair audience to hear the remarks they desire to make in the course of this debate. Under these circumstances, considering that the few Ministers left upon the Front Bench would require a certain amount of sustenance, I think it would be for the convenience of all Parties—both the Government themselves and those who advocate the claims of the crofters—that the debate should be now adjourned to some more fitting opportunity—to some occasion when a full attendance can be secured. It must be quite clear to everyone in the House that, in the present state of the Benches opposite, the House is not fairly able to grapple with this most important question. Hon. Gentlemen who have been sent here to represent the crofters know what grievances they have to bring forward, and they wish naturally to advocate them in a fuller House on both sides. At this period of the evening it is quite impossible to get a fuller House; and, therefore, I think the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for North Meath ought to be acceded to.

Dr. CLARK (Caithness): When the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) rose to address the House I noticed that there was no one present who represented the Government of Scotland. I understand now, from the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland, that he is not prepared now to reply to the case which has been brought forward against the acts of the Government in Scotland. If the Government are ready to reply, I would ask my hon. Friend the Member for North Meath to allow that reply to be made at once. A very strong case has been made out; the Scotch Members have brought that case before the House, and naturally we want to hear what can be said by right hon. Gentlemen opposite in defence of the action they have taken. We do not propose to go further. Therefore, unless the Government are prepared to speak now, we might as well adjourn the debate until they are ready to make their reply.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. Ritchie) (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): The hon. Gentleman who spoke just now seemed to consider that the arrangement for carrying on the debate to-night has been somewhat out of the usual course. Now, it is perfectly well known to hon. Gentlemen that there is an interval when the House is by no means full, during which it is never expected that Ministers should get up and reply to a strong case made in a full House. As I understand the arrangement this evening, the Scotch Members worthily occupied the full time of the House up to about 8 o'clock, and the fact that they made so extremely strong a case is an argument in favour of the reply being also made when the House is equally full. As far as I understand, that is the opinion of the Government, who are only anxious that they may be allowed to reply to the case which hon. Members opposite have put forward when the House is full. As far as the Government are concerned, they desire no adjournment of the debate, but are perfectly prepared to make their reply. The arrangement, as I have said, is by no means an unusual one. Hon. Gentlemen who have had experience of this House know that between half-past 8 and half-past 9 or 10 o'clock the House on both sides is generally remarkably thin. There has been no exception to the rule to-night. The thinness on one side of the House has been equalled by the thinness on the other. [*Cries of* "No!"] Well, at any rate, it was mentioned by the hon. Member for North Meath that there were only 29 Members on that side of the House. If there were only 29 Members of the House who expected that a Minister would rise to make a reply, I think that is a sufficient answer to the complaint. There can be no hon. Member who would desire that the answer of the Minister of the Crown should be made in a House of 29 Members. If the Motion for the adjournment of the debate is withdrawn, the Government are perfectly prepared to go on with the debate.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 87; Noes 112: Majority 25.—(Div. List, No. 8.)

Original Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WATT (Glasgow, Camlachie), in resuming the debate on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), thought he expressed the general opinion of the House when he said that the consideration of the Address had lasted long enough, although it must be admitted that Scotch Members had not occupied much time. Looking at the question calmly and dispassionately, he thought his hon. Friend and Colleague the Mover would have been justified in bringing forward the question even if he had used language of a much stronger character than found its way into the Amendment. But hon. Members on the Liberal side of the House were surrounded by difficulties of no unusual character, seeing that the naval and military expedition to Skye was initiated by a Liberal Government. Yet, though they were opposed by what he might term officialism in that House, he believed that they had not only Scotland, but England and Ireland, in their favour upon this question. There existed a consensus of opinion in favour of using every means at their disposal for ameliorating the condition of the crofters of Scotland. As a good deal was said in that House with regard to the maintenance of law and order, he was glad to be able to state that the crofters were essentially a law-abiding, honest, and industrious people. Until within the last few years they had well sustained those characteristics; and, as an illustration of the fact, he might mention that one might walk through many miles in the Highlands without seeing a policeman. After the interesting speech of his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow, it was not to be wondered at if a crofter, after toiling from sunrise to sunset, handing over the last shilling to the owner of the land, and leaving his family in a state of starvation—if, when a writ was put into his hand, the smouldering flame of rebellion should be aroused. Such had been the case during the past few years, no doubt; and it might with some truth be said that the crofters were no longer law-abiding. Such a state of things was much to be regretted; but it was a curious and significant fact that every measure of reform had had to be preceded by a period of agitation, lawlessness, illegality, and such like. As a Party man, he was sorry to say that the crofters of Scotland looked upon it as a matter of small moment to them whether a Conservative or a Liberal Administration was in Office, for the simple reason—as a crofter remarked the other day—that almost every Member of every Administration was a landlord, or more or less connected with the landlord interest. He would like to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour) upon what impartial, circumstantial, and reliable information or evidence he decided the necessity of despatching a naval and military force to Tiree? Impartial authorities almost unanimously asserted that the sources of information in Tiree were more or less tantamount to information derived from the Duke of Argyll. In a letter which he had received from a crofter there occurred these words—

> "Why does the British Government not at once hand over the administration of law and justice in Tiree to the Duke of Argyll? We would be no worse off. That is impossible, and the Government would relieve itself from the onus of taking any active part in a course of procedure morally guilty, if not actually worse."

What considerations, he would like to ask, had induced the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) to adopt a policy for Scotland diametrically opposed to the policy recently carried out by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), who had stated that the Government had brought pressure to bear on certain landlords to give abatements in rent? Was it because the present Government was of opinion that it could ignore or crush the just claims of the crofters of Scotland? During the past decade many measures of reform and alleviation had been passed for Ireland; but what measures had been conceded to the crofters? It was true, the Crofters' Bill was passed in 1885, with a view of assuring just rents in consideration of the agricultural depression; but the Government had taken advantage of a naval and military expedition to enforce rents upon the very eve of the sitting of the Crofters' Commission. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland would, no doubt, agree that Scotland had not been dealt with as liberally in the past as Ireland had been. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would state whether there was any valid reason for that, and whether the Government would adopt for Scotland a Bill similar in its provisions to what was generally known as Lord Ashbourne's Act to enable crofters to become peasant proprietors? The result of the Commission on the Crofters had been reductions of from 30 to 50 per cent. He thought he might, therefore, fairly maintain that the crofters' grievances had been established so far as the Commission had gone. Provided the Government were prepared to inaugurate a policy similar to that adopted for Ireland, with moderate rents, fixity of tenure, and reasonable interest on loans, the crofters at present on the soil might live and thrive, or, at all events, live. As to the congested condition of portions of the Highlands, landlords had long maintained that emigration was the only remedy; but he did not think that was a time, when millions of men were being armed on the Continent, to talk of emigration, and endeavour to drain the country of a peasantry which had done so much in years gone by to maintain the honour, *prestige*, and position of this great country. He did not think that of late years so much had been heard on that point. There was one thing which he thought had never been urged against the crofters of Scotland; and that was that those who were able to pay their rents declined to do so. It had been said that the sentences on the Tiree and Skye crofters were calculated to bring the administration of law and justice in the Highlands into ridicule and contempt; and he would assert this—that the remarkable proceedings against the crofters of Scotland would result in drastic legislation which would be proportionately disastrous to the landlords of Scotland. There was no doubt that owing to the depression of prices in agriculture the landlords in recent years had been severe sufferers; but would anyone say that capitalists had not been equal sufferers? He did not sympathize with the landlords whose incomes had been reduced, because it did not put them in a necessitous position. He had more sympathy with the poor crofters, who for several years had been in a starving condition. While he had been in Parliament he had heard a great deal of talk as to the vindication of law and order; but he confessed that he had more faith in the qualities of mercy, and the reciprocal blessings which flowed therefrom. He would, therefore, support the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): The hon. Member who moved this Amendment (Dr. Cameron) has done, I think, well in bringing it forward, because he has taken numerous opportunities, in various places throughout the country, to express similar views to those he has expressed to-night, and even in stronger terms than he has done in the course of this discussion; and it is only fitting—and I thank him for it—that he has given the Executive of Scotland an opportunity of responding in the only place where, with due regard to their own dignity and position, they could respond to the charges which he and his Friends have made. An hon. Member, speaking a short time ago on the Motion for Adjournment, said that the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow had made out a very strong case. Well, Sir, the hon. Member for the College Division always makes out a strong case; and he made out a strong case to-night by taking a course which I never heard has been taken by any Scotch Member before, and which I shall be very much surprised if any other Scotch Member ever takes again—that is, to attempt to make out that the system of justice and the administration of the Criminal Law in Scotland is a bad system, as compared with the system of other nations.

Dr. CAMERON: I did not intend to infer anything of the sort. I complained of the administration of what, when well administered, may be a very excellent system.

Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD: The hon. Member probably said something which he did not intend to say, and has forgotten what he said; because I noted down at the time that he had a very strong objection to having a verdict by a majority in criminal cases; and he contrasted that with the necessity in England for having a unanimous verdict. He also made a statement against our not having the benefit of a Grand Jury, which I am quite sure the great mass of Scotchmen would be sorry to have; and he further made a statement against the power in Scotland to change the venue, which he knows very well is a change merely to the City of Edinburgh from distant parts of the country where there is no Circuit. Further than that, it is of the greatest possible value to the prisoner that he should be tried at a place where there is no local prejudice against him. ["Oh, oh!"] I challenge contradiction of that statement. The hon. Member will find it difficult to show cases in the criminal administration of Scotland in which a change of venue to the City of Edinburgh has been made for any other reason than that which I have mentioned. We all know that, in the celebrated case of Dr. Pritchard, it would have been fatal to his having a fair trial to have had the trial on the spot where the offence took place. In addition to that, the hon. Member knows very well —for he knows all about the law of Scotland—that in the case of the offenders in Tiree and Skye, unless we had brought them to Edinburgh for trial, we should not have been able to have tried them in the Supreme Court of Scotland until the month of April next. It was also better for the prisoners themselves that they should have been tried in Edinburgh; because, in that city, there is the best legal skill available for their defence, and they are tried before Judges whose character for justice and impartiality is unimpeachable, and by juries of intelligence and education. Therefore, when the hon. Gentleman accuses the Executive of doing injustice to those men, by bringing them to trial with a rapidity and expedition quite unknown in England, and evidently in Ireland, he makes a very unfair and futile attack on the administration of justice in Scotland. Then, says the hon. Member, you should not have tried them before the Supreme Court at all. You should have tried them before the Sheriff, with a jury, or, summarily, before the Sheriff of the county where the offences took place. I make two answers to that. In the first place, if we had tried them before a Sheriff and jury, we would have had a much greater outcry against the prosecution; because, in the ordinary course, they would have been tried before Sheriff Ivory.

Dr. CAMERON: That was not so in the Braes case in 1882. They put aside Sheriff Ivory.

Mr. J. B. BALFOUR: That was tried before the Sheriff Substitute at Inverness summarily.

Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD: I am coming to that. I am speaking of a Sheriff with a jury, and the proper officer would have been the Sheriff of the county, with a jury in Inverness or Portree. I do not think the hon. Member and his Friends would have thought that a very proper course to take. But then, says the hon. Member, they ought to have been tried summarily. Well, I need scarcely say that, in that case, we should have had a great outcry that they were being tried by a Sheriff Substitute whose decision, without a verdict of their own fellow-citizens, would consign them to 60 days' imprisonment. In fact, whatever course we might have taken, it would have been equally open to the animadversion of the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow. That was obvious. But I give another reason for trying them in Edinburgh. Cases of mobbing, rioting, and deforcing officers of the law are so rare in our country that, when they do occur, they ought, as I said before, to be tried where the best legal talent can be got for their defence, and the best judicial officers to try them from the Bench. I go further, and I say that I prefer the opinion of Lord Young—the Judge upon the Bench—to the opinion of the hon. Member. However skilled the hon. Member may be in debate, and however well he may know the affairs of Skye and other places, at least he will grant that a Judge of the High Court of Justiciary—a distinguished lawyer such as Lord Young — knows better what the practice of the Courts should be in this country, and the duties of the Executive in such circumstances. Lord Young, in the last case tried, distinctly announced his opinion in open Court that the Lord Advocate of Scotland would have been guilty of a gross dereliction of duty if he had tried these cases in any other Court than the Supreme Court of the country. I think that these observations of mine entirely dispose of the point where, and in what Court, the cases ought to have been tried; but we are told by the hon. Member opposite that the object of the Government in instituting these prosecutions has been to put down lawful agitation. [*Expressions of dissent.*] Yes; those were the very words — I took them down at the time. If hon. Members think that is our object, they surely will concur with me that, in the test of our conduct, it is well that we should have the highest Judges of the land to lay down the law, and the best and most experienced juries of the country to give their opinion upon it. I could not believe it possible that such a statement would be made in this House, although it had been made out of it; but, since it has been made, it is the strongest confirmation of our having done our duty in getting the highest Judicature of the land to try the case. The hon. Member says the sentences pronounced in the case of the Skye prisoners show that the prisoners must have been tried in different and inferior Courts altogether. Well, as regards the sentences pronounced—and light some of them were—they were pronounced for this reason—that these crimes have been extremely rare; and, in the next place, that, in the opinion of the prosecutor, of the jury, and of the Judge, those crimes would not have occurred at all unless ignorant men had been misled by the suggestions of agitators. For that reason only was a small sentence pronounced in these cases. The hon. Member who has spoken last asked why it was that, in the Tiree case, such high sentences were pronounced as from four to six months' imprisonment? The Judge who tried that case, before pronouncing sentence, consulted the whole Judicial Bench as to what was the proper sentence to give in the circumstances of the case. Having done so—that Bench consisting of men above suspicion—he came to the conclusion that the sentence he pronounced was a proper one, and the reason why he came to that conclusion was this—that while it was true that no violence was suffered, and no injury inflicted upon those who were doing their duty on that occasion by those who were carrying out the mobbing, rioting, and deforcing—they not requring to use any violence—yet there was an overwhelming force, indicating most distinctly their intention not to be defeated, and, undoubtedly, that they would, by force and violence if necessary, prevent the execution of the writs. Upon this matter I have only to say—that when you find a mob stating that they will not allow the ordinary course of the law to proceed, except "at the point of the bayonet," and a crowd cheering a sentiment of the kind, that is the most dangerous kind of mobbing and rioting which can possibly be; and when you find, further, that they threatened to throw the carriage and horse, and the man himself, who was only the driver of the officer, over the cliff—not a mile, but only 50 yards off—it is no answer to say that no injury was inflicted. If the officer upon that occasion, and the constables who were with him, had taken the course which they might have taken—although I do not think it would have been a proper course—and had fought out the battle with their batons, there would have been a great deal of injury, and a scene of bloodshed and violence. But these 200 men stated their intention by force and violence to prevent the service of the writs; and the officer was not only justified, but, in my opinion, right, in declaring himself deforced, and not allowing a riot. Every constable examined on that occasion declared his conviction that, if the officer had proceeded to do his duty, there would have been bloodshed to a very considerable extent. And that was the reason why the sentence in the Tiree case was a different sentence to that pronounced in the subsequent cases — because there was reason to believe, in those later cases, that the people would not have resorted to dangerous measures. But what was the Tiree case? I was not at all surprised that the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow, who knows a great deal better about that case than some other Members who have spoken, scarcely referred to it at all, except to make one or two statements, which I will refer to presently. The Tiree case was a case in which there was no question of rent at all. There was no question of exacting anything at all from these people of Tiree. The facts were simply these—that a farm having become vacant in the Island of Tiree, a large number of crofters seized it by force, put their own cattle upon it, and defied the authority of the law to turn them out. Therefore, their case was very different from that which might have been put for other people, who, suffering from distress in their own crofts, and being asked to pay rent on their own crofts, were inclined to resist payment. It was a case in which, without the shadow of a title, these people seized land to which they had no right whatever, and defied the authority of the law to put them out. And what was the writ that was to be served upon them? It was a writ for no other purpose than this—to give them notice that they must appear, and give answers in Court, otherwise, unless they could show a good answer to the accusation of taking possession of the property without title, they would be ordered to give up possession and leave as trespassers. There was no personal attack upon them of any kind—no idea of an eviction, or anything of that sort. It was simply a question whether they were to receive a notice, without which they could not be turned out of possession, even if they were guilty of trespass. Just let hon. Gentlemen consider what that means. If you are going to allow people to resist service of a writ, which charges them with going on ground to which they have no title—if they refuse to receive the writ, without which the owner of the property cannot take possession and the course of law cannot take effect—what is the necessary consequence? The necessary consequence is that every man must defend his own property, or that we must turn every person, who can be sworn to be a trespasser, into a criminal. The law in this free country says "No" to that. It says that if a man trespass on the property of another, he can only be turned out on the operation of a Civil Court, and the owner of property has to suffer any damage done that may occur during the time necessary for that operation, because this is a free country, and because we believe that everybody will submit to the jurisdiction of those Courts. Without that, we would have no basis for our liberty at all. I presume the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow will not suggest a complaint against this Government, because we did not take the course of informing everybody that the law was that they are entitled to walk into other people's property and turn their sheep and cattle upon ground to which they have no title; or that a benevolent Government is to back them up against a Court of Law in their illegal possession. The hon. Gentleman will never suggest anything so monstrous as that. The case of Tiree was simply a case of people trespassing without the slightest ground of title, and preventing the course by which alone the law could deal with their case, by refusing to receive the summons of interdict which was to bring them into Court. Now, where was the oppression, and where was the wrong there? I can understand it may be suggested on the part of the crofters that, some hundreds of years back, these people were robbed of their land, and that there may be some plausible tradition for a case of that kind; but surely that is not practical politics? Neither is it practical common sense. And, therefore, as regards the Tiree case, though there may be ideas in the minds of hon. Members, who have no experience of mobbing and rioting, that the sentence was too long, I say that the sentence was a just sentence, and that the conviction was a just conviction. That leads me to say to the hon. Gentleman the Member for the College Division of Glasgow, with reference to what he called the horrible oppression put upon the people of Scotland, as compared with their fellow-subjects in England, by verdicts being taken by a majority——

DR. CAMERON (interposing): I am sure the right hon. and learned Gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. What I said was simply that, in the present day, the prisoner does not get the same amount of latitude and fair play shown him in Scotland as in England, and, therefore, that the administration of the law requires to be much more careful in order that it may be just.

Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD: Very good. But then my hon. Friend forgets the very important matter, which he knows historically—having well studied the history of all these cases—that every verdict of conviction which has taken place against these crofters has been a unanimous verdict. [Dr. Cameron dissented.] My hon. Friend shakes his head at that. I suppose he will admit that the Herbusta one was unanimous. He does not shake his head at that.

Dr. CAMERON: That was a case of acquittal.

Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD: No; it was the Garalapin case that was a case of acquittal, and we will come to that presently. But in the Borniskitaig case there was a unanimous verdict. He does not shake his head at that. But I know why he shakes his head at the Tiree verdict. The hon. Member has evidently got hold of a cock-and-bull story out of the newspapers that the jury were eight to seven—being 15—for the conviction; but it turned out that there was not a word of truth in that, for the foreman of the jury, being attacked by a member of the jury, wrote and explained that there were 10 for a verdict of guilty of the whole charge, three for a verdict of guilty of the deforcement only, and two for a verdict of acquittal. I do not say I am giving the very exact figures; but, if not, they are, as far as I can recollect, very near it; and so clearly was the majority of the jury—a majority amounting to as many as would have sat and tried the case in England—of opinion that there was no ground for acquittal of the whole charge, that, doing what is done in every English jury, where otherwise there would be no verdict at all, they used the powers of persuasion of the majority as regarded the evidence on the other members of the jury, and the jury came to the conclusion to return a unanimous verdict, on the footing that if the verdict was unanimous they would also be unanimous in their recommendation to the leniency of the Court. But the hon. Member for the College Division says that in the case of Garalapin the jury also acquitted. I do not think he would have said that if he had known the facts as well as I know them. On the morning of the trial we balloted the jury, and the Crown did not order anybody to stand by. ["Hear, hear!"] But if we had had information that there was any individual on the jury who would not have considered the case honestly and fairly, and given an honest verdict, we should have challenged. [*Renewed cheers.*] The Crown in Scotland has a right of challenge; and I remember long ago, when I first came to the Bar, occasionally the Crown did challenge a juror, not on grounds of objection to him at all, but simply to keep up their right to do so. [*Opposition laughter.*] Yes. Hon. Members, perhaps, do not know—even some of my hon. Friends from Scotland may not know—that in Scotland any law, whatever it is, may perish by not being used. Now, Sir, we did not challenge any jurors on that occasion; but the prisoners, exercising their proper right, challenged a large number; and, speaking of that, I will recall the fact to the hon. Member's mind which he very well knows—that the unanimous verdict in the Tiree case was obtained in spite of the prisoners having exhausted every challenge in their power, and the Crown not having exercised any challenge at all. On the morning of the Garalapin case we balloted a jury for that; and as I did not expect it to take a long time, and it did not—probably in England or Ireland it would have taken three or four times as long—I told the Judge we had another case for the afternoon; but for the sake of the jurymen who had not been balloted, I was willing, if both parties assented, to take the same jury. Accordingly, they agreed to that. It is perfectly true that the first jury acquitted the Garalapin mobbers and rioters, and that for a very simple reason, because the only man who was capable of identifying them—formerly a ground officer to Lord Macdonald—had not seen the men doing anything particular. Well, they were acquitted, and nobody blames the jury for that; but that plainly showed they were not a jury packed to obtain a conviction. In the afternoon we put up eight prisoners, who were from Herbusta, and by 7 o'clock the same jury had unanimously convicted the whole of them. We have heard lately that nothing is law until the law, as laid down by the Judge, has been sustained by the verdict of a jury. That is a view which to me is strange indeed; but, taking that to be the law, we have here the law of the Judge sustained by the fact that every jury which has sat upon these crofter cases has been unanimous in convicting the prisoners brought before them of the offence with which they were charged. So much for the administration of the law in Scotland. I think the attack made upon it was not a worthy attack, because it was not based upon any reasonable or tangible grounds. Then, one hon. Member suggested that the Judges who sat in the Courts did so to serve the interests of themselves and other classes; and that that is a strong reason for not taking Judges of the Supreme Court into Scotland to try the cases; but I hope he was not serious, for it is an accusation which no one acquainted with the Scottish Courts, or Courts of Justiciary, is base enough to suggest here or outside this House. Well, it does not finish here. One hon. Member suggested that, in the Tiree case, the witnesses for the defence were not examined, because a threat was held out by the prosecution that, if they gave evidence, they would themselves be put upon their trial. I think the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow said he had heard something to that effect from Mr. Angus Campbell, who was agent for the prisoners. But I am quite sure Mr. Angus Campbell would not have lent himself to a statement of that kind. I will read a few lines from a letter written by that gentleman to another gentleman interested in obtaining the release of some of the Tiree crofters, with which we are now taunted. The writer says—

> "I more than approve and appreciate the efforts made on behalf of the men, and the manner in which you have acted. Personally, I dissociate myself from the action of certain so-called friends of the men, because I can scarcely be expected to approve of any application in mitigation of sentence, which is accompanied by an attack on the Executive, on the Judge, and on the jury, and by a universal tirade against existing law, not only in relation to land, but to criminal prosecutions. Indeed, to be candid, I think the worst possible friends of the men were those who, whilst professing every desire to secure their liberation, were indulging in words and acts making it impossible for the Chief Secretary or the Lord Advocate to re-entertain the notion of liberation."

And now, Sir, not only that; but it so happens that I have also got by me a note of what was said by the counsel for the defence of the prisoners on that occasion—the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow knows he is one of the most ingenious lawyers we have, and one of the ablest staters of defence I ever came across—I mean Mr. Rhind. Now, Mr. Rhind was asked whether he proposed to lead any defence with his 43 witnesses—although we were told by the defence that they could not afford to bring witnesses to Edinburgh—and he said—

> "After consideration with my learned friends, we have agreed that we have obtained sufficient evidence from the witnesses for the prosecution for our purposes. We, therefore, propose not to call any evidence."

Now, I leave Tiree and the public prosecutions that have taken place. In doing so, I may say that I am quite prepared to accept responsibility for my share in them, and I am convinced of this—that there is no man who was present at the trials, however much he may be in sympathy with the crofters, who will not say they were conducted with the greatest possible fairness and consideration for the prisoners. No doubt, the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow, through an organ with which he is said to be connected, told the public, the day after the trial, that if the jury had gone upon the evidence, and not upon the summing-up of the Judge, the prisoners would not have been convicted. That is a suggestion no man should make in this country, where it is well known that the law laid down by the Judge is the law of the land; and all honest men hold that while the jury, after they have sifted them, say whether the facts have occurred or not, and whether they are sufficiently proved, the Judge tells them what constitutes a criminal offence, and no suggestion can be entertained that the jury should listen to their own fancies of what the law should be. But it is not confined to this, for we find reverend gentlemen, at meetings presided over by the hon. Member, not ashamed to stand up in their place in public and say that Lord Mure summed up right dead in the face of the evidence. Will the hon. Member ask the agent for the defence (Mr. Campbell)—for whom he seems to have some respect—will he ask Mr. Rhind, the counsel, whether or not there is any ground for saying that Lord Mure summed up dead in the face of the evidence? [Dr. CAMERON: I never said that.] No; but the words were used at a meeting over which the hon. Member presided. The Rev. T. M. Cruickshank said Lord Mure summed up dead in the face of the evidence—that *The North British Daily Mail* said that if the jury had attended to their own views, and not to the charge of the Judge, the jury would not have convicted the prisoners. What I say is this—that that statement, made at the meeting, did more harm to the crofters of Tiree, both those convicted and those unconvicted, than could possibly have been done by any other means that could have been devised. These words were addressed to people whom the hon. Member insists are ignorant people and easily led, and yet, by these statements, made at meetings and in newspapers, people are induced to believe that the law has been unjustly administered, and that no honest man could hold up his face and justify the verdicts. All this, observe, is a prelude, forsooth, to a petition for the release of these men! In what way, as Mr. Campbell pointed out in his letter, could they have acted more against the interests of these men as regards release than in making these statements? Another meeting was held in London, at which they were told that Exeter Hall was well filled by 350 people. And we find that the people who are there are people—I do not know to which of the Three Kingdoms they belong, but I am certain it is not Scotland—who, when the Queen's name is mentioned, receive it with hoots and hisses and groans. We are told that this is a representative meeting of Scotsmen and of the Highlands. We have been told to-night, several times, that the Scottish, and particularly Highlanders, are a loyal race. I am perfectly certain that these prisoners from Tiree and Skye would rather have served twice their time than be supported by men in this House, or anywhere else, who would be parties to being present at a meeting at which the name of the Queen was hissed. And, observe, at this meeting the object is not to allay excitement, not to induce a state of peace. The hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton), at that meeting, said he rejoiced at what was going on, because he believed that this excitement was only the beginning of a wave which, he hoped, would spread over the length and breadth of the land. These are the guides of ignorant people, and these are the men through whom it is expected that peace will be given to the districts in Scotland in which the crofters reside. The hon. Member who addressed the House last (Mr. Watt) was present and spoke at this meeting. Did any dissent come from any gentleman as to what was said at this meeting—a meeting at which, be it observed, the effort was to get a mitigation from the Executive of the decision of the Supreme Court of Scotland? So far as I am concerned, I should be ashamed to belong to any Executive that would be a party to mitigating any sentence where those who supported it did so upon such grounds; and I venture to say that if the Tiree crofters, for mitigating whose sentences we have been sneered at, were to be let out only on the grounds of such petitions as these, they would be doing their term of imprisonment still. Let me glance, for a moment, at the attacks made not only on the administration of justice, but on the administration of the Executive; and I was told to-night, for the first time of my holding of the Office—and I think it will be new to my right hon. and learned Predecessor—that there is an irresponsible power entrusted to the Lord Advocate and his assistants. Now, the Lord Advocate of Scotland has for many years been, as a matter of ordinary routine, a Member of this House, and I have never yet heard any attack of that kind upon his proceedings in the conduct of criminal business, or in his assistance to the general administration of the country. I have not heard it to-night; but I have heard a statement made that I possess in my Office irresponsible power. I have not yet heard, however, what it is I have done with my power of which the hon. Member (Dr. Cameron) complains. I shall be glad to hear it. Of course, the Lord Advocate is an official having a certain and a serious responsibility; and he is responsible to this House and to the country for it. If there is any act of mine which can be shown in which I have offended against the principles of justice—by which I do not mean the justice that Members of this House imagine for themselves, but that justice which necessarily is embodied in the law of the land, which alone I have the duty to administer—I say that, if anything can be shown in which I have in any way offended against the law of the land, which it is my sole duty to uphold and maintain, I shall be very glad to have it pointed out, and extremely sorry to have offended. But this is the first time I have ever heard it expressed that the Lord Advocate is an irresponsible official; and I should like to know in what way is the Lord Advocate more irresponsible than any other Minister of the Crown? He may have, in some respects, more difficult and more delicate duties to perform. In some respects he has duties to do which require the exercise of care and attention such as few offices require. He is the sole responsible head for all public prosecutions in Scotland. Can you have a better proof that the system under which the Lord Advocate is responsible for prosecutions of crime in Scotland is a system which proves itself satisfactory to the sense of the country than that no man in this House now living, however old, can remember one real instance of private prosecution? It is open to any citizen of Scotland to institute a prosecution if the Public Prosecutor will not do it; but no such thing is known in the history of Scotland in modern times. The Lord Advocate has to consider, in many cases, whether he will prosecute or not; in many cases, how far he will carry prosecution, and how far he will abstain. These necessarily are difficult duties; but they are not made easier by the kind of things which have been said about his office to-night. At all events, they are not made easier by suggestions that he is exercising an irresponsible power, and is doing his work so as to serve the interests of himself and of a class. It has been the proudest boast of all connected with the system of working the criminal administration in Scotland that there justice has been administered without fear, favour, or affection; and nothing that has occurred in this House to-night has convinced me that my Predecessors in Office have had any ground to be ashamed of the part they have taken; and nothing has occurred, I think, to indicate to any Member of this House that I have any cause to be ashamed. A great deal has been said also about the military expeditions which have taken place to different parts in the Western Islands. Is it astonishing that military expeditions are necessary, when hon. Members of this House tell us, as the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty (Dr. R. McDonald) did to-night—he said he would be frank about it, and he was frank—that he had advised people to resist the operation of the law until they got what he calls justice? Where are he and his Friends going to get justice? Is it the ordinary mode of getting justice to refuse to go to the Courts of Law for its administration? I perfectly understand that if everybody is to settle for himself what is to be justice, perfectly conscientiously and perfectly fairly, with the aid and advice of gentlemen like the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow, I perfectly understand the position. But how long will society go on upon that footing? Because, if he is entitled to his opinions, and his interpretation of what constitutes justice, then, equally, every rascal who possesses property is entitled to take his own view of what is justice; and when the hon. Gentleman abuses the landlords of Skye for having declined to pay their rates when they could not get their rents——

DR. CAMERON said, he had not abused the landlords; he had commented upon their conduct.

MR. J. H. A. MACDONALD: Well, it was their idea of justice that a man who got nothing out of his property should not be called upon to pay the burdens upon that property. They were entirely wrong in that. But if the hon. Member thinks it was a new thing in the end of 1886 to tell these proprietors that, he is very much mistaken; because information was given to them upon that matter a long time before; and, in my opinion, they acted foolishly and wrongly in their resistance. But how will that act upon other people? The hon. Member says these landlords in Skye endeavoured to get this military expedition sent for the exaction of their rents by this refusal on their part to pay rates. I beg to tell the hon. Member and this House that when this expedition was sent to Skye it was upon the express condition that it should be used equally as regards all for the enforcement of the law; and I beg also to tell him that it was put in operation in every case in which it was necessary for the recovery of rates, and it was put in operation in an extremely small number of cases in which the object was to get writs served for the recovery of rents. It is an extraordinary fallacy, and one which I must here refer to, that runs through a great part of the arguments used on the other side, to suppose that these expeditions of force, both military and police, were sent to these islands for the purpose of exacting rents. They were sent to these islands by the Executive for no such purpose. The Executive had nothing to do with the question what the Civil Court is about in its operations. It has a duty, and one duty only—to see that the Civil Court shall not be defied. These expeditions were sent because the people, urged on by Members of this House, were refusing to allow the Courts of Law to exercise their jurisdiction.

Dr. CLARK: Which Member, may I ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman?

Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD: An hon. Member whom I do not see in his place; but who told us frankly, to-night, that he had advised the people to resist.

Dr. R. McDONALD: I beg the right hon. and learned Gentleman's pardon. I did not refer to ordinary rents; but to arrears of rents that the Crofters, Commission should be allowed to settle.

Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD: You must pay these rents if Parliament has decreed that they should be paid. I take it that the interruption of the hon. Member more plainly indicates the utter hopelessness of his case; because is he or this House to decide what is the meaning of the Crofters' Act as between man and man? Is this House to be turned into a Court of Justice? If that is to come about, God forbid that any of us should be living. If this House is to decide upon *ex parte* statements and upon stories told, and is to decide the meaning of its own Acts of Parliament, it is a thing never heard of in any civilized country; and the hon. Member, whose extreme anxiety is to bring his friends to a state of real civilization, is teaching them deliberately, though not intentionally, to go against the first principle of civilization, which is that the Courts of the country have a duty to decide what the law is, and that no Parliament can interfere with them in that decision. Hon. Members opposite are very fond of referring to the Constitution of America; but there is no place in which it is more firmly and clearly laid down that the Courts of Law are to decide what the law is. If it turns out to be a bad law or badly made, this House may be asked to alter it; but the House will not be encouraged to alter the law by hon. Members teaching that the way to get it altered is to resist the operation of the Civil Courts. A great deal has been said also about the system of the Sheriffs' Courts; and the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow told us that it was a bad system. It has not been found so in Scotland.

Dr. CAMERON: I beg pardon again. What I said was that it was a bad system that the Judge of the county in whose Court the cases were to be tried should act as the arrester, accuser, and hunter-up of evidence.

Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD: That is what I said. The hon. Member said it was a bad system for the country. Well, it has not proved a bad system. ["Oh, oh!"] Hon. Members may say "Oh;" but where will they find in the history of our country a complaint of its being a bad system until now? It is all very well to complain of a particular system mixed up with an attack upon a particular individual who happens to be one of the officials of the system. But where will you find, throughout the length and breadth of the world, a system that works better than our system of criminal investigation? The investigator in all these cases—and the hon. Member knows it—has nothing to do as to deciding the where or how they are to be tried. The hon. Member knows as well as I do, that in every case of criminal investigation which comes before the Sheriff, he does not decide how the case is to be tried, or the Court in which it is to be tried. Every case, as the hon. Member well knows, after the investigations have been made, is sent to the Crown Office in Edinburgh, and I and my Colleagues there take the responsibility of deciding in what Court the case is to be tried. In so far as the investigations are concerned, the Sheriff is simply and solely an administrative official. He is simply making investigations to discover what witnesses shall say on the subject in order to report. Is there anything bad in that system? Can the hon. Member point to anything in the administration of justice which has occurred in Skye or Tiree, during the time that these cases have been happening, which shows that the system is a bad one? I know of none; and when I am accused of having an irresponsible power entrusted to me and my assistants, it is extremely strange that no complaint on that matter has ever reached me from any hon. Member before it reached me in this House. But the statements of the hon. Member from beginning to end are the best refutation of what he said. They are all based upon small points got from reports in newspapers, and from excited gentlemen like the Rev. Mr. Cruickshank at the meeting that has been referred to, and who used very strong and very unjustifiable language—language that can never do any good in the administration of this or any other country. Then hon. Members sit by at meetings in the Highlands where gentlemen get up and say that if a certain Sheriff had done a particular thing to them, as he had done to somebody else, they would have sent him down reeking hot to hell. Expressions of that kind are received with loud applause, and no single Member of Parliament gets up to make a protest against it.

DR. CLARK: May I ask at what meeting was that said?

MR. J. H. A. MACDONALD: I think it was at Bonar Bridge.

DR. CLARK: May I inform the right hon. and learned Gentleman that I was in the chair at the meeting, and deny that at the whole of the conference at Bonar Bridge any such statement, or anything approaching it, was used by any speaker there. I say that the insinuation is perfectly untrue so far as the Bonar Bridge convention is concerned.

MR. J. H. A. MACDONALD: I am extremely glad to hear it. It is only a strong indication of how foolish it is of hon. Members like myself and others believing all that we see in the newspapers. I was not aware that my hon. Friend was at the meeting, else I should not have quoted that expression without asking him beforehand if it was made. But there was a meeting held at Bonar Bridge, and pretty strong things were said there against the administration of justice; and I presume the chairman of the meeting will not be inclined to demur, when I venture to tell that chairman and the other members who spoke thus of the administration of justice that that is not the way to get anything which is wrong in the administration of justice put right, and it is not the way to increase the respect of those, who know the administration of justice in this country a good deal more than they do, for the opinions that they hold. Upon all this stuff we are asked to grant another Government inquiry, I suppose by Royal Commission. We all know perfectly well that if I, under the authority of the Government, were to stand here and say that we were about to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into these matters it would be received with loud laughter. When we were last in Office there was nothing that was more consistently thrown in our teeth than that we were a Government of Royal Commissions. But what would this Commission of Inquiry have to do? Is it to inquire whether the statements made by the hon. Member for Ross-shire, and whether the statement made about the administration of justice by the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow, along with his friend, Mr. Cruickshank, were correct? If that is the object of the investigation, then the investigation is not in the least degree called for, because the Government know already that these statements are not facts. There can be no use of an inquiry, unless it is to be followed by action on the part of the Government. There can be no use for inquiry in the case of gentlemen who know all about it already. There can be no conceivable use for an inquiry, if it is based on the idea that the Government are to interfere with the operation of the Law Courts of the country. Something has been said to-night about the proceedings of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and about his using pressure upon the landlords not to be hard upon the tenants, and we were asked why we did not take the same course. I do not think the way the Chief Secretary for Ireland has been treated in the House this Session can be any encouragement to us to take a similar course. There is no question about it. It is not the duty of the Executive—there is no obligation upon them—to be making inquiries into the details of particular cases. If details of particular cases come to their knowledge in which they can convey these details to the landlord, and endeavour to get him to exercise kindness to his tenants, they may do so if they like. But when a question comes up whether a landlord or a tenant, or anybody else, has gone to a Court of the country and got a summons, for the purpose of bringing the matter into Court to be discussed there, this Government, and no responsible Government, could ever dream of taking steps by their own action to interfere with that proceeding; on the contrary, they would know it to be their absolute duty, by all the powers at their command, to prevent the summons of that local Court from being refused in service by the party to whom it is presented. Further, hon. Members want an inquiry into the administration of justice in Scotland. [An hon. MEMBER: The Highlands.] Well, the Highlands. The Government are not going to accede to that request. The Government themselves are not only aware of the facts in regard to the state of the country; but they are also aware of the facts as to the administration of justice. And there is no need for any inquiry; because the Government have already satisfied themselves that they have no action to take beyond what they have taken already. But this I want hon. Members to understand—that it is in vain to appeal to us by saying, as the hon. Member for the College Division said—"You spend a large sum of public money and get very small return for it." In the first place, I say that does not apply to the case of the expedition to Skye, because I fancy the rates which were in arrear at the time that expedition entered the county were £3,130 15*s*., of which there only remained due when the expedition left the island £60 15*s*., and the proportion in which these sums were due was £1,769 due by the landlords, and £1,365 15*s*. due by the tenants. [Dr. CLARK: The crofters.] Well, the crofters. The law lays down that the crofter is just a tenant. But they were not all crofters that were in arrear. That is the result of the expedition as regards rates. The result of the expedition as regards rents was that only in a small proportion did the landlords take advantage of the expedition being there to proceed in the service of summonses for rents; and in almost all cases they have succeeded in making a settlement with their crofters, some of the settlements being final, and some of them being dependent upon the results of the Crofters' Commission. That expedition—I do not care what it cost—established this—which my right hon. and learned Friend's expedition in the previous Government established also—that we have not yet got a responsible Government in this country that will hesitate to give all the power of the law, at whatever expense it may be, to prevent the diligence of the Courts of Justice being defeated by lawless people. And we were certain—and I think my right hon. and learned Friend will agree with me—that neither of these expeditions would ever have been necessary, if it had not been that ignorant and ill-informed people, egged on by others, took courses which could only lead to establishing anarchy, and which could never lead to securing any satisfactory results to themselves or to others.

DR. CLARK (Caithness) said, he was much disappointed at the speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate, who had not touched upon one-third of the case presented by his hon. Friend the Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), but replied instead to newspaper reports made outside. Although the right hon. and learned Gentleman now refused them a Committee of Inquiry, the probability was that he might yet be glad to consent to grant one. He (Dr. Clark) might call his attention to the fact that the right hon. and learned Gentleman's Predecessor refused an inquiry into the condition of things in the Highlands; but six months afterwards he was glad to issue a Royal Commission to inquire, and that Commission substantiated every assertion that was made by those who took the crofters' side. Then facts were denied; inquiry was refused; and then, when lawless acts occurred, they were glad to grant an inquiry; and then the jury of landlords admitted that all their facts were true. Now, in the Report of that Commission—which was only to inquire into the condition of the Land Law—there was a special paragraph regarding the administration of justice in the Highlands; and amendments were suggested in the mode of administering justice in the Highlands. That Royal Commission not only took up the question of the condition of the crofters and the laws affecting the tenure of land, but they put a special paragraph in their Report regarding the reforms wanted in the administration of the law in Scotland. It was, therefore, quite plain that they were not now raising the question for the first time. He thought that in Scotland the powers given to Public Prosecutors and Crown officials were greater than they ought to possess. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had scarcely alluded to the case of Skye, which was the most important one brought forward by the Mover of the Amendment. The right hon. and learned Gentleman paid more attention to the case of Tiree, because he thought it was one that would tell against them. In regard to Tiree, he (Dr. Clark) would frankly admit that the men broke the law, though they did so under great provocation; but still the right hon. and learned Gentleman did not fairly represent the condition of things in that island. During the last 40 years there had been a great many evictions.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.) inquired whether the hon. Member meant evictions for the non-payment of rent?

DR. CLARK replied that he did. There had been cruel evictions of the worst possible kind; and on that point he would refer the right hon. Gentleman opposite to the Report of the Royal Commission, where he would find that during the time the present noble Duke had held the islands evictions of the most cruel character—unequalled even in Ireland—had occurred. A branch of the Land Law Reform Association was established in Tiree, and was presided over by a local agitator. When a farm became vacant, as the district was so congested, the crofters wished that that farm should be obtained for enlargement of their holdings; and, acting under their leader's advice, they agreed that no individual should personally make a tender for the farm, but that the Duke should be asked to give it for the good of the entire crofting community. Their leader, knowing that no personal application would be made by the crofters, made a personal application to the Duke for the farm; and in spite of the fact that he and his brother had three farms already, he got this new one, although the crofting population were starving owing to the congestion, and their children growing up under conditions which led to disease and premature death. When the people found they had been betrayed by the man who acted as their leader they felt indignant, and endeavoured to prevent him getting into the farm. They took illegal action, the result being that the Commission was sent, and two men were committed to prison. Mr. Angus Campbell certainly stated at Glasgow that some of the witnesses were privately informed that they would be made defendants. He said the prosecutor told him so, and this was one of the allegations which they desired to have investigated. It was not at all to the credit of the Duke that he aided and abetted that man in getting this additional farm, considering the condition in which the crofting population was situated. The result of the illegal action on the part of the people was the expedition to the island; and the imprisonment of two men because they were supposed to be local leaders and aiders and abettors. There was no doubt that in the Highlands there was a feeling that they were not always fairly treated by the Lowlanders, who did not like the Highlanders, as occasionally they became competitors in the labour market and accepted smaller wages. That feeling existed, whether there was any justification for it or not. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate had ignored the case as regarded Skye. He (Dr. Clark) contended that the expedition which was sent to Skye caused all the trouble, and that the Parochial Boards should have put their ordinary powers in force. If the right hon. and learned Gentleman had been wise he would have requested the Crofter Commission to go to Skye. The high-handed proceedings of Sheriff Ivory, he thought, resembled those of a Turkish Pasha in Macedonia, who vented his personal spite and used his power for personal purposes. There were some men in Skye whom Sheriff Ivory did not like. In particular, he would refer to the case of a minister of the Established Church, the Rev. Mr. M'Callum, who, although a State-paid parson, was a leader of the people. On various occasions that gentleman had come into collision with the Sheriff, who sent him to prison on some pretence. They wanted to know what the pretence was, for the Lord Advocate had refused to give them that information. Then, his friend, Mr. John Macpherson, was also a local leader. On different occasions the Sheriff had expressed his desire to get him into his power. He did so, and kept him in prison from one Saturday night until another. John Macpherson was taken in a gunboat to Portree. He was not allowed to communicate with any of his friends, and on Saturday night he was turned away to walk home, a distance of 34 miles. Mr. Macpherson had never been tried, and never would be tried; and what he (Dr. Clark) begged and prayed of the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite was that these men should be tried. He and his Colleagues all declared that they had no confidence in the administration of justice in the Highlands. Every Crofter Member except one would make that statement. When they had persons administering the law who were servants of the landlords and the Crown, and who had been defeated politically, he thought there was a right to claim an inquiry. He asked the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether it was legal to poind babies in Scotland? If a man came to his house, assaulted his wife, and poinded his baby, he would give him something more than law—he would knock him down at his feet. Blaming the Government for refusing an inquiry, he would warn them that they were simply playing into the hands of a small dynamite faction which existed in the Highlands. ["Name!"] They were not crofters. This small dynamite section in the Highlands advocated the destruction of grouse as a protest against the illegal official outrages that had been committed by Sheriffs and Sheriffs' officers. He hoped the Government would consider this question more seriously than it had hitherto done. He (Dr. Clark) tried some time ago to show that in the Highlands there was a dangerous class of people; but the Government took no action, and, indeed, turned round and tried to throw the blame upon himself and his friends. Up to the present time he and his friends had been able to prevent any outrages in the Highlands of Scotland. All those which had been committed had come from the landlords and their agents. It might, however, be that a change would take place, and that this agitation would be stained by crime; and if it was the responsibility would rest on Her Majesty's Government for refusing this reasonable inquiry. The result of sending crofters to prison was to make them good land agitators. As the Lord Advocate had been thrown over by the Government before, he hoped he would be thrown over again now, and that in the interests of justice the inquiry demanded should be granted.

Mr. HALDANE (Haddington) said, the Amendment of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) must, so far as its terms went, be regarded as referring to the general question of the administration of the law in Skye and the Highlands, and he (Mr. Haldane) would, therefore, vote for it; but if it were to be interpreted as a Vote of Censure upon the present or the late Governments he should decline to support it. It had been urged that, where the local authority had failed to do its duty as a local Executive, the general Executive of the country ought not to interfere. In his view, that failure, whatever it amounted to, could afford no such reason. The duty of the Executive was to enforce the law as declared by Parliament, whatever that law might be. The Executive had no discretion in the matter. He dissented from the apparent opinion to the contrary, when it was advanced by the late Chief Secretary for Ireland, and in so far as it was put forward by the present Chief Secretary; and he dissented from it most emphatically when it was put forward as an opinion maintained and upheld with regard to recent events in Skye. The second point that appeared to him to be plain was that it was impossible, at the date at which the recent expedition was sent to Skye, to enforce the law by the ordinary means. If it were necessary to bring testimony in aid of this, he could call in the testimony of no less distinguished a person than John Macpherson, of Glendale, who had admitted, during the expedition, that, but for the military, nothing belonging to the crofters would have been carried off. In that state of affairs, it appeared to him beyond all doubt that it was the duty of the Government to take active steps to have the law put in force, though those steps might, in ordinary circumstances, have been deemed unreasonable; and it further appeared to him, as established by the facts, that the expedition was not an unreasonable one. Yet it appeared to be put forward, as a charge against the judicial functionaries of the island, that they ought to have put off the execution of decrees until the Crofters' Act, which was about to come into operation, should have done so. That was a proposition from which he wholly and entirely dissented. The local judicature had no discretion in the matter. He thought it was a grave slip in the Crofters' Act that it was not framed in such a fashion as to be put in operation to defeat the exaction of the last pound of flesh on the part of some of the landlords of Skye. As he had stated at the outset, he would vote against the Amendment if it were a Vote of Censure. He thought that neither the late Government or the present one was deserving of censure. It appeared to him that they only took steps to enforce the law, steps which might be clumsy and unreasonable in ordinary circumstances, and the nature of which might have been, and probably was, due to the fact that the law, as it existed in Skye, did not sufficiently provide for the enforcement of decrees; but, at any rate, they were steps which were necessary to be taken, and which it was the duty of the Executive to take. So far as he could judge, the foolish proceeding of issuing medals was not the only foolish act done by Sheriff Ivory in the course of his career there; but he believed him to be a man who honestly strove to do his duty; and he did not think those were times in which they should be ready lightly to cast Votes of Censure on the Executive and judicial officers of the Government who were only trying to carry out the functions committed to them by law. The state of the crofters was, no doubt, an unenviable one. The conditions of life had greatly altered for them. They belonged to a race the time for which had long passed; and it was only natural that they should feel discontented when they looked around and saw the more favourable conditions under which other classes were living. The Crofters' Act doubtless had done some good, but it had not met all the exigencies of the case; and, consequently, there were still a large number of crofters living in a state which sorely needed amelioration. The question before the House was not that of a Vote of Censure; but the terms of the Amendment were such that they might be interpreted to mean that the general system of the administration of justice in the Highlands, and in Skye in particular, was not satisfactory. He did not think it could be contended by anyone that it was satisfactory; and he was fully persuaded that there was room for inquiry as to whether amendment might not be made. It seemed to him, for instance, that it was not desirable that the functions of a Judge should be united in the same individual with other duties, and an alteration should certainly be made in that respect. It was because he believed the existing state of things, not merely in Skye, but throughout a considerable portion of the Highlands, was by no means satisfactory, that he was prepared to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron).

MR. SHIRESS WILL (Montrose, &c.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate because I believe the issue is a very serious one. Certainly, I do not rise for the purpose of making any attack upon the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald), or upon any judicial officer in Scotland; but merely to invite an inquiry into the matters which have been raised, and which have not as yet been answered. I must congratulate the Lord Advocate upon the great ability and humour of his speech. The right hon. and learned Gentleman's speech was admirable from several points of view; but it was specially admirable for this—that in it he answered and defended points which were not attacked. The speech which I thought the right hon. and learned Gentleman set out to answer was the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), in which charges were made certainly deserving an answer; but the Lord Advocate devoted a great part of his speech to answering the case with respect to Tiree, which is but of secondary importance, though I admit it had been referred to in the course of the debate. He did not answer the question of the hon. Member (Dr. Cameron) as to how much was due by the crofters. Was it because the right hon. and learned Gentleman did not think the point is of sufficient importance to make inquiry respecting it, or was it because, having inquired into the facts, he found they will not bear the light? How is it that up to the present time we do not know how much was due from the crofters when this military expedition was sent?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): There is no means of ascertaining how much was owing by the crofters.

MR. SHIRESS WILL: Surely there is such a thing as a rate book, from which the information can be got. With the greatest respect to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. A. J. Balfour), I assert he is wrong in saying there is no means of finding what was due by the crofters. Having been appealed to to say how much was due, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate has given figures. He says that £1,769 was due by landlords, and £1,369 by "tenants;" and so he mixes up, or rather his subordinates who get information for him mix up, the amount which is due by tenants of large holdings with the amount due by the crofters. Now, there is a practice in America which is known as jerrymandering. I believe it was practised in France during the last Empire; and what has been done in this case—namely, the mixing up in the figures the large tenants with the crofters, by which it appears that a large sum was due—is really a jerrymandering resorted to in order to justify the expedition. But what did the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate himself say as to the necessity of the expedition? He said the expedition had been sent because the crofters had been induced to withhold the payment of their rates by the advice given by some Members of this House. I put it to the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether the landlords were not owing the larger sum? Was it any Member of this House who dissuaded the landlords from paying their rates? One thing we wanted to know from the Lord Advocate in answer to the speech of the hon. Gentleman (Dr. Cameron) the Mover of the Amendment is this — How came this expedition to be sent; who authorized it and was responsible for it; and upon what facts did it proceed? Surely the authority who ordered the expedition must have been satisfied that the crofters had been withholding the payment of their rates. Surely that authority must have been satisfied as to the amount due before they sent the expedition. Now, Sir, the expedition was sent; but just before it arrived the landlords undoubtedly paid their part. Who was the authority to decide whether or not the expedition which was justifiably sent in the first instance was any longer justified after the landlords had paid the larger amount of that which was due? According to the figures given by the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) the amount then due by the crofters was only some £600 at the outside. Did no one exercise his judgment as to whether the expedition should be further continued upon that state of facts? The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate takes credit for the fact that only £60 of the whole amount which was due remains unpaid. But how was recovery obtained from the crofters? Why, by taking the poultry of some, by taking the peat stacks of others—in fact, by depriving these people, who were in the direst poverty, of the last sticks they had by them. The money was paid, but under circumstances which I do respectfully think require some inquiry. But how was it that this authority, after sending forth this military expedition, did not make themselves acquainted with this fact, that of the amount that appeared upon the rate books to be due a large portion was really not due, at all events could not be recovered, because some of the people were dead, others were receiving parochial relief, and some were abroad—one man had been abroad three years? How was it that no one inquired into these things, and that the rate book or the statement of some person was accepted as final and sufficient authority upon this matter? But the matter does not rest there. If the expedition were legal in its origin, how did it proceed? What were the warrants of distress that were sent to be served upon the people? Let me remind the House of what takes place in England. In England, if people are in arrear with their poor rates a large number are gathered together and put in one warrant of distress. A complaint is then made embracing 10, 20, 50, or 100 people or more; and then under the 12 *Vict.*, passed in 1849, a particular summons is issued to each person calling upon him to show cause why a warrant of distress should not issue against him, and he had thus an opportunity of being heard. If such a course had been followed in this case there would have been no warrant sent against persons who were dead, against persons who had paid, against those who had counter claims for work done for the Parochial Board, although I admit in form there is no legal set-off in that matter. If that is not the law of Scotland probably the Lord Advocate will explain; but certainly that is the law of England. Well, then, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate makes an attack upon my hon. Friend the Member for Ross (Dr. McDonald), which I cannot allow to pass unnoticed. The right hon. and learned Gentleman said the hon. Member for Ross had declared that he had advised some persons not to pay rent under certain circumstances. The right hon. and learned Gentleman is totally mistaken in supposing that my hon. Friend (Dr. McDonald) had advised tenants generally not to pay rent. [The LORD ADVOCATE dissented.] I am quite ready to accept the disclaimer of the right hon. and learned Gentleman; but he will allow me to repeat—in case it should be misunderstood by others—what I understood the hon. Member for Ross (Dr. McDonald) to assert, and the only thing I understood him to assert, was this — that the Crofters' Commission being charged with the power of examining into the arrears of rent, and of saying whether they should be paid in whole, or in part, or at all, the landlords—in anticipation of their coming, which would be in a very few weeks—brought actions in the Sheriff's Court to recover the arrears, and took steps to enforce the decrees. The Crofters' Commission had authority to deal with the payment of the money, and it was pending the decision of the Commissioners that my hon. Friend recommended the withholding of payment. And now I should like to say one word with reference to what the Lord Advocate said as to the change of venue. It is perfectly true that the Court of Justiciary is the highest Criminal Court in Scotland, and that the best lawyers and the best legal practitioners are to be found there. But, Sir, what was this crime? What was its magnitude? Not a blow struck, not a stone thrown, not a stick applied to the head or body of any human being, simply the assembling of a few women and other people, due to the excitement of the time, provoked very largely by the presence of the military. In one case the offence was held to be deforcement; in another it was held not to be deforcement. But, while I do not dispute the righteousness of the verdict as to deforcement, what was it after all? It was a crime which could well have been tried by the Judges who presided in the Sheriff Courts in Scotland. What is said is this—and I do not quite understand the Lord Advocate has answered it—that instead of taking these people up to Edinburgh, where their witnesses could not follow them on account of the expense, they might have tried the prisoners in one or other of two places—at Portree in the Island of Skye, or at Inverness. Does the right hon. and learned Gentleman mean to say that a fair trial would not have been had in Inverness? Does he mean to say that a jury in Inverness——

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD): What I meant was that no Court could be held there until the month of April.

MR. SHIRESS WILL: If I be wrong I should be glad to be corrected. What I assert is that these prisoners might have been tried in one of two places out of Edinburgh—they might have been tried in Portree with or without a jury; they might have been tried in Inverness with or without a jury, by the Sheriff or by his substitute. Very well, then; here we have the fact that this learned Sheriff, against whom I say nothing—I am not going to condemn a judicial officer until the facts are inquired into; all I do is to join my hon. Friends in asking for an inquiry into the circumstances—here we have the fact that either this Sheriff might have tried the prisoners with or without a jury—if he had any hesitation he could readily have had a jury—or he might have obtained the services of the Sheriff Substitute, who is always a gentleman of judicial experience and legal training. Instead of that, the prisoners are taken to Edinburgh, and our case is that these people were so poor that their sticks were taken and their peat stacks were sold in order to meet the payment of the rates, and that they were totally unable to take any witnesses to Edinburgh. Unless I am misinformed, no witnesses were taken up from Skye, and the suggestion is that the change of venue to Edinburgh was a harsh proceeding. I am quite certain of this—that the right hon. and learned

Gentleman the Lord Advocate would not intentionally do anything that was harsh or unkind, and I make no attack upon him personally. Now, the Lord Advocate addressed to my hon. Friend (Dr. Cameron) a great many observations with regard to the Scotch law; and perhaps I may, in a few words, tell the House what my reading of the law in Scotland upon this important point is. In England, if a man is suspected of any offence, he is served with a summons—by that summons he is taken before a magistrate and the case is inquired into. The accused may be let out on bail, and he has every opportunity of being defended and of clearing himself. But in Scotland, if one of these crofters is suspected—of deforcement for instance—he is immediately arrested, and then taken a distance of from 20 to 30 miles. He is taken to Portree, for instance, and there examined by the Sheriff or magistrate. The Sheriff also examines the accused's witnesses. I am not complaining of that system, and I do not understand my hon. Friend (Dr. Cameron) to complain of it; but what we ask the House to bear in mind is that that is a system which is apt to work harshly unless its operation is closely watched and jealously guarded. That is the sole extent of the charge made. I should like to give two or three illustrations of what did happen. It was supposed that somebody or other had put stones in the road to upset the Sheriff's officer when driving along. For the sake of my argument I will assume that supposition to be true. The law has to be vindicated. Two boys were seen in the neighbourhood, and they were at once suspected and arrested. The boys were carried off in what is described as a machine to Portree, a distance of 20 or 30 miles—I forget which. And what happened there? They were positively held to bail in £15 each. These poor fellows had not 15*s*. or 15*d*. each; but, fortunately, the landlord of the hotel at Portree became bail for them. The next day, or very shortly afterwards, three other boys were arrested by the Sheriff's officer, or rather by the constables with him, and they were also taken to Portree. These prisoners were kept at Portree some time, and they were told they might go home. There was no evidence against them, yet they were arrested and kept imprisoned. I am stating the case within the facts, because I do not wish to exaggerate in the slightest degree. These boys were taken up absolutely without any evidence at all to justify their arrest; they were carried 30 miles, kept in gaol some time, and then were told they might go home. I am told that in the case of the arrest of the first two boys there was no warrant; but for that I cannot vouch. Then there is the case of the poor woman, Mrs. Macmillan. She was arrested by the Sheriff's officer who has been so often mentioned in the course of the debate. She came down to the road, whereupon the officer said—"Oh, this is one of the deforcers." First of all she was taken out to the gunboat *Seahorse*, kept there some time, then conveyed to Portree, and ultimately carried up to Edinburgh upon the charge of deforcement. She was discharged without even being put on her trial, and she has been so ill in Edinburgh that I am told by an hon. Member sitting on this side of the House that he has only lately sent her a small contribution towards her subsistence. This is another instance in which I say the practice or the machinery of the law in Scotland, though I do not complain of it as bad, is machinery which requires to be closely watched and guarded, or else you have cases of injustice such as I have mentioned constantly recurring. Mr. Speaker, there is one other matter which I wish, with your permission, to refer to. It is said that a midnight raid was made. Why was the dead of night chosen for the search? The men could be seen better in the day; and as to finding them in the night, it is well known they were not found, though searches were repeatedly made. This, however, is not the matter I wish to refer to. The point I desire to mention deserves inquiry, and I should be glad if the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Home Secretary (Mr. Matthews) will give me his attention, for I feel sure he will not sanction what is said to have taken place in this instance. A search warrant, in order to be legal and justifiable, must be issued against an individual or individuals by their individual names and for individual offences. It cannot be a general search warrant. Every man's house is his castle, and it cannot be entered unless the search warrant is lawful. Now, what happened in this case was this—the officers of the law, with a search warrant for some person or persons, proceeded to search every house in the village. Anything more unusual—I will not characterize it by any harsh word—cannot be imagined. It is said you are justified in breaking into the house of a neighbour to search for some person. That I do not deny. If you have reasonable cause to believe that a man is in his neighbour's house you may go in and take him. But for a body of policemen with a search warrant to begin with house No. 1 and go right through the village is certainly a circumstance which requires inquiry. I forgot to mention another instance of unlawful arrest. One day a poor cowherd was seen on the skyline. The officers were searching for deforcers, and I suppose there was no one else in sight, so they charged the cowherd and captured him. Of what they did with him I happen to have a record. They carried him, of course, to Portree and kept him in prison for four days. His offence was nominally deforcement; but, in point of fact, it was that he was seen on the skyline and had not run away. Upon his arrival at Portree, he was searched—possibly to see whether he had any weapons of deforcement, such as pitchforks, in his pockets—then they took off his shoes and put him in a bath. [*Laughter.*] I do not suppose that the prisoner or any Member of the House objects to a bath; but a prison bath is, no doubt, another matter. Well, after he had been kept in gaol at Portree for four days he was told he could go home. No charge was brought against him; and I ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate whether it was ever intended that any charge should be brought against him? I am sorry for having occupied so much of the time of the House; but I must say that whatever may be said about the agitation, whatever the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate may say about the Exeter Hall meeting, I shall not be deterred from taking, up to a certain point, a sympathetic part in asking not for a judgment of condemnation, but merely for an inquiry. I ask it on behalf of people who cannot ask it for themselves with the same facilities with which we can, because they are a small folk, a poor folk, and a distant folk; and because it is only by enlisting the sympathies of just men, amongst whom I include the Lord Advocate, that they can hope to get their grievances redressed.

MR. PICTON (Leicester): Mr. Speaker, as the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) did me the honour to refer to me in the course of his speech, I may, perhaps, be allowed a word in explanation. The Lord Advocate referred to the meeting held in Exeter Hall—that is to say, in the small room, not in the great room, of Exeter Hall. As I understood, there were a few friends gathered together to express sympathy with the crofters; and, so long as I was at the meeting, there was certainly no sound uttered that could be considered as disloyal to Her Majesty. True, I was not present during the whole of the proceedings; but, so far as I have been informed, nothing took place at all like what has been mentioned by the right hon. and learned Gentleman. With regard to the remarks he ascribed to me, I may say I did say—and I repeat here fearlessly—that the agitation amongst the crofters is but one small part of a very large question—I have said the same thing before in this House—and I added that I did trust the excitement caused by the sufferings of the crofters would result in a reversal not only of the crofters' wrongs, but also of the wrongs of all similarly situated. I did say I thought that down to a very recent period only the rights and privileges of the landlords had been considered, while the needs, the sufferings, and the wrongs of the tenants of all grades, but especially of the smallest tenants, had been cruelly neglected. I did say I thought I saw signs of a peaceful revolution which would change all that, and in the hope of that revolution I rejoiced. I cannot help believing that the debate which has been raised this evening by my hon. Friend the Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) will aid towards that peaceful revolution. I do not think that the criticisms, good humoured and pointed as they were, of the Lord Advocate really touched the essence of the case that was presented by my hon. Friend (Dr. Cameron). The Lord Advocate, like other Gentlemen speaking on the same side, was very strong indeed about law and order. Law and order are continually mentioned together, as though they are identical, or as though they were inextricably connected; but a state of things does often arise in which the law is the most fruitful cause of disorder, and in which, until the law is changed, you never can have order. The only remedy for such a state of things, apparently, in the opinion of the Lord Advocate, is to enforce the law continually, whatever the consequences may be. He spoke of hon. Gentlemen coming to this House with notions that he regarded as groundless; he spoke of the justice which Members of this House imagined for themselves, instead of the law of the land. Well, Sir, unless there is possible a justice higher than the law —a justice more perfect than anything that is administered by the law at the present time—I hardly suppose that many of us would take the trouble to come to this House. It is for the purpose of securing a higher justice than that which is furnished by the law, as it at present exists, that I suppose we come here to try in our small way to be legislators. The fact is that if you think of nothing but law you often fail altogether to do practical justice. We are told by ancient authority that the law is good if used lawfully; but the same authority adds that the law is not for the righteous, but for the ungodly and for sinners. Now, it does often happen, not only in the Highlands of Scotland, but in other parts of the United Kingdom, that the law presses most hardly not upon the wicked, not upon criminals, but upon good, peaceable, industrious, and thrifty citizens, who only wish to live their lives in peace, and have a fair opportunity of making a livelihood. It is in such cases that the law is found to irritate, and to cause our peaceable and virtuous citizens to revolt. Has it not been found to be so in Skye, in Tiree, and other parts of the Highlands? Are not the men who have been dragged up as criminals known to be men of the most excellent character? Are they not sympathized with by all the men of excellent character around them? If that is the case, I think it is, so far as it goes, very strong evidence that an inquiry is needed to show why it is that discontent and irritation arise. I may refer to certain words—most suggestive and impressive words—which appear towards the end of the Report of the Crofters' Commission, and which were approved by the Chairman and the majority of the Members of the Commission. After referring to the disorders which had taken place in the Highlands previous to the appointment of the Commission, and after urging, as gentlemen in their position might be expected to do, that the law must, if possible, be maintained, the Commissioners went on to say—

> "But collisions between proprietary rights and popular demands are to be deprecated, for they leave behind them lasting traces of resentment and alienation. The mere vindication of authority and repression of resistance would not establish the relations of mutual confidence between landlord and tenant, in the absence of which the country would not be truly at peace, and all our inquiries and counsels would be expended in vain."

This Report was, of course, written some time before the Crofters' Act was passed. It was in the hope that the aspirations of Her Majesty's Commissioners might be realized, and that a genuine peace might be established, that a number of us strove most earnestly to obtain the enactment of a more thorough-going measure than that which was passed. We considered that the measure introduced by the Government would never meet the case, and experience has proved that that is so. But not only has the measure itself proved to be insufficient, but the spirit in which it was administered—at any rate in Skye at the beginning of the period when it was expected to come into operation—was most disappointing, and was, I consider, most irritating to the people of Skye and the Highlands and Islands around. Take, for instance, the proceedings at the Sheriff Court in Portree towards the beginning of November — November 10 or 11 was, I think, the date. They are reported in *The Glasgow Herald*, a newspaper not very favourable to the cause of the crofters. There we find that the Sheriff, against whom personally I wish to say nothing whatever, presided. I deprecate—I lament—the violent language that has been used about an official holding so high a position, and I shall be the very last to say anything against him. I speak of him simply as the embodiment of the policy of the Government, as which, I suppose, he may fairly be regarded—at any rate, in the temper in which he administered the law. He asked repeatedly, and, as I cannot help thinking, in a somewhat irritating manner, whether the Commissioners were constituted a Court? He refused to allow that it was possible for the crofters to appeal to the Commissioners, and he asserted that the Commissioners could not possibly override the Courts of the Realm, in which, for all I know, not being a lawyer, he may be perfectly correct. But I do not think that was the tone in which he ought to have spoken to people who were suffering so acutely as the people before him were—people who were at their wits' end to find a meal. When the advocate of one of the defenders said his client was unable to pay the arrears, the Sheriff asked, "Has he no cattle?" and all the time there was an Act on the verge of coming into actual operation to deal with precisely such cases, so as to avoid the hardship involved in depriving a struggling tenant of his little capital. Moreover, the Sheriff went on to say—

> "I suppose we all know how the arrears have arisen. I think any person who reads the newspapers must know the reason. The arrears have all arisen since 1884, particularly since a certain speech was made in Parliament stating that no assistance would be allowed to collect arrears of rent. Ever since then non-payment of rent has been on the increase all over the island; but the question really for consideration is this—the proprietors have made a reasonable proposal, and I think you should be prepared to state whether you think it a reasonable proposal, and whether you will recommend your client to adopt it. It seems to me a reasonable proposal on the part of Lord Macdonald, and I think you should consider twice before you decline to accept it."

I do not think that is the way in which we have a right to expect the law to be administered; and then, considering the amount of reductions that have been made where the Crofters' Act has come into operation, the case of these poor people who were refused justice in the Sheriff's Court appears to me all the harder. We were told in this House not long ago that we on this side know no difference between good government and bad government, except that good government is government which is conducted and founded upon the assent and consent of the people; that if a Government is alien to the sympathies, the wishes, and the wants of the people, that Government breeds discontent, which, in its turn, leads to illegal conduct and illegitimate proceedings. This language of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) seems to me to be especially applicable to the case of the suffering people of Skye and the islands around. We cannot be maintaining a just system of law if we find that its operation causes bitterness and discontent and indignation on every hand amongst those upon whom it is brought to bear; and, therefore, even if the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) is able to show that, point by point, the law has been literally and drily carried out, I do wish the Government would show a little kindly consideration towards people who have been disappointed in the operation of the reforms that they desired, and would offer some kind of inquiry to see whether the people have any just cause of complaint.

MR. FRASER-MACKINTOSH (Inverness-shire): The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) made some reference to a meeting which was held in Exeter Hall. I was chairman of the meeting, and perhaps it is as well I should state exactly what occurred. The Lord Advocate seems to think that because only 300 people were present the meeting was not a large one. There are several halls in Exeter Hall, and we were in one of the small halls. The meeting was an open one. The Memorial to Her Majesty was moved by Miss Helen Taylor, a lady entitled to every consideration, and, although an amendment was proposed, the resolution was carried. So far as I am aware, nothing occurred which could be interpreted as in any way disrespectful to the Queen. My hon. Friend the Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) has, in a most able speech, asked for an inquiry into the administration of justice in the Highlands. The right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) has made no reply to the distinct allegations which have been made. We want to know why the military expedition went to Skye? All we know is this—that a combination—to use a mild term—existed on the part of many landlords in the Outer Hebrides not to pay their rates. Early in 1886 the landlords refused to pay their county rates, and at a later period they would not pay the local rates. Things were brought to a dead lock owing to the proceedings of the landlords. Now, what happened? A military expedition was sent for the alleged purpose of recovering rates, and not rents. There was nearly £5,000 of rates due in Skye at that time, of which 90 per cent was due by the landlords and by large tenants. The moment the expedition arrived the landlords and large farmers paid their rates. Now, if the island had been under proper administration instead of under that of Sheriff Ivory, the expedition would not have remained. All the suffering which has been described took place entirely in consequence of the action of the landlords. We make several demands. We make no attack upon the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate; but what we complain of is excess and abuse in the administration of the law. Before the Union of Scotland and England bail was fixed at a small sum; but at the close of the century it was enormously increased. To a nobleman the sum of £1,200 would be comparatively nothing; but to a crofter £60 is an enormous sum to be required for bail. The right hon. and learned Gentleman says it is the maximum; but I complain that the maximum was enforced in many cases; and the fact is that some of those who could not find this extreme bail were discharged or acquitted after being kept in prison for some time. I ask if no compensation is to be given to those persons? I say that the matters which have been detailed demand an investigation and reply on the part of the Government. With regard to Sheriff Ivory, I am convinced that as long as he continues to hold his present position there will be no peace in the district. Why can he not be removed or even promoted? I assure the Lord Advocate that the question of the administration of justice in the Highlands and Islands is one which we cannot allow to remain in its present position.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Hunter.*)

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Before assenting to the adjournment of the debate I should wish to know from hon. Members opposite whether the debate will terminate to-day (Wednesday)?

MR. J. W. BARCLAY (Forfarshire): In reply to the right hon. Gentleman, I point out that any understanding as to the termination of the debate must depend on the reply of the Government. The Scotch Members do not intend that it should terminate unless they have a satisfactory statement from the Government. They are determined to obtain some redress for the grievances brought forward.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

PARLIAMENT—ARRANGEMENT OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): Sir, I wish to say on the subject of the adjournment of the debate that I had the assurance from the right hon. Member for Berwickshire (Mr. Marjoribanks) that the Division upon this Amendment would be taken to-day, and upon that assurance I requested my hon. Friends not to challenge your decision. I make that statement, Sir, in order that there may be no misunderstanding on the subject.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.): I should be sorry to disavow anything which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwickshire (Mr. Marjoribanks) has said; but I think it very desirable that these arrangements should be made in the hearing of the House, in order that hon. Members who do not belong to the Party of the right hon. Gentleman opposite may have an opportunity of expressing their views on the subject.

MR. MARJORIBANKS (Berwickshire): I think it right to say that I gave the right hon. Gentleman the assurance that the debate would conclude to-day (Wednesday) on the authority of the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), the Mover of the Amendment. I think also that the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) agreed to the arrangement when it was made.

DR. CAMERON (Glasgow, College): I shall do my utmost to prevent the breaking of any arrangement arrived at.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY (Forfarshire): I speak only for myself; but I was no party to such an arrangement, and the termination of the debate will depend upon the time at which the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) makes his reply; I must again inform the Government that the people of Scotland are determined to have some redress for the grievances so long complained of.

MOTIONS.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (FISHING BOATS) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Baron Henry De Worms, Bill to amend the provisions of the Merchant Shipping (Fishing Boats) Acts, *ordered* to be brought in by Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. Jackson, and Sir Herbert Maxwell.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 168.]

WASTE LANDS (MINING) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Philip Stanhope, Bill for the cultivation of Lands rendered waste by Mining operations, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Philip Stanhope, Sir John Swinburne, Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Paulton, Mr. Howell, and Mr. Fenwick.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 169.]

PARISH ALLOTMENTS COMMITTEES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Cobb, Bill to establish Parish Committees for acquiring and managing Allotments of Land, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Cobb, Mr. Channing, Mr. Fuller, Mr. James Ellis, Mr. Herbert Gardner, and Mr. Thomas Ellis.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 170.]

House adjourned at twenty minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 16*th February*, 1887.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Metropolitan Open Spaces Act (1881) Extension * [171]; Parliamentary Elections (Simultaneous Voting) * [172]; Municipal Rates Assessment * [173].

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Ordered, That the Order for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Address have precedence of the other Orders of the Day.—(*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [FIFTEENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [15th February] proposed to Question—[See page 84.]

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the 12th paragraph, to insert the words—"And humbly to represent to Her Majesty that recent events in Skye and Tiree, and the general administration of justice in the Highlands, have caused serious concern to the people of Scotland, and demand full inquiry."—(*Dr. Cameron.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted.

Debate *resumed.*

CROFTERS (SCOTLAND).

MR. HUNTER (Aberdeen, N.) said, he would not trouble the House with any apologies for addressing them upon this subject, which had now been under discussion for one night. The conduct of the Government in sending a military expedition to Skye, and the conduct of the local judicial authorities subsequent to that proceeding, had very seriously troubled the conscience of the people of Scotland, and had excited widespread, and, he might almost say, universal indignation and irritation. Under these circumstances, if the Scottish Members had allowed one single day to pass—when it was in their power—without bringing this question before the House of Commons, they would have been guilty of gross dereliction of duty, and would have been very severely called to account by their constituents. The debate had proceeded, so far, he was sorry to say, in a somewhat one-sided fashion. A number of speeches had been made in support of the Amendment. Only one speech had been made against the Amendment, and that was made not by a private and independent Member, but by one of the officials whose conduct in these transactions was reflected upon. He did not propose to follow the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) in his somewhat rambling discourse on things in general with which he entertained the House. As the right hon. and learned Gentleman usually did in debate, he gambolled gracefully like a whale in a field of clover. The right hon. and learned Gentleman spoke of meetings in Scotland and in London; about speeches made by hon. Members, about everything except the issue before the House. He (Mr. Hunter) might give one little incident which might, perhaps, inspire the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate with some caution when he next came to speak about London meetings. One of the first meetings he (Mr. Hunter) had attended in London was in favour of what would now be considered a very moderate reform of the Land Laws. After the resolution had been put, a gentleman rose and moved a revolutionary amendment. He (Mr. Hunter) kept his eye on that man, and he afterwards found that that gentleman was a paid organizer of Conservative demonstrations in London. The right hon. and learned Lord Advocate laid down a most extraordinary legal doctrine—namely, that every person who attended a public meeting was to be held responsible for the opinions uttered by others at that meeting, and from which he might entirely and totally dissent.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): I never said anything of the kind. What I said was that no dissent was uttered.

MR. HUNTER: Then the right hon. and learned Gentleman's position was that as soon as at public meetings any person made a statement with which 500 disagreed, the 500 were responsible and ought to immediately jump up, when the resolution was proposed, and protest against it.

MR. J. H. A. MACDONALD: Yes; if the statement was disloyal.

MR. HUNTER said, he was happy to hear that remark, because it explained some of the mysterious proceedings in the Highlands. If that was the doctrine of Scotch law, he could not say that he shared that enthusiastic admiration for Scotch law and Edinburgh lawyers which the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate had so feelingly expressed. The right hon. and learned Lord Advocate said what hon. Members wanted was a Royal Commission. It was nothing of the kind. What was wanted was a Committee of Inquiry of the House of Commons. They did not ask the House of Commons to condemn either the Government or their subordinate officials with reference to what took place in Skye, because the facts were not before the House in an official and authentic shape. What he contended was that the supporters of the Amendment had established abundant and ample working ground for inquiry. What were these grounds? They had the testimony of three experts—three newspaper correspondents. One of them was the correspondent of *The Scotsman*, who had special facilities for knowing one side of the case, because he accompanied Sheriff Ivory in the war-ship, and he therefore possessed knowledge of what was going to take place sooner than any of the others, in consequence of the continuous private communications he received from Sheriff Ivory. They might, therefore, look to *The Scotsman* correspondent's account as being a report from the official standpoint of what took place. Another reporter who described what he saw was that of *The Glasgow Herald*. Now, *The Glasgow Herald* had been distinguished in its leading columns by strong opposition to the views of the crofters, and of measures which the crofters considered would be beneficial to them. *The Glasgow Herald* had been an anti-crofter paper, so that *The Scotsman* and *The Herald* might be relied upon as not putting the case too favourably for the crofters. There was only one paper which in its leading articles took the side of the crofters—*The North British Daily Mail*. He had examined the different accounts of the transactions described by these correspondents. There were some minute points of difference; but as regarded the main facts there was no difference whatever. They practically agreed in describing what they saw. In these circumstances, as regarded the facts, they had abundant proof to justify them in asking that an official inquiry should take place. That was the case which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) had to answer, and which had not been answered by the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate. The first point was—how were the Government to justify the sending of a naval expedition to Skye? It was sent either for the recovery of rates or of rents. He would first deal with the necessity for the expedition so far as recovery of rates was concerned. He (Mr. Hunter) would admit that if the Government had been able to establish a case of that kind it would have justified their action in sending troops to Skye. If they had shown that in consequence of a combination—or what lawyers called a conspiracy—not to pay rates, the local government of Skye was thrown out of gear, schools stopped, and paupers unable to procure maintenance; if they had shown that it was necessary to take legal proceedings to recover the rates, and that these legal proceedings could not be attempted without the presence of a large military force, then the Government would have established circumstances to justify them in sending the military expedition to Skye. But, so far from that being the case, the very contrary could be proved. He would push the matter further, and ask, Who owed the rates, and why were they not paid? Eight-ninths of the arrears of rates in Skye last March were owing by landlords and large farmers, who were practically in the same boat with them. Out of £5,200 arrears, less than £600 was the amount due by crofters. These figures appeared in a Return made to Parliament by the late Government. The late Government had no difficulty in distinguishing between the amount of rates due by the crofters—that was, by tenants under £30, and tenants over £30 — but the present Government would give them to understand that that information could either not be procured at all, or only with extraordinary difficulty. [Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear!] But that information was published in March last, and the important point was that the arrears of the crofters could not materially have increased between March of last year and October, when the expedition was sent. Was it necessary to take legal proceedings as regarded the sums due by landlords and large farmers? He did not believe it was; but, if it had been, it was not necessary, so far as those eight-ninths of the rates was concerned, to send a naval expedition to serve writs on Mr. Macdonald and Colonel Fraser. Therefore, so far as regarded £4,600 out of the £5,200 due, it could all have been recovered without sending a single soldier or even a single policeman to Skye. As to the remaining £600, was there any proof in the possession of the Government that the crofters had determined not to pay their rates, and had entered into a conspiracy not to pay them, and would resist the officers of the law in carrying out legal proceedings? In order to establish their case, the Government must prove that, for if the contrary were proved the whole case for the Government, so far as rates were concerned, absolutely broke down, and the sending of the naval expedition remained without a shadow or shred of justification or excuse. What were the facts as to the willingness of the crofters to pay rates? He would mention what could be proved beyond doubt if a Committee of Inquiry was held. They could prove that the whole and sole cause of the non-payment of rates was the misconduct of the Parochial Authorities and of the persons they employed to collect the rates. They could prove that; as regarded the proceedings taken to recover rates, nothing more scandalous in the administration of parochial business had ever occurred in Scotland. Some of these legal proceedings were taken against men who had been dead for years, which proved that for four years the collector had never called in the townships where those ratepayers had lived, or he would have known that they had passed beyond the reach of the Parochial Authorities. In numerous other cases those legal proceedings were taken against persons who had actually paid their rates, and in many instances the proceedings were stopped by the production on the part of the ratepayers of the receipts. Many were sued from whom the rates had never been demanded. There were persons against whom proceedings were taken who had counter-claims against the Parochial Board for exceeding the amount of the rates. There were paupers on the poor roll who were sued, and there were numerous cases in which the proceedings were of the most harsh, cruel, and oppressive character, inasmuch as they were proceedings taken against persons who were absolutely in a state of extreme destitution and poverty, in order to extract from them rates which no Parochial Board, in the proper exercise of its duty, should have demanded. These cases were not rare or exceptional, but were most numerous. He thought that effectually disposed of the Government's contention that it was necessary to send a military expedition in order to recover rates. Now, how did it stand with regard to arrears of rent? Last year an Act was passed for the benefit of the crofters. One of its provisions—a provision which was inserted in the Bill as it was going through the House—gave power to the Crofter Commissioners to reduce arrears of rents, and if the tenants paid those reduced arrears they were not to be liable to eviction from their farms. But there had been a delay, which had not yet been explained by the Government, in the application of the Crofters' Act to Skye; and although the Government, in hot haste, sent down a naval expedition to Skye on the 5th of October, it was not till the 21st of October that any information reached the authorities in Skye that the Crofters' Act had been applied to that Island. Now, he ventured to say that if it were true, and if that were the defence of the Government, that the expedition was sent, not to collect arrears of rates, but of rents, anything more scandalous on the part of a Government had rarely taken place—because the object of such proceedings was to defeat the intention and the operation of the Crofters' Act. The intention of Parliament, expressed in terms that were perfectly well known to all the authorities in Scotland, was that, inasmuch as there was some reason to believe that in many cases—or, at all events, in some cases—the rents at present paid by the crofters were extortionate, it was not fair that they should be debarred from the benefits of the Crofters' Act if they failed to pay the whole of the arrears of rent which, by the decision of the Commissioners, were found to be excessive. Therefore, where the Commissioners thought it necessary to do so, they had the power to reduce the rents; but if the Government sent soldiers to Skye with a view to intimidate, to terrorize, and to extort from the inhabitants sums which that very Act of Parliament had virtually declared to be illegal, then he ventured to say that anything more monstrous in the shape of abuse of Executive authority had seldom been brought before the House. Let not the Government take to themselves the consolation that they had got the letter of the law in their favour. The spirit of the Act of Parliament was clear and beyond dispute; and if they had violated the spirit of the Act, and endeavoured to put pressure on the tenants at the last moment, then let them stand to the judgment of the country. He was quite aware that the Court of Session had driven a coach and six through the Crofters' Act, and had found a loophole in that Act, and that it appeared to be the correct construction of that Act that, though the crofters paid reduced rents, they could not be evicted, but that they could be made bankrupt if they did not pay the whole of the rents, and having been made bankrupt they might be evicted. So the result was that, according to the decision of the Court of Session, the Crofters' Act of last year—in so far as it dealt with arrears of rent—was a piece of self-stultification. What was the state of matters with respect to the spirit of lawlessness of which they were told so much? The expedition arrived on the 5th of October, and, although they were hard at work day after day, there was not—except on the 25th and 26th of October—the slightest act done that could be construed into a resistance of the law. There was not a single finger raised, nor an angry voice heard through the whole of Skye, with the exception of these two days. What happened in these two days? In the course of the first fortnight of the operations of the expedition all the writs for the collection of rates had practically been served, but proceedings continued to be taken for the collection of rents. At Herbusta and two other places there was a certain amount of disturbance of the peace on the 25th of October. That disturbance, so far as he could make out, originated in a very natural rumour—considering the conduct of the Government—that the military were coming to evict the tenants from their homes, so that they might not get the benefit of the Crofters' Act. That rumour naturally would excite considerable indignation. The gatherings in question in no case exceeded 30 people. They were of the most trumpery character. No assault was committed—not a hair of any man's head was injured. [Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD: Oh, oh!] Well, the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate prosecuted the men in Edinburgh, and they were expressly found not to be guilty of any assault. There was no violence, no outrage, no assault. There did exist, however, resistance and obstruction of the Sheriff Officer in serving writs—a most regrettable and most deplorable event, for this reason—that the crofters, without doing any violence—indeed, without advancing their cause in the least—played into the hands of their enemies; because, without knowing and intending it, they were found to have technically stepped across that narrow and almost invisible line which separated legal guilt from legal innocence. He (Mr. Hunter) said unhesitatingly that there was no intention on the part of the crofters to resist the law. There was, however, an intention on the part of the crofters to offer resistance within the law. He used the expression "within the law," because they had been familiar lately with an analogous case — namely, of pressure within the law and pressure without the law. What was pressure within the law and what was pressure without the law was, no doubt, matter of opinion. These crofters committed the mistake which, according to Chief Baron Palles, was committed by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). Intending to keep within the limits of the law, they did that which, according to the technical rules of Scottish law, amounted to a technical deforcement. This was but ignorance of the law; and, as they knew, ignorance of the law excused no man. He could not share the raptures with which the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate spoke of the law of Scotland, especially upon this question, because he had endeavoured to study the definition of deforcement by Lord Mure and Lord Young, and he was totally unable to reconcile the definition of Lord Mure with that of Lord Young; and, what was more, he was totally unable to understand either definition. He had succeeded once in his lifetime in acquiring a certain mastery of Scottish metaphysics; but he was bound to say that the Scottish law, as applied to the crofters, was more difficult to understand than Scottish metaphysics. What occurred was a temporary ebullition of temper under circumstances of unusual excitement, and the most was made of it by the authorities, because, if they had not got hold of this slight crutch to lean upon, the whole expedition would have been absolutely ridiculous. It was the only thing that would stand between them and the contempt of the country. This trumpery incident was magnified into a sort of State offence, and developed, in the ingenious hands of the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate, into constructive treason. Sheriff Ivory having, as he thought, caught the crofters in an illegal act, was determined to make the most of it. He followed it up by wholesale arrests, and not only so, but arrests of a questionable, if not of an illegal, character took place. There was the case of Beeton, the cowherd, who was arrested without a warrant, on the more or less erroneous statement of a police officer, and was liberated after being in prison four days, there being no evidence against him; he was discharged without compensation. Two boys were arrested by policemen on their own authority, though they had not been caught doing anything wrong. Then there was the cruel case of Mrs. Macrae. Anything more cruel he never heard of. A woman suffering from lameness and disease, with a child at her breast, was compelled to walk through the mud and mire for many weary miles in that desolate part of the country. She was kept in prison, and was subjected to all the expense and anxiety attending a trial; and when the Lord Advocate got her at Edinburgh for trial, he did not venture to give any evidence against her, or bring any charge. It might be that that was to the credit of the Lord Advocate. Very likely it was; but if it was to the credit of the Lord Advocate, how much was it to the discredit of those officials who acted under him and who brought her there? Then there were the cases of the Rev. D. M'Callum and Mr. John M'Pherson, who were accused of an offence of a character which he would have been unable to understand if he had not heard the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate's doctrine of constructive responsibility announced last night. Upon a mere newspaper statement, which turned out to be utterly untrue, a minister of the gospel, a minister of the State Church, was arrested on a Saturday night and kept in prison until Monday, when he was discharged on bail, and never brought to trial; and they had declarations from the Crown authorities themselves that two months after that arrest they had no evidence upon which to proceed. In Scotland it was the usual course not to arrest men for trumpery offences who could easily be found, but to serve them with a summons. Why was the course not followed in this case? The complaint in this case was that a most unusual—although, perhaps, a technically justifiable—proceeding was followed. Could it be pretended that a minister of the gospel and a man like Mr. John M'Pherson could not be found when they were wanted? He would tell the right hon. Gentleman why this unusual course was followed. It was that in order—whether they were guilty or not—they should, at all events, have some punishment in the shape of imprisonment, and the punishment was inflicted upon them because they had been guilty, in the eyes of Sheriff Ivory, of the abominable crime of vindicating the crofters. Anything more scandalous in the administration of justice could scarcely be conceived. The right hon. and learned Lord Advocate said these laws had existed for a long time, and there had been no complaint. But why had there been no complaint? It was because the right hon. Gentleman would not have tried to do in Edinburgh, or Aberdeen, or in the South of Scotland, what his officials had done in the Highlands. He would remind hon. Members of the gross illegality which the hon. Member for Montrose (Mr. Shiress Will) had pointed out last night, of searches made in the dead of night for a number of crofters upon a purely technical offence. It seemed that the authorities in Skye, not content with arresting persons who were accused of crimes, also arrested witnesses; and there was a case where the operation of arrest had been brought into play against two persons who were guilty of no other offence than that they were suspected of knowing something about some accusation which had been made against somebody else. Two policemen had been sent from Portree to arrest two men named M'Leod and M'Caskie, and drag them from their work in order that they might be examined, and they had received no compensation for the loss to which they had been subjected. Another man, Norman M'Lean, had been arrested and put into prison for refusing to admit a police constable to a meeting which he had convened. He (Mr. Hunter) took it that any person who held a meeting had a perfect right to choose his own company, and, at all events, that the remedy for the police constable would be a civil action. But in this case a respectable man was arrested on the trumpery charge of keeping the policeman out of the meeting, and put into prison. He would tell the House something about these prisons. In Scotland there was a vestige of the old Roman law and of the old French law, which was called by the name of the *oubliette*—and well might it be so called—because when a person was arrested he was shut up from all communication with the outside world. He was not allowed to send any message until such time as the authorities thought fit to subject him to examination. He congratulated the Government upon having, at last, taken steps to mitigate that great evil, because at present there was no power on the part of the Government, even if they felt disposed, to allow such communication. There was now lying on the Table of the House an Amendment of the Rules of the Prison Commissioners, which would in future authorize the authorities in cases where they thought fit—though in those cases only—to allow communication with the prisoners from the time of the arrest. The House, therefore, would understand what was meant in Scotland by this violent process of arrest, instead of the ordinary and usual summons. The right hon. and learned Lord Advocate threw great contempt upon the newspapers, and the information they contained; but it was a fact that in all these proceedings the officials in Skye had no authority to go upon, and no evidence of any kind except what appeared in the newspapers. It appeared in the newspapers that a Mr. Nicholson, who had some controversy with Sheriff Ivory last year—and it was an unfortunate circumstance that, upon a question of fact, four witnesses had sworn to a state of facts diametrically opposed to that which was affirmed by Sheriff Ivory—it was alleged that Mr. Nicholson had called Sheriff Ivory a liar. That was a Saxon expression, but it was not very polite. Proceedings were taken against him. Was a summons issued calling upon Nicholson to show cause why he should answer this charge? Nothing of the sort. He was arrested, and put into the *oubliette*, which gave him time for reflection; gave him, in short, a taste of those blessings of Scotch law of which the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate was so proud. Another gentleman—a Mr. Mackay—had written a letter to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland. That letter had been published in some Scotch paper. Although there was no evidence to show by whom it was published, the author of the letter was assumed instantly to be the publisher, and he had called Sheriff Ivory a "judicial monster." Now, that language was not polite. Sheriff Ivory himself, however, was in the habit of using very strong language; and although it was highly improper that crofters should reciprocate in a similar inelegant epistolary style in which he indulged, yet it was not inexplicable that they should do so. Mackay was not summoned—he was arrested, and another gross abuse of the forms of the law was perpetrated. If upon inquiry it was ascertained that these were the facts, it was impossible to pass too strong a condemnation either upon the officials who were guilty of them or upon the higher authorities who sanctioned them. He (Mr. Hunter) had stated that there was no foundation whatever for that which was the basis of the whole case of the Government—the allegation that there was a spirit of lawlessness and resistance to the payment of rates among the crofters. He might quote a great many witnesses on that point; but he would content himself with one. He would content himself with the words of the bitterest enemy of the crofters in Scotland—he meant *The Scotsman* newspaper. What did the editor of that paper say with reference to this part of the case? In a leading article on the 12th of October, he said—

> "In the first place, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the accumulation of the large arrears of poor rates which in some parishes have left the Parochial Boards literally without the power of discharging their legal duties is, in very great measure, the fault of the Local Authorities themselves. In no case has there been displayed a disposition on the part of the people to refuse payment of the rates, or even to complain of inequality or oppressiveness of their incidence. But in many instances they have been able to produce receipts for a considerable proportion of the amount now sought to be recovered; in others they have alleged, apparently with truth, that no application for payment has ever been made; while several asserted that they had paid the rates to the factor, but that the amount had been appropriated by him to the rent account. In one instance a writ for two years' rates was served on a person who on investigation was found to be a pauper, the rent of his holding being paid for him by the Parochial Board. Facts like these show clearly that the administration of the Poor Law in Skye has been characterized by a degree of laxity and downright negligence that is alone sufficient to account for the present unsatisfactory condition of affairs."

When he could quote such testimony from the bitterest enemy of the crofters—the man who most habitually and most persistently reviled the crofters—and when that was his summary of the facts—he (Mr. Hunter) thought he had made out as strong a case for an inquiry as had ever been presented to the House of Commons. In one case a woman who was applied to could not pay the rate. Her husband was away from home searching for work, and he was totally unable to pay the rate; but still the woman was pressed for payment. There was a similar case, of a woman whose husband died two years ago, and who was reduced almost to poverty, and she pleaded that she could not pay the money. The whole story of Skye was full of such cases. Mr. Duncan Macrae, one of the most extensive merchants in the island, stated that about four years ago he discovered that many of his customers were falling behind in their payments; but he would not ask the assistance of the police or Marines in assisting him to collect his debts. In one parish some of the crofters did not produce corn sufficient for seed, and those who were not able to do so had to live on potatoes. It was impossible to read the description of that island, and the frightful state of poverty in which the people were, without perceiving the truth of the remark that in many of these cases the officers of the law, instead of going in full military array to collect rates, would have been far better employed if they had distributed the cost of the expedition among the people in the shape of charity. The real object of the expedition was to extort arrears in defiance of the spirit of the Crofters' Act, and to compel the tenants to pay these excessive and exorbitant sums which would be declared in due time by the Crofters' Commission to be unfair. While the payment of rates was the excuse, the collection of rents was the real object of the expedition. One of the Parochial Boards in Skye had passed a resolution that they would not allow any writs for rates to be served along with writs for arrears of rent. What did the Government do? The Government threatened that unless they consented that the writs for rates should be served at one and the same time with the writs for rent the Government would refuse to give the Parochial Board any assistance whatever in the collection of rates. He (Mr. Hunter) would give hon. Members one or two illustrations of the class of persons from whom these rates were to be collected. One of these cases was that of an old pensioner named

Nicholson, who had served Her Majesty in several notable campaigns, and who had arrived at an advanced age. He was one of those who were marked down for prosecution in this campaign for rents. His arrears amounted to £8. If ever there was a case in which a landlord should have shown some indulgence surely it was the case of an old hero of so many battles. But extreme proceedings were taken against the man, and ultimately, when his goods had been seized and were on the point of being sold, some people in the neighbourhood came forward and contributed out of their own pockets the £8 which was demanded by the landlord. Yet *The Scotsman* quoted the case as a proof that the inability to pay rents was a hollow pretence, and that it was only necessary to apply extreme torture in order to extract the full rents. The editor of *The Highlander* and one or two gentlemen, ashamed of their country—and ashamed that men should be subjected to such harsh proceedings—contributed out of their own pockets the £8 which the landlord had the meanness to take. This war was still going on. On the 15th of January there was a batch of writs for arrears of rent served—30 altogether—and 14 of these were against widows, most of whom were struggling to bring up their families under very difficult circumstances. He (Mr. Hunter) would say a word about Sheriff Ivory. Perhaps the House would understand why it was that the people in Skye were not so profoundly impressed with the dignity of the Sheriff as the Sheriff was himself. The reason was that the Sheriff did not always behave in a very dignified manner. In one case Sheriff Ivory ordered a policeman to go to the house of a widow as fast as possible, and because the policeman was not able to go fast enough the Sheriff shouted after him to take off his coat and run. He (Mr. Hunter) condemned the double capacity in which Sheriff Ivory was employed—as an Executive officer and as a Judge. The right hon. and learned Lord Advocate informed the House that this union of judicial and police functions was one that had never been complained of; but the Lord Advocate himself forgot that he himself had mentioned a fact which conclusively proved that the system was intolerable to the people of Skye. The right hon. and learned Gentleman said they could not try these cases in Skye.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. J. H. A. MACDONALD) (Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities): I never said so. What I said was that, owing to the state of feeling in that part of the country, we should have been reproached by our hon. Friends opposite if we had tried them by Sheriff Ivory.

MR. HUNTER: Yes; you would have been reproached by the whole country, and deservedly so. The fact that Sheriff Ivory had been employed as a policeman in ferreting out and conducting operations against the crofters was a fact which, in the opinion of the country, disqualified him from acting as a Judge. What was that but to condemn the utterly monstrous and anomalous system of employing the same man as a Judge in the Court and as a policeman to bring them to trial? The best proof of the poverty of the people was in the nature of the articles upon which distraint was executed. What were those articles? In numerous cases those articles consisted of the bed and bedding of the crofters, as nothing else could be found. In one case, four or five hens were the sole property that could be seized; and not only that, but one of the commonest objects on which the distraint was executed was the stack of peats. The effect of this was to make it a criminal offence for a crofter to go to his peat stack, and have a fire to keep him warm in the depth of winter. Happily, the law of England did not know what the Sheriff Officer was; but he was a mighty personage in Scotland. The smallest proceeding in a civil suit in Scotland could not be taken without invoking the aid of this august person. It was one of the relics of the Roman law which were embedded in the Scotch law. It appeared that the Sheriff Officer was in some mysterious way clothed with the majesty of the law, and that to show any disrespect to a Sheriff Officer was a high and mighty offence. Unfortunately, the instrument whom the law was compelled to employ was not always worthy of that high vocation. Macdonald, who was principally engaged in these proceedings in Skye, was a gentleman who, entirely of his own spontaneity—when he was sent to execute an eviction—was not content with evicting a tenant, but proceeded, without the authority of the landlord, to burn down the house. He was not aware that any criminal proceedings had been taken against Macdonald; but the landlords had raised a civil action for £70 damages against him. It was the favourite amusement of Macdonald on going through Skye, to threaten the people that he would burn down their houses. On several occasions the reporters witnessed assaults which he committed on perfectly inoffensive people, and Macdonald was the very worst person whom the Government could have selected for the duty. Inverness was the county where the offence, if any, had been committed. Inverness was a Highland county—a Gaelic-speaking county. In Inverness there would have been a perfectly fair trial. No one could charge the people of Inverness with excessive partiality to the crofters, seeing that the Burghs returned his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Inverness (Mr. Finlay) to Parliament. The cost to the crofters out on bail would have been comparatively small, and the cost of bringing witnesses would have been comparatively small. What was the reason for trying them in Edinburgh? It put the poor crofters to an expense of £30, apart altogether from counsel. It was therefore oppressive to the crofters. Another reason was that in order to make a mountain out of a molehill, and to impress the country with the idea that there was a revolution in the Highlands, the authorities made a sort of State trial of the charges in Edinburgh; and the reason why the trial was taken to Edinburgh was that Edinburgh was the one place in Scotland where the atmosphere was polluted and poisoned with slanders against the crofters. There was only one morning newspaper published in Edinburgh at the time, and he could cull from the leading articles of that newspaper—day after day and week after week—a paper circulating entirely amongst the class of persons from whom juries were drawn—statements of the most violent character, assuming the guilt of all the prisoners, and accusing them not only of every criminal offence, but of moral delinquencies. Those extracts were of such a character that he felt certain in England they would have afforded good ground for an application to remove the trial from Edinburgh on the ground that a fair trial could not be held, for the conduct and character of the newspaper. And, now, he came to the sentences,—he was not going to criticize the sentences passed upon the crofters, except to say that the people of the country could not fail to compare, nor overlook the fact, that the sentences that were passed on the Scotch crofters were as severe as the sentences passed on the Belfast Orangemen—four months and six months in both cases. But in the case of the crofters, a mere technical violation of the law; and in the case of the Orangemen, a state almost of insurrection. But there was one substantial difference between the two cases. In Belfast, the Orangemen were the tools and the dupes of the Irish landlords. In Skye the crofters were the victims of the Scottish landlords. The right hon. and learned Lord Advocate had accomplished that which at one time he (Mr. Hunter) should have thought would have been beyond the power of any Lord Advocate—he had succeeded in bringing the administration of the law in Scotland into contempt. There was no people more law-abiding than the Scottish people, or who had a greater loathing of the taint of imprisonment, but such had been the administration of the law, that when some of the crofters were released from prison they were met with pipers and bands, and received the ovation of a whole neighbourhood. And why was that? Because the whole population of Scotland looked with disgust and with indignation upon the manner in which this law was carried out; and the cruel severity of the sentences imposed. That was an unfortunate feeling to engender. It would probably spread from the North to the South; and it was a feeling which had been wantonly excited and provoked, without the slightest justification, by right hon. Gentlemen opposite. He (Mr. Hunter) had hoped that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham (Mr. Joseph Chamberlain) would have taken part in this debate. He had seen statements in the newspapers that the right hon. Gentleman was interesting himself in the crofters, and that he was to make—at the ensuing Easter—one of those political pilgrimages out of which he expected to derive considerable profit. He (Mr. Hunter) regretted that in an hour when the right hon. Gentleman's services might have been extremely useful, and on a question of the highest importance to the crofters, the right hon. Gentleman did not see fit even to countenance the House by his presence. He warned the Government, however, that if they did not grant this inquiry, hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House had no alternative but to assume that the charges made were true. If the statements were inaccurate, exaggerated or distorted, then the Government ought to welcome an inquiry. If the Government refused the inquiry, then they would know what to think, and he ventured to anticipate that even the small number of hon. Members the present Conservative Government was now able to return for Scotland would be very substantially diminished at the next Election.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY (Forfarshire) said, he regretted that the time of the House had been so long occupied with this debate—for two reasons. Firstly, because of the delay to the Business of the country ; and, secondly, because it was an unpleasing duty for Scottish Members to come to this House and complain of mal-administration of the law in Scotland. But he wished to call attention to where the responsibility lay. Hon Members from Scotland had on many previous occasions called attention to the maladministration of justice in the North West of Scotland, and there had been no redress. In particular, he himself had called attention to the anomalous position of Procurators-Fiscal in that part of the country. These Procurators-Fiscal were also the public prosecutors, and in the Island of Skye and in the West Islands generally the same individual was factor or land agent for the proprietors. It was alleged—and he thought there were good grounds for the allegation—that they used their official position to act oppressively towards the tenants, and to bring them more effectually under the control of the landlords. When hon. Members called attention to this point they had received the usual official reply that either there was no ground for the complaint, or, that if there was, it was impossible to find a remedy. Only the other day he had asked the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) whether he had taken any steps to remedy the state of matters in two such instances in Skye? He understood from the right hon. and learned Gentlemen the late Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour) that negotiations had been entered into with the Procurators-Fiscal for the purpose of getting them either to surrender their offices or their private practice. But no progress seemed yet to have been made towards the accomplishment of this design. In face of the fact that up till this time no steps had been taken to remedy or meet the complaints of Scottish Members, respecting administration of justice, they had no alternative except to bring the matter before this House in the most complete manner possible. This seemed the fitting opportunity, for the Address gave—and was intended to give—to Parliament an opportunity of discussing the action of the Government during the Recess. The right hon. and learned Lord Advocate attempted some reply last evening, but that reply did not deal with the charges which had been made in support of the Amendment, and for the benefit of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour), he, (Mr. Barclay) would point out the charges they made against the Executive officials and authorities in Skye that he might give what explanation of them he could. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman might yet see fit—if not on this Amendment, then in some other way—to grant an inquiry, which the right hon. Gentleman ought to give in his own interest as well as in the interest of the people of Skye. The charge divided itself into two heads—the first was that the landlords in Skye had entered into a conspiracy to defeat the beneficent intentions of Parliament when they passed the Crofters' Act, and, further, that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland and other legal officials of the Crown were a part of that conspiracy. He did not wish to be misunderstood. He had for the right hon. Gentleman the highest personal respect, and he would state deliberately and frankly that he did not believe in the least that the right hon. Gentleman was knowingly a party to the conspiracy. The right hon. Gentleman was deceived, he believed, by the officials in whom he thought he had a right to trust; and he believed the "King of Skye" had proved himself too astute both for the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland and for the Government officials. What were the facts? There had been a previous military expedition to Skye, which did not do much good, but it had indirectly a highly beneficial influence on the crofters, for it apparently satisfied the then Liberal Government that it was necessary for Parliament to interfere to protect the crofters from the rapacity of the landlords. That was the only inference which could be drawn from the fact that the Liberal Government brought forward their Bill and carried it through the House of Commons with the approval of the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The object of the Act was to give the crofters security of tenure in Skye, and to provide that they should only be called upon to pay fair rents. There was another provision in the Bill with respect to arrears of rent. When the Bill was passing through the House it was evident, from what was known to be the condition of the crofters in Skye, that if the Act were passed, however beneficent its terms might be, it would do little good to the crofters in Skye so long as a great burden of arrears was hanging over them, and the Act authorized the Commissioners to deal with arrears. The object of the conspiracy of which he spoke could be inferred from what took place. The landlords of Skye were determined as far as possible to defeat the beneficent intentions of Parliament, and they endeavoured to exact all they possibly could of the arrears before the Crofters' Act came into force. The Act came into force as soon as it passed this House, but unfortunately it was one of those pieces of patchwork legislation which had resulted when on previous occasions the House had attempted to deal with land. The Act was not made applicable to any part of Scotland until the Commissioners appointed under the Act should so declare; but the approval of the Secretary of State for Scotland was also required before the Act took effect. Unfortunately, the Commissioners began with the mainland, where the case, in his opinion, was not so urgent as in the islands, but they did send a Report to the Secretary for Scotland, bringing Skye under the Act. For some reason, however, a period elapsed of three weeks between the time this Report was despatched by the Commissioners and the time when it received the sanction of the Secretary for Scotland, and to that point he would respectfully direct the attention of the right hon. Gentleman because a great deal depended on those three weeks. During that time the landlords were not idle. They raised many actions in the Sheriff Courts against the crofters for arrears. Of course the Act of Parliament did not from the date of its passing suspend the action of the Sheriff Courts from the collection of arrears, and not until the Act actually came into operation by the fiat of the Scotch Secretary were the Commissioners able to take any cognizance of arrears. In the meantime the landlords were urging upon the Government to send an armed force to Skye to maintain law and order on the island. What were the grounds of this application? It was represented that it was impossible to collect the poor rates, the education rates, and other rates necessary for the maintenance of the framework of society. What truth was there in this allegation? On the 14th of March last, a return was presented to the House showing the amount of arrears due by the landlords and the larger farmers, and also by the crofters. The right hon. Gentleman had recently stated that it would be extremely difficult to obtain information as to the amount of the arrears of rates due by the crofters, but there were only seven parishes in Skye, and the Board of Supervision had only to request information from the Parochial Boards as to the amount of arrears which had been paid since the return made up in March last. That would not have been a matter of much difficulty, while everybody would allow that in the discussion of this question it was of material consequence to know who were responsible for the arrears. There could have been no great difficulty in supplementing that information. At the 14th of March the arrears of rates in Skye amounted to £5,200. The total amount of rates payable by the landlords was £4,652, and their arrears on that sum amounted to £3,605. The landlords had paid only £1,047, or less than one-fourth. The larger tenants were responsible for £2,526, and they were £1,004 in arrear, having paid rather more than one-half. The total amount for which the crofters were responsible was £1,123, and of that they had paid £532, or nearly one-half. Surely the Government would not plead that it was necessary to send a military expedition to serve writs upon the landlords and larger tenants. If such were the facts the case of the Government for the sending of this expedition had entirely broken down. The object was to defeat the intention of Parliament by collecting arrears from the tenants which the Land Commission might not consider to be justly due. That was the first part of the case to which they invited a reply from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland. The next part was the accusation—not made now for the first time—of the mal-administration of justice in Skye and the Western Highlands generally. It must be recollected that the whole administration of justice in Skye was practically in the hands of those who sympathized with the landlords. The charge against the administration of justice did not rest on one or two isolated cases. The whole system—the whole manner in which the law had been administered—was what was complained of; and numerous facts and cases had been brought before the House. They said that these cases showed that the administration of justice was partial in Skye. Take, for instance, the manner in which Lord Macdonald had been treated, compared with the crofters. It was considered that it would be a great scandal if Lord Macdonald's furniture should be seized in payment of his debts; but it was not thought any scandal by the authorities in Skye—and no compunction was manifested—at the poinding of the peat stack or the bedding of the poor crofter. They had heard how oppressively the system of poinding had been carried out; and he must say he did not envy the feelings of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland, or of the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate, when listening to the details which had been communicated to the House by his hon. Friend the Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron). They must recollect that they themselves were responsible for what took place. They were responsible for sending the expedition to Skye; and they were responsible for the manner in which their officials had carried out their most disagreeable duties. Scottish Members had pointed out that the carrying out of the law had been oppressive, and in several cases, there was great reason to believe, had been illegal—that Sheriff Ivory had caused the arrest of people without warrants; that he had carried out the law in the most extreme manner; that he had adopted processes which would be only justifiable in the worst cases; that he had imprisoned many individuals without bringing them to trial; and that they had been dismissed without any compensation. Cases had been brought forward which gave them great reason to believe that Sheriff Ivory had acted vindictively in the discharge of his duty. He had had differences with some people in Skye—men of position, highly responsible individuals in Skye—and some of these individuals had been the men whom he had arrested and cast into prison. These cases, he submitted, constituted *primâ facie* evidence to justify them in demanding an inquiry. That was all they demanded on the present occasion. If this inquiry were refused there would remain for them the Constitutional duty of endeavouring to withhold supplies to enable such a system to be carried on, and he gave the Scottish Secretary due notice, if they did not get satisfaction upon this discussion, that there were still opportunities open to them; and they should consider it their duty to avail themselves of all the opportunities which presented themselves until they were satisfied that they had obtained justice for the people of Skye. There was another grave charge of illegality on the part of Sheriff Ivory, and that was with respect to telegrams. It appeared from a statement made by the Sheriff himself that he made application to the Home Secretary for the possession of certain telegrams, which was refused, but he obtained possession of them by other means, which could not have been otherwise than illegal. None of the legal formalities necessary for their production were complied with, and they had it on the evidence of responsible people in Skye that Sheriff Ivory attempted to coerce the Postmaster into disclosing the contents of telegrams. All that had been brought before the House already, but no step had been taken by the Government in the matter. He appealed to the House and to the country whether the Scottish Members were not justified in doing all in their power to bring these matters forward, and to obtain the verdict of the House on the allegations made. He thought this discussion could not fail to produce much good. Hitherto the representatives of the Crown in Skye considered themselves to be wholly irresponsible. Only under such an idea could they have entered on the proceedings they had taken. Now, he thought they would find they were not irresponsible, and that the people in Skye would find in the House of Commons a Court of Appeal in which their case would be brought forward until they obtained redress. The crofters were suffering. A good many of them had been sent to prison, but he did not think that would be without a beneficial effect in Scotland. The fruits of the imprisonment of the Skye crofters, in connection with the first expedition, had been the Crofters' Act, and he ventured to say that the fruits to be derived from the imprisonment of crofters, in connection with the last expedition, would be that the men of Skye would get a fair and impartial administration of justice in the future. He should think it would be one of the great objects of ambition of the right hon. Gentleman the present Secretary for Scotland, that he should inaugurate a system which would be no less beneficial to the crofters than it would be to all who had any interest in those islands.

MR. CALDWELL (Glasgow, St. Rollox) as the Representative of one of the Divisions of Glasgow where a considerable amount of sympathy existed on behalf of the crofters, felt constrained to take some part in the debate. The Amendment before the House had nothing whatever to do with the relations between the crofters and their landlords, or with the rights of the crofters to the possession of land. The Amendment simply related to the administration of the law under two heads—as regarded the events which took place in Tiree and Skye, and the general administration of justice in the Highlands. Generally, as regarded the events in Skye, the question turned upon the purpose for which the Naval and Military Forces were sent to Tiree. It was maintained by the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) that these Forces were sent for the purpose of recovering parochial rates. If that was so, then a case for inquiry had been made out; not only a complete case for inquiry, but a case which would prove that the expedition was not warranted in the circumstances; or in any case, if warranted in the circumstances, that the greatest defaulters were not the crofters, but the landlords. Taking the statistics given by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate himself, that £1,700 of the rates was due from the landlords, and £1,300 of the rates from the tenants, they showed that the landlords were in greater arrears than the crofters; the parochial rate in Scotland being payable half by the landlord and half by the tenant. Going a little further, they found that a number of these rates which were debited to the tenants were evidently rates which had been for several years in arrear; and there were also rates due by parties on the Parochial Board who could not be expected to pay them. It seemed to him, however, that that was not the real point of contention in this case. A very considerable amount of mal-administration had, no doubt, been proved on the part of the Parochial Board authorities. It was no part of the landlords' right to refuse payment of the rates, merely because they did not happen to get payment of the rents, because the rates were not, like the Property Tax, levied upon, but were a burden upon land; and whether the property were let or not, the landlords were still liable, according to the law of Scotland, for the poor rates. Therefore, the action of the landed proprietors in refusing to pay rates upon the ground that they had not received rents was utterly unjustifiable; and the action of the Parochial Authorities in refusing to execute the law, and declining to use every means in their power to recover those rates from the landlords, was equally unjustifiable. So far, therefore, if the case were to turn upon the question of the military being sent for the purpose of collecting the parochial rates, then he should say distinctly a case had been made out for inquiry. He did not consider, however, that the Naval and Military Forces were sent for the purpose of recovering rates or rents. The matter, so far as he understood it, arose in this way. There had been a petition to the Court of Session, upon which intimation was to be made to certain defenders who had taken possession of some hill in the district without any lawful authority. The officers were engaged in serving this intimation from the Court of Session, and in the course of executing their duty as officers of the Court, they were deforced; and the object of sending a naval and military expedition was for the purpose of apprehending the parties who had committed this criminal offence. That being the case, the question of rates had nothing whatever to do with the question of sending that expedition. The Military Force of the country was a force which ought not to be employed in any way, either by influence or otherwise, in the recovery of rent; but, as was well known, in the law of Scotland the decrees and warrants of any Court must be intimated by Sheriffs. Those Sheriffs' officers, in the case for the Court of Session, were bound, on the application of any individual, or any person holding these decrees or warrants, to execute them. They had no power to refuse compliance; and when they were engaged in the execution of their duty, they were entitled to the utmost protection of the law. The men had nothing whatever to do with what the warrant contained. It was of no consequence to the Executive, or to the Naval and Military Forces, for what purpose the warrant was being executed. They had simply to do with this—that the warrant was the warrant of the highest Court of Scotland, the warrant of the Court of Session, which they were entitled and bound to serve; and it was the duty of the Executive to give them all the necessary protection which the law could give them in so doing. Those who supported the Amendment should clearly understand that the law of Scotland made no difference between the collecting of rents and the collecting of rates. Coming to the proceedings in Skye, he considered that they did not amount to very much after all. So far as the charges against the administration of justice were concerned, one of the cases referred to was the poinding of a baby. That was not a proper or prudent thing to do on the part of any officer; and he did not suppose that any one in the country would at all approve of what was done on that occasion. At the same time, it was not a criminal act on which the Lord Advocate could take proceedings; but, no doubt, it was a case in which some amount of censure would be given to the officer. They had this to remember—that the officer had, at the hands of the crofters themselves, received a good deal of abuse and ill-treatment, physical and otherwise. As to the search of houses without warrant, he was not going into the legal question as to whether the searching of houses, under the circumstances, without warrants, when the Sheriff was upon the spot to give verbal instructions, was or was not illegal. If it was illegal, then the law of Scotland provided a complete and Constitutional remedy. If any officer of the law did an illegal act, he was amenable to the law, and an action might be raised against him in a Civil Court; and he did not see why Parliament should be asked to interfere in a matter for which the ordinary law had provided a suitable remedy. Then, again, they were told that arrests were made without warrant. The same observation applied in this case as in the other. If anything illegal were done the parties who did it were amenable to the Civil Law. They were also told that certain witnesses were arrested for the purpose of getting evidence from them. He apprehended that the reason why these parties were apprehended, in the first place, was because they were accused; and most probably finding that they were not very great criminals, and that they might be useful in giving information, the Authorities made them witnesses. Another matter referred to was the burning down of a house by the officer. An officer, without instructions from the landed proprietor, had no right to burn down any man's house; but, at the same time, he failed to perceive where there was very much grievance on the part of the crofters. If this house was the property of the landlord, and the tenants were not being deprived of possession, and if they were not in lawful possession, the act of the Sheriff's Officer was a matter in question between him and the landlord; and he (Mr. Caldwell) did not see that in the interest of the public generally, the crofters had very much cause for complaint. The House had been told that the landlord had raised a civil action against the officer. That was the proper remedy; and he had no doubt that if the landlord could prove his case he would get substantial redress. He now came to the question of criminal procedure. It was stated in the Amendment that the administration of justice in the Highlands had given great concern; but what was there different in the administration of justice in the Highlands from that which prevailed in any other part of Scotland? The only observation he had heard to warrant that part of the Amendment was the one given by the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. Barclay), where he spoke of the Procurators Fiscal being also agents of the landlords. It was, however, well known that the Government on both sides had been endeavouring, as far as they possibly could whenever vacancies arose, and the circumstances of the district and the remuneration warranted it, to separate the two positions in order to allow of the Procurator Fiscal devoting his whole time to the work of the office. He thought that far too much importance was placed upon the powers of the Procurators Fiscal; because it was well known that in Scotland the Procurator Fiscal, especially in the cases of Tiree and Skye, had, practically, no power in the matter. He simply collected information, and took the depositions of the witnesses; but the whole responsibility of sending to trial rested entirely with the Crown Counsel in Edinburgh, so that after all the charge against the Procurator Fiscal was one which did not interfere with justice in the slightest degree. Then, with regard to the change of venue in the cases of mobbing, rioting, and deforcing the officer, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate stated that his reason for sending the case to Edinburgh was because mobbing and rioting and deforcement of officers was of rare occurrence. He believed there was no instance of a case of the kind having been tried before a Sheriff; and he also stated that there was an opportunity of getting a fairer trial in Edinburgh than in the locality. He thought, however, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate missed the most important and strongest point for taking the case in Edinburgh. It was this—that the warrant had issued from the Court of Session, and, therefore, that it was necessary that the officer, in the execution of the warrant, should have the protection of the Court whose warrant he was engaged in serving. The trial of the cases in Edinburgh possessed this further advantage—that it enabled the judges to pass small sentences. Although the sentences were small, the fact that they were passed by the Court of Justiciary impressed upon the public the heinousness and enormity of the offence which had been committed. The acquittal might have arisen from the circumstance that the witnesses did not in Court bear out the statements they had made in their precognitions; and as to the convictions, no one had stated that they were unjust. Why, then, should an inquiry be granted? As to the charges against Mr. Macpherson and Mr. M'Callum, he had little doubt but that if hon. Members were to read the report of their speeches, it would be seen that the authorities had ample cause for the course they took in apprehending the parties, and that only the difficulties in the way of proving the shorthand notes caused them to come to the conclusion to give the accused the benefit of the doubt and liberate them. It had been suggested that their resistance to the law had got the crofters the Crofters' Act, and he had no doubt but that there existed an idea in the minds of the crofters that if they continued to resist the law they would get still further grievances redressed. It was time that, in kindness to the crofters themselves, the country should make known to them that resistance to the law could be of no possible service in obtaining for them justice, but might lead to their own apprehension. He himself regretted the attempts which were being made in the Highlands to set tenant against landlord, for from whom could the people get employment where the land was insufficient to maintain them, if not from the landlord class? The profit to be made out of these holdings was not sufficient to maintain themselves and their families; and they must, therefore, look to the landlords to give them extra employment. Any antagonism between the landlords and tenants must be to the detriment of the tenants. Reference had been made to the existence of a dynamite party in the Highlands. It was hinted that it had been restrained from action so far, but if a certain amount of inquiry and justice was not granted no one could say what that party might do. He thought it was time enough to speak of the dynamite party when they arose, and ought not to have been introduced into a discussion which sought for justice in a Constitutional way. Hon. Gentlemen, if anything of that kind occurred, would not be altogether exonerated after the hints they had given. But anything in the way of levelling to the ground, by means of dynamite, shooting lodges in the Highlands would not commend the cause of the crofters to the people either of Scotland or England, but would have an exactly opposite result.

Mr. PROVAND (Glasgow, Blackfriars, &c.) said, he did not apologize for rising in the debate, for it could not be said that Scotch questions had occupied the House any length of time for years past. He regarded that as a great Constitutional question. Let him congratulate the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate on the eloquent apology of the hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. Caldwell). He did not intend to comment on the remarks of the hon. Gentleman. He had heard them with very great surprise; and he trusted that, when the hon. Member returned to the St. Rollox Division of Glasgow, he would, at least, make an attempt to convert as many of his constituents as he possibly could to the views which he had just expressed in that House. To wish the hon. Gentleman success would be a superfluity. It did not take much imagination to look forward to the result with which the efforts of the hon. Gentleman would be met in Glasgow to explain the action which had resulted from the recent expedition to the Isle of Skye. There was only one statement which the hon. Gentleman made to which he (Mr. Provand) wished to allude. One of the hon. Member's statements was that agitation, even the disturbances, and movements of a popular character against the carrying out of the law had done no good to the crofters, and would do them no good; but he (Mr. Provand) thought that that was flatly contradicted by experience, for he was sure that, if it had not been for the facts which came out during the agitation after the military expedition of 1884, the Crofters' Act of last year would not now be on the Statute Book. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland would deal fairly with the question of the extent to which the rates were due by the different classes in Skye when the expedition was ordered. On the question of arrears, the Act gave the Commissioners power to take into account the amount of arrears due before the application for a fair rent was finally determined. Some claims for payment of arrears came before Sheriff Hamilton, who decided that, in consequence of the clause in the Crofters' Act, it was not competent for him to deal with those arrears. That judgment was approved of by another Sheriff, yet, after these decisions, Mr. Sheriff Ivory, sitting at Portree, first tried to dispute the matter; and then, after a quibble with the advocate for the tenant in an action for £30 11*s.* 6*d.* of arrears, brought by Colonel Fraser against Alexander Macdonald, observed that it would be a long time before the tenant could get a settlement under the Commission. The defender had made application to the Commissioners to deal with the arrears; and the agent, Mr. Reid, stated that the Commissioners, under the Act, were constituted a Court to deal with those arrears. Sheriff Ivory asked him to what Act he was referring. In his remarks on that occasion, Sheriff Ivory showed, in his opinion, that he was not acting as a Judge, but as an advocate for the landlords. Sheriff Ivory said they were not a Court, but a Commission. That was a quibble, for it was clearly enough stated in the Act that it was the Commission that was to deal with the arrears. The Sheriff said it would be a very serious matter to stop all actions for those arrears for two or three years until the Commission went to Skye. But if the Commission had sat in Skye first, instead of in Sutherlandshire, he (Mr. Provand) believed they would have been saved this Amendment to the Address, and the consequent discussion. Of course, if the landlords could recover their arrears before the Crofters' Commission sat, they would be so much better off; or, if they could make the crofters bankrupt, the latter would be debarred from the benefits of the Crofters' Act. It was one of these two things that the landlords tried to do, and no one would doubt that, in this direction, Sheriff Ivory had favoured the landlords as much as he could. In Sutherlandshire he found that the Commissioners had written off between 50 and 60 per cent of the claims for arrears. Now, he had no exact information; but that which he had received pointed to this — that the Island of Skye was enormously over-rented, as compared with Sutherlandshire. Yet, even in Sutherlandshire the reductions of rent were, in some cases, three-fourths of the whole amount the tenants had hitherto been paying. In one case in Sutherlandshire the Commissioners raised the rent by nearly 25 per cent, but no such result was likely to follow when the Commission arrived at Skye. He had the returns of one estate in Skye, which showed that 30 years ago the rent of the crofts was £981. Since that time there had been taken from that estate several township and hill grazings worth £250, leaving the net value, as at 30 years ago, at £731. Now, the rent of these crofts to-day was £2,213—an increase on that estate of 300 per cent in 30 years. It would, therefore, be seen that the Skye proprietors had, naturally, very strong inducements to attempt to get in something of their arrears before the Commissioners reached that place; because, otherwise, it would be most unlikely that they would recover anything like the amount they claimed. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate last night interlarded his reply with expressions about the wickedness of opposing the law; but if all the laws were right and perfectly proper, then what was the use of having any Parliament at all? Of course, hon. Members opposite did not want any change; but they on that (the Opposition) side had to be taken into account, and they knew no way of bringing about those changes in the law except by showing opposition of some kind to the law being carried out. They were suffering from laws made by landlords, for until the last 40 years the people had no voice in the making of them. He challenged hon. Members opposite to produce any enactment passed more than 40 years ago, the terms of which were not as strongly in favour of the landlords as they could be, and which were not simply dictated by rapacity and selfishness. He saw an hon. Gentleman smiling. He would give him two or three examples. They passed a law to make bread dear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is not confining himself to "Recent events in Skye and Tiree," or to "The general administration of justice in the Highlands."

MR. PROVAND said, he would apologize if he had said a word not strictly in accordance with the Amendment. He would deal with the laws which related to Skye and the Western Highlands. The landlords could no longer come to that House and ask Parliament to pass laws such as were formerly passed. The landlords of the West of Scotland had, however, endeavoured to become a law unto themselves. They had laws of their own, under the name of Estate Laws, which surpassed everything sanctioned by that House in former times, and which it would not tolerate now. The few extracts he would read had reference to the estates of proprietors who were supposed to be more generous than the average. They were as follows—

> "The tenant shall keep no guns nor other firearms on his farm. . . . . . The proprietor or his factor, or others authorized by him, shall be entitled at any time to enter and search the premises of any tenant for guns or firearms; and, on such being found, the tenant shall be held to be the owner, and shall be liable to a penalty of 5*s*. for each gun or firearm, over and above their forfeiture. . . . . . In case any of the tenants themselves or their servants, or others belonging to their family or frequenting their houses, shall be detected in shooting or destroying game, or being an accessory to their destruction, or of the eggs thereof, or in fishing, they shall, on proof of the fact, pay a penalty of £1 for the first offence; and, if the offence be repeated, they shall pay double rent for that year over and above the penalties imposed by law."

That was a private enactment of a proprietor in the West of Scotland.

> "The tenants shall be bound personally to reside on their farms, unless with the written consent of their landlords."

["Hear, hear!" *from the Ministerial Benches.*] It seemed, according to the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite, that landlords were the only persons entitled to be absentees.

> "And, in order to prevent over-crowding, the eldest son, or such other son as the parents may select, shall only be allowed to reside permanently with them; the other sons, after attaining the age of 21, whether married or not, being bound to find accommodation elsewhere, unless with the written consent of the proprietor."

Hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to approve of such an enactment. Let them bring in a Bill in that direction to apply to England, and they would then have the matter discussed. He could conceive nothing more directly aimed against the common weal of the people than such an enactment. They had heard a good deal during the debate about the loyalty of the Highlanders. It was a thing which no man could question. At the same time, it had received a very great shock during the past few years on account of the recent proceedings in Skye. He could assure the House that the people in the Highlands, and throughout Scotland in general, viewed the recent proceedings in Skye with indignation and disgust. It was necessary that justice should be impartially administered, in order to ensure the confidence of the people. Had Sheriff Ivory exhibited in these recent proceedings of his that unprejudiced mind and sound judgment which ought to be exhibited by any gentleman occupying his office? If one-half of the charges that had been alleged against the Sheriff in this debate turned out to be true before the Commission of Inquiry, which he had no doubt they would get some day, it would have been more than proved that he had done much to bring the administration of the law in Scotland into disrepute. He (Mr. Provand) knew that the Government and those behind them could, when the Division was taken, quite easily put down their demand for inquiry; but that would not deter them from again asking for an inquiry, because if what had been described by the different speakers was true, there must have been something like a reign of terror in Skye. They had accounts of policemen and soldiers being awarded medals for catching crofters, or what seemed to be a sort of man-hunting; of a series of night raids by Sheriff Ivory, who appeared to think that his duty was that of a judicial Moonlighter; and of the collection of arrears, though the Crofters' Act stated that those arrears were to be afterwards settled by a Commission. It did not appear as if the slightest care had been taken in preparing the writs for the rates. Some of them were made out against men who were dead; some against persons who were in receipt of parochial relief; some against persons who had left the island a long time before; some of the rates had been already paid; some apportioned by the factor for arrears of rent; and some had never been asked for. It was a very singular thing that a military expedition should be sent against people in circumstances of that kind. There had been no serious outrage of any kind, and their condition was the outcome of a position of the direst poverty, almost entirely produced by the rack-renting of the landlords, and to but a small extent by the recent agricultural depression. Had the crofters made Skye a Kerry, and had outrages occurred there, no doubt the Government would have sent down some person like General Buller to exercise a dispensing power. But, being quiet and peaceable, the Skye people, instead of being treated as the men of Kerry were, almost had war made upon them by the Government. The question would not end with that evening's Division; and he thought that if the Government would take a reasonable view of the matter, it would be much better to grant the inquiry now than to have to grant it when they could not help doing so. They knew the Government could move their mechanical majority into the Lobby against the Amendment; but they would not always be in that position, and the "crutch," they had heard so much of would not always avail them. The question would come up again and again; and if the Commission were not granted, they would have in that House a Scotch Question, and, like the Irish Question, it would be always with them.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): Sir, I do not know how far I ought to regard it as a compliment that hon. Gentlemen from Scotland were so anxious that I should take part in this debate. I confess I thought that the able and conclusive reply of my right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald), last night, would have sufficed the House as our contribution to this somewhat too prolonged debate; but as hon. Gentlemen are determined that the debate shall not conclude without their hearing some observations from me on the subject, I feel that I cannot do otherwise than humour them and make a reply. I do not know that the speech to which we have just listened requires any very detailed observations on my part. The hon. Member (Mr. Provand) told the House that he thought the speech of my right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate was merely an elaborate essay on the maintenance of the law—not a bad subject—and I venture humbly to submit to the House, that if more speeches were heard from Gentlemen sitting opposite that could lay claim to such a title, the cause which they profess to have at heart—the maintenance of law and order—would be far better secured than it is at present. The only other remark that I have to make is to take notice of something the hon. Member let drop with respect to estate regulations, and to which I listened with the very greatest pain. He held up to the reprobation of this House estate regulations by which the owners of land attempted to prevent overcrowding and sub-division, and he actually instanced that as an example of landlord tyranny with which this House would do well to interfere. I need not say that those who have even the most elementary and casual knowledge of the Highlands, know that the great evil from which the Highlands are suffering is that of overcrowding and sub-division, and that the one force which has done something—I grieve to say not enough—but which has done something to resist that tendency, is the force of the estate regulations, laid down by the landlords; and that if this House shold do anything to weaken that check, the evils in the Highlands will be multiplied tenfold, and you will have, from one end of the Western Highlands to the other, a condition of things which can only be paralleled by cases like that of Glenbeigh, in Ireland, of which we have heard recently so much that is painful. But before I come to the main case for the Government, there are one or two remarks which have fallen from previous speakers in this debate of which I feel bound to take notice. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton) could not refrain—though I do not know that it had much to do with the question before us—from dilating, in their favourite strain, upon the evils and misfortunes of a country subject to landlord tyranny, and to laws made in the landlord interest. Now, I am not going to follow the course of these hon. Gentlemen and debate the question of landlords in the Highlands. I have done so more than once in this House, and if Bills which are now before us come forward for discussion I shall probably have to do so again; but I wish that hon. Gentlemen, who talk about Land Laws made in the interests of the landlords, would sometimes ask themselves what are the laws in other countries, where nobody supposes that landlords have supreme influence in legislation. Some of the clients of the hon. Gentleman opposite—some of these crofters in the Western Islands—will, I hope, find their way to America, which is always held up as the one country where true freedom exists. When they get to America I hope they will prosper, as many of their ancestors have prospered in that country. I hope that they will, in turn, become proprietors of the soil, and I hope that they will rise to the position of having tenants on their property. When they do, I hope they will recollect that, though they have come to a country where no landlord thinks of adopting any other course than that of enforcing the letter of his bond, they come from a country where that has never been the practice of the landlords. I hope they will recollect, when they are deciding the rent at which they are to let their land, that they ought to take something into account besides the mere rack-rent or market value of their land, recollecting that they have come from a country where the landlords are moved by other considerations than these. I do not mention the special privileges given to Highland tenants. I do not speak of the fair rents fixed by the Courts. I do not speak of the fixity of tenure which has been given them. I talk merely of the Land Law as it obtains over the greater part of this island, and I say that, even if you take that law, and exclude from your consideration the extraordinary and abnormal privileges given to the Highland tenants, these people, when they get to America, will find that the system of private property in land is enforced with far harder regard to the interests of the landlord than it has ever been in this country. The hon. Member for Caithness (Dr. Clark), whom I do not see in his place to-day, told us yesterday that, in Tiree, cruel evictions had constantly taken place for causes other than the non-payment of rent, and he appealed to the testimony of the Crofters' Commission in support of his proposition. Sir, I deny the statement, and I deny the validity of the evidence brought in support of it. It is untrue that in Tiree, during the last 40 years, there have been any evictions of crofters for causes other than the non-payment of rent; and when we are asked to take as proof the uncrossexamined and uninvestigated evidence of Tiree crofters in this matter laid before the Commission, I will remind the House of a story which I think I have brought before their attention on a previous occasion, in which some crofters in Tiree brought out as an evidence of a grievance before the Crofters' Commission, that the landlord had interfered with their right to cut peat. That story is extremely plausible, and I am surprised that it has not been brought up in this House as an example of landlord tyranny. There is but one flaw in it, but it is a considerable flaw—namely, that there are not, and there never have been, any peats in Tiree at all. Now, the hon. Gentleman who spoke first today, the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Hunter), who also, I think, is not in his place, described one of those cases of deforcement, and excused the crofters because, he said, they attempted to resist within the limits of the law. He admitted that they had passed what he was pleased to describe as the invisible line which separates a legal from an illegal proceeding; and he described all that they did as mere trifles, and not worthy to be considered by the principal Law Courts of Scotland. Well, Sir, I hope that the hon. Member for Aberdeen will never have to submit to the treatment which those officials have had to submit to whom it was attempted to resist "within the limits of the law." What happened exactly was this—that the Sheriff Substitute, the principal legal officer on the spot, and all his legal assistants, were pelted with peat, covered from head to foot with filth, and one man had filth thrust into his mouth. That is the kind of proceeding that the hon. Gentleman thinks so lightly of, and regards with such a lenient eye that he would pass it over as a trifling eccentricity unworthy of the consideration of the Courts of Law. I believe that some other Gentlemen want to speak, and I am anxious to come to the main object of the case which has been made against the Government. The matter has been put before us in this way—we have been asked—"Why did you send the expedition to Skye at all?" Well, I think everybody who has taken the trouble to investigate, in an impartial spirit, the condition of that island before we sent the expedition, will admit that some steps had to be taken by the Government to vindicate the law. We sent the expedition, not to collect rents, and not to collect the rates, but to vindicate the law, that had been outraged from one end of the island to the other. It is a matter of perfect notoriety, and one which was brought before the Government in such a manner that they could not refrain from attending to it; that the officers of no Court in Scotland could proceed to do their duty in the greater part of the island without—not the chance, but the certainty—of their being deforced; and that is a state of things which, so long as I have anything to do with Scotland, I shall not acquiesce in as tolerable; and I am convinced that right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Front Bench opposite will entirely endorse the view we take of that matter. Then it is asked—"Why did you not send the Police—why did not the County Authorities use the Force which was at their disposal, without coming to the Government and asking the Navy to help them?" Well, Sir, the course that we pursued was dictated, among other things, by considerations of common humanity. It was brought before us, in the clearest manner, that the Police Force at the disposal of the County Authorities could not possibly protect the officers of the law without their being deforced. If we had increased that Force, as we might have done by contributions from the other counties, it might, perhaps, have been possible to raise it to such a strength that it would have been able to overcome all resistance on the part of the crofters. That is possible; but what was certain was, that if we had attempted any such course, the law would not have been vindicated without a fight between the police and the crofters, which would, most certainly, have ended in bloodshed on one, possibly on both sides. That is a result which I, for one, was not able to contemplate with equanimity. I knew, and the event has proved that I was right, that if we sent a military force to protect the police, we should be able to vindicate the law without causing any unnecessary suffering to the people. I knew that if I sent the police unprotected by the military, there would, as I have said before, certainly be broken heads, and there might possibly be loss of life. What would this House have said, what would hon.

Gentlemen themselves have said, if I had chosen the second course, instead of the first, and had come down here, and had to answer, not for the trifling accusations which have been brought in such detail against us, but, perhaps, for the destruction of lives which, if I had taken a different course, might have been spared? Then, and then only, should we have been open to the kind of accusations which hon. Members have been levelling so freely against us. The hon. Member for Aberdeen actually implied that the Government, or rather that Sheriff Ivory, had, in one case, taken steps to see that resistance was offered to the officers of the law; because, the hon. Member said, if there was no resistance to the expedition, that expedition would have appeared ridiculous in the eyes of all Scotland. In my opinion, the resistance that was most unfortunately offered on one occasion to the execution of the law is the one blot—almost the only blot—in the conduct of the expedition. I should have thought that the expedition had been conducted with unexampled and unprecedented success, if it had not been for that single unfortunate case of resistance to the Sheriff Officer and the police; and so far from taking the hon. Member's view, that the expedition would be made ridiculous had there been no resistance, in my opinion the chief justification we have for it is, that wherever the Marines were brought into close contact with the police, there no resistance was offered at all. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) was in his place last night when the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) moved his Amendment, because the hon. Member for the College Division gave a view of his theory of interference of the Executive which I do not think the right hon. Gentleman will accept. What I understand to be the right hon. Member's theory is, not that civil processes are never to be enforced under any circumstances with any assistance whatever from the Forces of the Crown. What I understand him to hold is, that the Forces of the Crown are not to be used as a substitute for policemen or Sheriff Officers. I do not see the right hon. Gentleman in his place now.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby) rose, and said, that he was in the House when the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow moved the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. I had not noticed him. My eyesight was in fault. And yet the right hon. Gentleman is not so insignificant a person that he should escape observation. It is not my business to defend the Constitutional law of the right hon. Gentleman; but, at all events, in our practice I think we may claim agreement with each other. Whether or not it is right, under any circumstances, to send the Forces of the Crown to support civil writs I do not determine. That is not what we have done. What we have done is exactly what the right hon. Gentleman and his Government did—namely, to send the Forces of the Crown to support the police when they were unable by themselves to see that no resistance was offered to the emissaries of the Courts of Law. That is what we have done in Skye, and that is what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby did himself in Tiree; and I do not believe that any Party in this House will be found to say that our action deserves the condemnation of Parliament. I now come to the question of rates. A great deal has been made by almost every speaker of the small amount of rates actually due by the crofters; and I have been very freely attacked because I have not supplied hon. Members with official data on this subject, though they seem to be tolerably well supplied with all the facts they wanted without my assistance. I may explain, in defence of my conduct, that I am dependent on the Board of Supervision for getting the facts which hon. Members say they require. The Board of Supervision informed me that they could not, partly owing to the disorganized state of Skye, supply me with the information I wanted without a great deal of labour and a considerable lapse of time, and until they can supply me with that information, of course, I am unable in my turn to supply it to hon. Members in this House. But this is really a matter of small importance. Hon. Members appear to think that much turns upon whether the proportion of rates due by landlords was large, as compared with that due by tenants, or whether it was small. In the judgment of the Government, nothing turned upon that whatever. What we felt was that the law was not vindicated in Skye; and whether the law was broken by the landlords or by the tenants mattered nothing to us; and we insisted, from the beginning, that the law which the expedition had to enforce was a law to be enforced alike against rich and poor, the landlord and the crofter, the big tenant and the small tenant; and that policy we carried through faithfully to the end. The hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow talked as if the merits of this expedition were to be measured by the amount of money to be collected. I never regarded this expedition as a commercial speculation. I decline altogether to regard it as a commercial speculation. It is to be estimated not by the amount of rates to be collected, but by the degree in which it fulfilled the end for which it was sent—the end of compelling the landlord and tenant alike to fulfil their obligations. Several hon. Members who have spoken in this debate seem to think that one of the elements of the case that we have to consider was the hardship of demanding these rates from the poorer tenants—poor rates and school rates. I think there is no incident of our law harder than that which compels those who are themselves on the verge of pauperism to contribute their mite towards the support of pauperism. But is that evil an evil confined to Skye? Is it not one which you feel, which is felt with force and severity within a few hundred yards of the place where we are now sitting? Do you not know that every day, in our large towns, the local authorities proceed against a precisely analogous class of those who meet the pity, and who deserve the pity, of hon. Members in this House? They have got to enforce the law against those upon whom the enforcement of the law presses very hardly indeed. But is that a reason why the Executive should say—"We will enforce the law against the large ratepayer, but we will not enforce the law, under any circumstances, against the poorer ratepayer." Everybody knows that a Government which attempted such a course as that would be turned out of Office in a week; and if distance did not lend enchantment to the view, if hon. Gentlemen could only be got to look with the same eyes at facts in Skye as in Leicester or London, they would see how much of their rhetoric, if applicable at all in either place, is applicable even more in the large towns with which they are familiar than in the remote and romantic districts of the kingdom. The hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow maintained that this expedition served no purpose, so far as the collection of rates was concerned, because, he said, the crofters were perfectly ready to pay their rates, whether the expedition was sent or not. Nothing can be further from the fact. I do not know on what shadowy substructure of imagination the hon. Member has built that astonishing hypothesis.

Dr. CAMERON: What I said was founded on the Report of the Officer of the Board of Supervision.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know whether the hon. Member has sat through, as I have done, almost the whole of this debate. If so, he must know that the hon. Gentleman who succeeded him in the debate has paid him the compliment of repeating, without any sensible modification, almost everything he said. There is one plain and simple consideration which I will offer to the House. which I think disposes absolutely of this contention. The House is aware that the Government determined that this expedition should enforce the payment of rates alike by landlord and tenant. As soon as the expedition reached Portree, the landlords and the larger tenants proceeded to pay their rates. The whole of the rates were collected from these defaulters in a few hours. But it required a military visit, repeated on three occasions, to extract from the crofters their share of the rates; and how, under these circumstances, it can be represented that the crofters were burning with the desire to pay these particular debts, I am utterly at a loss to imagine. The landlords have been very savagely attacked for not having paid their share of the rates until the expedition arrived; and the hon. Member for the College Division of Glasgow told us that the rates were an incident, not on rent, but on land, and that the landlord was liable to pay the rates, not because he received rent in respect of his land, but because he owned the land. There cannot be a doubt that the law of the hon. Member is perfectly correct, and I very greatly regret that, as that was the law, the landlords did not fulfil the law, and I did my best to make them fulfil it. But you must recollect that though that is the law, it is only half the law. The other half of the law is, that for land which the landlord lets out, he shall receive rent, and that the State shall see that he shall receive rent. The law doubtless says that the landlord shall pay rates in respect of land, and not in respect of rent. But the law also says that when the rent is due to the landlord, that rent the Courts of Law shall enforce. Though I do not say that the landlords were justified, I say they had something remotely in the nature of an excuse, owing to the fact that, as is perfectly well known to hon. Members, rents in Skye were £20,000 in arrears. I hope I have made it clear I am not justifying the landlords. If the landlords repeat what they did before, I shall repeat what I did before, and I shall see that they are obliged to pay; But in common justice recollect that you are only enforcing half the law, you are leaving the other half unenforced; and very great hardship is inflicted upon that class in whose behalf you do refuse, from whatever cause, to enforce the whole law. So much for the question of rates; now for the question of rents. And here I cannot but say that I think the accusations brought against the landlords by almost every Gentleman who has spoken in this debate are of the most unjustifiable description. I say nothing of the share I am supposed to have had in it. The accusation is, that the landlords made the excuse that the rates were in arrear to compel the Government to send an expedition to Skye in order that their rents might be exacted; and that, by the exaction of their rents, their tenants might be made bankrupt, and thereby excluded from the benefits of the Crofters' Act which this House passed last year. A more scandalous or unjustifiable accusation never was brought forward in this House. I am unable to believe that some, at all events, of the Gentlemen who made that accusation had not taken the elementary trouble to ask whether the facts, in any way, justified so grave a charge against a large body of their fellow-countrymen. I can, I think, convince the House, without much trouble, of the utter futility of this charge. I have already mentioned that the arrears in Skye amounted to £20,000.

DR. CLARK: The small tenants did not owe more than £15,000.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Very well; I will accept the hon. Gentleman figures. But the House will see that the case in favour of the landlords is so strong that the hon. Gentleman thinks it necessary to correct my figures, and to bring down the amount from £20,000 to £15,000. I care not whether the sum is £20,000 or £10,000, but I will call it £15,000. Out of the total sum of £15,000, the sum which the landlords tried to obtain, while the expedition was on the island, amounted to £1,100, and of that amount they secured actually only £373, taking the rest in some form of security. In no single case did they take advantage of the expedition to evict a single crofter, nor to make a single crofter bankrupt. It is in the face of facts like these, that hon. Gentlemen think that because landlords in Skye at this moment are an unpopular class, they can make an appeal to the gallery, and accuse these men, who, Heaven knows, have suffered heavily enough, of having deliberately entered into a conspiracy with the Executive Government to defeat the Crofters' Act. The House knows my opinion of the Crofters' Act. There are some arguments to be used in favour of it; but there is, in my judgment, an overwhelming mass of argument to be used against the principles on which it is based; but the Crofters' Act is law, and I mean to do, as I have done, my best to make that law effective, and aid in every way its execution according to the intention of Parliament. I have been asked why I did not send the Crofter Commission to Skye in September. I will tell the House. I was anxious, from the information I had, that it should go to Skye. I consulted the Crofters' Commission on the subject, and they told me that they entertained very strongly the opposite view; that they had received an immense mass of applications from other parts of Scotland; but that they had not received, I think they said, a single application from Skye; and they earnestly pressed me to allow them to pursue the course which, as a matter of fact, they have pursued. Whether it would have been better that the Crofters' Commission should have gone to Skye in September, I will not attempt to say; but I was not influenced in the course I took by any desire to defeat the operation of the Act, and I think the House will admit that, after what I have just told them. I now come to one or two questions which, I think, were dealt with by my right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate, but which have been pressed so much on the House since that I suppose hon. Gentlemen want them replied to again. We are told that it was a great hardship on the crofters arrested for deforcement that there was a change of venue from Inverness-shire to Edinburgh. The first observation I have to make on that is, that there never has been a case in which a crime of this kind has not been tried in Edinburgh. [An hon. MEMBER: Oh!] Perhaps the hon. Gentleman who said "oh" is aware of a case, and will communicate the fact to the House. I believe that the Government strictly followed the lines of precedents in the course they adopted. In the second place, I have to tell the House that, so far is this from being a cause or excuse for instituting an inquiry into the course of justice in the Highlands, and the legal officers there, if there be an offender in this matter, that offender sits in this House. It rests absolutely and entirely with the Lord Advocate to decide where, and how, trials of this kind are to take place. If hon. Gentlemen think that the course which my right hon. and learned Friend has pursued in this matter was wrong, let them impeach him. We hold that he was right; but whether right or wrong, he is here to answer for himself. Certainly, on account of his action, there can be no motive whatever for instituting the inquiry which the Amendment desires to set on foot. We have heard a great deal about what are called the midnight raids of Sheriff Ivory; they were simply an attempt, which turned out ultimately successful, to arrest those engaged in the great crime of deforcement. His action was perfectly legal. If it was illegal, bring an action against him. But you know it was perfectly legal; and those who attack him most have probably taken the most careful steps outside this House to convince themselves that no action lay against the Sheriff on that account. Sheriff Ivory has been attacked for the arrest of a rev. gentleman named M'Callum, and of another person named John Macpherson, and of a third named Mackay; and these arrests have actually been attributed to the personal feelings felt on the part of Sheriff Ivory against the accused. This is a singular example of the injustice which Members, unwittingly perhaps, do to those who are absent, and who cannot defend themselves. Sheriff Ivory had nothing to do with the arrest of these gentlemen. Not only did he not give the orders for the arrest, but he did not know of the arrest. The arrest was not at his instance at all; and if he had known of it, he could not have stopped it. I hope that that accusation is disposed of. Then we are told of a poor woman being dragged over the moors to stand her trial at Portree. The facts of the matter are these—This woman put herself in the forefront of a deforcing party; and with all my respect for women's rights, I do not think one of those rights is with impunity to break the law. So far from being dragged unnecessarily over the moor, the authorities sent for a carriage to Portree to meet them at the nearest point on the high road. [An hon. MEMBER: That was close upon four miles distant.] I do not suppose the hon. Gentleman insinuates that the Government are bound to make a high road to the cottage of every person who may be accused of the crime of deforcement. The road may have been four miles off. My point is, that the utmost humanity in this case was used; because a carriage was sent for, and this poor woman was taken over the most convenient and nearest part of the moor to the high road. How hon. Gentlemen would have desired Sheriff Ivory to have acted if he was there, which I am not sure of, I do not know. The truth is, in my judgment, very scant justice has been done to Sheriff Ivory in this matter. It is not my duty to defend him. He is not a subordinate of mine. I did not appoint him, and I cannot dismiss him. More than that, he is not bound to accept my orders; but I feel it my duty to say in this House that Sheriff Ivory has been engaged, during these troublous times, in a most painful, a most difficult, and a most delicate task —a task in which any man might be expected occasionally to give some loophole to the sort of criticism we have heard during the last few nights. I believe that, on the whole, Sheriff Ivory has carried out his functions, so far as the crofter population is concerned, with the utmost humanity in his power. He has certainly not broken the law. Nothing said in this House has convinced me that he has, in any way, overstepped those bounds of humanity which ought to regulate on all occasions every officer of the law in carrying out the law. I am asked, why I do not give the inquiry? I am told it is very easy to grant an inquiry; and that, finally, an inquiry will be forced upon me. I will tell hon. Gentlemen why I do not give an inquiry. If I was to give an inquiry, it would be taken, and justly taken, as an indication either that I objected to the system into which the inquiry is to be made, or that I think that those who have the working of that system had grossly neglected and failed in their duty. Now, I do not believe either of those propositions. I do not believe there has been a gross failure of duty on the part of those who carry out the criminal system in the Highlands; nor do I believe that the criminal system is one which deserves, or requires, overhauling. The Criminal Law of Scotland is that part of the law of which every Scotsman is most justly proud. It is one in which, so far as it differs from the English law, differs, in my opinion, almost entirely for the better—and I will not be a party to an inquiry which will throw that law into the melting-pot, to bring out Heaven knows what brand new system which may be devised by the ingenious brains of hon. Gentlemen opposite. When hon. Gentlemen who have applied this system of microscopic investigation to every action which has taken place in Skye, basing their accusations, for the most part, on very flimsy material, I would ask them, whether they think it possible to have an expedition of the magnitude of that which was sent out, dealing with so large and so scattered a population, in a country so difficult as Skye, where the law had so long remained unenforced, and where the very idea of law appears to be vanishing from the minds and consciences of the people—I ask, whether they think it was possible to send an expedition to redress that state of things without some friction and some difficulty? If so, they take a more sanguine view of the possibilities of human nature than I do. Our law is administered, after all, not by angels, but by men, and if you impose upon men a most difficult, laborious, and delicate task, some slight failure there must necessarily be. So far am I from admitting, for a moment, that there are any such failures in this case as to constitute an occasion for inquiry, I take exactly the opposite view. And I am of opinion, and I feel it my duty to speak out publicly in this case, in this House, that I think the thanks of the country are, on the whole, largely due to those who have been engaged in this most difficult and laborious undertaking. It is on no account to be thought that I, or the Government, or even Sheriff Ivory, like expeditions of this kind, or that they add a charm to the dignity of the Office I have the honour to hold. Sir, I hope, and believe, that no Scotch Secretary will again have thrust upon him the painful responsibility which has been thrust upon me. I hope that it is the last time—it is almost the first, not quite—but I hope it is the last time it will be necessary for the Scotch Secretary to go to his Colleagues and say—"I must ask you to supplement the ordinary forces at the disposal of the Local Authorities, in order to maintain the elements of law and justice in the Highlands." But, Sir, so long, at all events, as I hold the Office for which I am now responsible, I shall not shrink if a similar case should arise for adopting similar means to put an end to it. I look back with much pain to what has passed, but with no regret whatever. I deeply deplore the necessity that was put upon me; but I should have thought myself cowardly, and utterly unworthy of holding any office under the Crown, if I had shrunk from the responsibility, which I did not seek, but which was thrust upon me. Sir, one of the Members for Glasgow last night—the Member for the Camlachie Division (Mr. Watt)—threatened me with the displeasure of the democracy. He said that the democracy were looking for a very different conduct of public affairs from that which was being pursued by the Government. I do not think so badly of the democracy as hon. Gentlemen opposite. I admit that, if some of the speeches we have heard in the course of the last two days really represent the feelings and views of the democracy; if they are capable of being guilty of the same inconsequences of reasoning, the same determination not to face disagreeable facts, the same weak sentimentality, which is the precise opposite of, and is absolutely inconsistent with, true charity and with true humanity; then indeed, Sir, we may have to face the displeasure of the democracy, but very much worse consequences will ensue to this country than the fall of this Government. We may well have reason to despair of the future of this country, if counsels such as those to which I have adverted are likely to prevail with the great democracies. But I do not believe a word of it. I believe, Sir, that the democracy of this country are as firmly determined as Her Majesty's Government to see that, in every part of this kingdom, law and justice shall prevail. And it is because I hold that conviction that I carry out, and the Government carry out, what they believe to be their duty, without the slightest fear of that displeasure of the popular constituencies with which some hon. Gentlemen have thought fit to threaten us.

Mr. J. B. BALFOUR (Clackmannan, &c.) said, that he would not detain the House long; but, as he had held the Office of Lord Advocate under two Administrations, he thought it right to say something on the question before the House. The hon. Member for the Camlachie Division of Glasgow (Mr. Watt) had asked him to say upon what application the late Government had agreed to send a military or naval expedition to Tiree. He (Mr. J. B. Balfour) had no difficulty in answering that question. The expedition was sent upon the application of the Sheriff Principal of the county, stating that the deforcement had taken place with regard to which there had been a good deal of discussion last night. The Sheriff's application was accompanied by the Report of the Chief Constable of the county regarding that act. It was only upon an application so made and so sustained that the expedition was sent; and in regard to the facts which actually occurred there could be no doubt whatever, because they had been made the subject of a most careful inquiry before the highest Criminal Court in Scotland, which had resulted in the unanimous conviction of the persons charged. There were one or two remarks made about subsequent trials on which he should not omit to say what he thought. He did not think it necessary to say anything in regard to the Tiree matter, because he scarcely thought it had been assailed. He did not think that any complaint had been made that the expedition was sent; but one or two remarks were made in regard to the subsequent proceedings, with respect to which he did not think it right that he should be silent. Complaint had been made that the men who were concerned in the deforcement were brought to Edinburgh by his Successor in Office, and tried before the High Court of Justiciary. Now, he had no hesitation in saying that if the Liberal Government had remained in Office, he (Mr. J. B. Balfour) would, in the circumstances of the case, have done exactly the same thing; and he would have done so in accordance with—he would not say invariable usage—but general usage, and in accordance with what he believed would have been the substantially unanimous opinion of the country. But in regard to the bringing of these men to Edinburgh, a remark was made last night by an hon. Member which he thought was a very unfortunate remark, and which he had been surprised to hear. The hon. Member said that these men were put to a disadvantage by being brought to the High Court of Justiciary in Edinburgh, in respect that there was what he termed a "racial prejudice" amongst the Lowlanders against Highlanders, and because, in addition, they came down and competed with the Lowlanders in the labour market. Now, he (Mr. J. B. Balfour) had listened to that statement with positive amazement, because he did not know any men who were so universally liked in every part of Scotland as the Highlanders. They were all proud of the Highlanders; and he ventured to say that there was not a part in the Lowlands to which they could go without finding Highlanders in positions of competence, of respectability, and of honour, and every man who had Highland blood in his veins was proud of it. The notion, therefore, that a jury gathered from the three counties of the Lothians — the three metropolitan counties— would in any way look with an unkindly or prejudiced eye on, or deal unfairly with, these poor people — to whose character as generally a law-abiding race everybody could bear testimony—was calculated to shock the common sense of anyone familiar with the people of Scotland. He ventured to say that the jury and the Judge must have viewed with great regret the spectacle of these ordinarily law-abiding men finding themselves in such a position; he thought it could be gathered, from the recommendations to leniency which were made by the juries in these cases, that they were moved not a little by the kindly considerations to which he had referred; and he should regret exceedingly if anyone in the Highlands believed that any such feeling as had been suggested existed towards their race. The only other point regarding the Tiree case was put interrogatively by the hon. Member for the Camlachie Division of Glasgow; and it was whether there had been injury to life or limb on that occasion. It might be that there was not; but he would say this—that it was altogether a mistake to imagine that the measure of the crime of deforcement and of preventing service of a civil writ was affected by the absence of injury to life or limb. That, no doubt, would form a very important ingredient in the fixing of the sentences, and quite properly; and he did not doubt that the fact that there had not been serious violence in those cases had largely influenced the Judges in making the sentences so lenient as they did, for if there had been serious personal violence, the sentences would have been heavier. The stopping of the Queen's writ was not to be treated lightly; for upon its free running, and upon obedience being shown to the orders of the Court, was founded the liberty and security of the poor as well as of the rich; and he could not imagine anything more deplorable than that the idea should get abroad that a declinature to allow the Queen's writ to run in any part of the Queen's dominions, was not a grave offence. He would say very little about the most recent Skye expedition, because it was after he left Office, and he only knew of it from what he read in the papers, and from the speeches of hon. Gentlemen in that House yesterday and to-day. But he would say one or two things. The first was that he was exceedingly glad to hear the statement made last night by his right hon. and learned Friend the Lord Advocate and reiterated to-day by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland, that that expedition was not sent for the purpose of collecting either rates or rents. Both right hon. Gentlemen had emphasized that. He was glad to hear it, because he should not have thought it right employment for the Military Forces of the Crown that they should be sent on either the one duty or the other. He would only further say this—that it was only under exceedingly rare and exceptional circumstances that the Military Forces of the Crown should be employed at all in this country. Accordingly, under the late Government, the most anxious and careful consideration was given to every application that was made for military aid. It was many times refused. It was refused invariably when they were asked merely to protect the service of civil writs; and when it was granted the most stringent conditions were laid down. The conditions on which it would be appropriately granted were laid down in the letter of the Government, written by himself, in November, 1882, to the Sheriff of Inverness; and he had not heard then or since any complaint in regard to those conditions. Nor had he heard any complaint in that House in regard to the first military expedition to Skye in 1884, the Papers relating to which had been laid on the Table at the time. One condition that they laid down was that under no circumstances should a military force be allowed to become a substitute for a police force. It was made a condition *sine quâ non* that any Local Authority which thought its civil force was not adequate, or should be overpowered, should put into the field as a primary force a large body of constables—he thought 40 or 50 was the minimum—and it was made perfectly clear that it was only in the event of a large civil force being overpowered that the military force should go to their aid. Those conditions were rigorously exacted, and he had not heard that they had been departed from in the recent expedition. He rather gathered, from what was said, that the view taken by the late Government had been concurred in by the present Government. Another suggestion which had been thrown out was, why, in such a case, the number of police should not be increased? Well, there was a practical limit to that. If there was reason to apprehend that the disturbed condition of a locality was to be permanent or prolonged, the right course would, no doubt, be to increase the police force, at whatever cost, and for the reason that he had stated—that under no circumstances should a military force ever be allowed to become a substitute for the civil force. The case was very different when what they had to deal with was something sudden, and something which they had reason to believe would be entirely transient and temporary. They could not train a police force in a day; for the county police of Scotland were not accustomed to act as drilled bodies of men, and he shared the hope expressed from the other side, that it would not be necessary again to send a military force to those districts, or indeed, to keep up an abnormal police force there. He entirely agreed with what was said by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. A. J. Balfour) as to the humanity of adopting the course which was adopted, exceptionally by both Governments, in sending a military force, rather than in attempting to augment the police force. That was a matter in which they were not without experience. On the first occasion, when there was serious trouble in Skye—the disturbances at the Braes—the county police were reinforced by a large, highly-organized, and drilled body of police from the city of Glasgow. That was a force which had a degree of training they could not expect to find in a county police force. When they attempted arrests there was a conflict, and considerable injuries were done both to policemen and other persons. If heads were not broken, they were a good deal bruised, which was a thing to be deprecated and lamented; while, in the cases in which a military force had been sent, there had been no injury done to life or limb. He would just say a word upon a matter alluded to by the hon. Member for North Aberdeenshire (Mr. Hunter). His hon. Friend had spoken of what he called "technical" deforcement, and of crossing an invisible line between what was lawful and what was unlawful. There were certain matters, of civil concern, he hoped, rather than criminal, in which it was difficult to know which side of a particular rule of law they were upon; but he could not imagine anything in regard to which a person of the simplest intelligence could have less doubt than whether he was or was not preventing the Queen's writ from being served. He could not figure to to his mind the conditions under which a man could be ignorant of whether he was stopping the Queen's writ. Whether it was by a blow, or interposing his person as one of a crowd in front of a door, or whatever the method taken was, it seemed absolutely clear that no man could be ignorant whether it was doing so or not. Now, he thought it right that he should say one or two words on the terms of the Amendment, because, as it was worded, it had reference not only to the particular cases of Skye and Tiree, but to the "general administration of justice in the Highlands." What did that mean? It had been interpreted in two ways. It had been interpreted by his hon. Friends who had moved and seconded the Amendment and other hon. Members in their speeches in one way, which he thought was its only meaning. The meaning of administration there he (Mr. J. B. Balfour) took to be "mal-administration." Theirs was a complaint against the mal-administration of justice. Some other hon. Gentlemen had said that they did not so interpret it; but while they repudiated the adoption of any such view as that, and indicated that they would not vote for it if it meant to charge mal-administration, they interpreted it as preferring no censure against anybody, but merely as complaining that the general system of Scottish criminal procedure was not good. That was plainly not what was meant, nor would that latter interpretation be appropriate, because the words were limited to the Highlands. There was not one criminal system for the Highlands and another for the Lowlands. There was one system for the whole of Scotland; and it was surely not to be regarded by his hon. Friends as a matter of such urgency as to be appropriate to be put into the Queen's Speech, if all that was proposed was an examination whether the general criminal system in Scotland was satisfactory or not. That was a large subject; but he believed the enormous preponderance of opinion in Scotland was in favour of the present system. He was not going to argue it; but he might say that it had always been the Scotch system. It was one of the stipulations at the Union that Scotland should preserve her own laws and her own Law Courts. Therefore, it was, in the strictest sense, a national system; and he believed that the great body of Scotch opinion was favourable to it. It had been from time to time amended, and he believed would admit of further amendment. If it was proposed, by the Amendment, to make a charge of general mal-administration of justice in the Highlands, that was a very wide, a very sweeping, and a very serious charge, because it was not limited to one county or one place, nor to one person or functionary. The House was asked by that general proposition to condemn, by implication and in the dark, numbers of persons whose names they had never heard, and an administration extending over a large number of counties of Scotland. Whatever might be the case with hon. Members who had no official duty in regard to the matter, he had no hesitation, having for several years held the Office which made it his duty to know how that system was being administered throughout the country, in saying that that proposition did not agree with the fact. It was not according to the fact that there was general or prevalent mal-administration throughout the Highlands of Scotland; and he could be no party to affirming a proposition which he knew to be contrary to the fact. He need say no more, than there were local Judges, local Fiscals, and others doing their duties just as honestly, just as fairly, throughout the Highland districts as any judicial officers either in the rest of Scotland, or in this or any other country; and he felt sure the House would be very slow to condemn these unknown and un-named officials *en bloc.* But take the particular case of Skye. He was not going into detail as to the proceedings of those who were responsible for the administration there at the time these events occurred. But he must say this, that having had a good deal to do for years with the administration of justice there, he entirely agreed with what the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland had said with regard to Sheriff Ivory, against whom many hard words had been used. He thought it was only fair that he should express his concurrence in what the right hon. Gentleman had said. Then, it was a matter of complaint that there had been a system of taking declarations and of separating the prisoner during certain days from his friends. He thought that was a thing that was liable to abuse. He thought it was a hardship, and within the last year or two an alteration had been made providing for the admission by the prison officials of the legal advisers or friends of prisoners. Something also was said as to an accused person being subject to a sort of private examination. Their rule upon that matter was very liable to be misunderstood; but there was nothing in it, when rightly carried out, which could be so described. The accused person, when arrested, was brought before a magistrate, and an opportunity was given to him of making a declaration; he was not required to make a declaration; he need not say one word; and it was the duty of the magistrate to tell him so, but that if he did make a declaration it might be used against him. The result was that the more knowing criminals did not make a declaration, but that innocent men generally did; because it gave the accused an opportunity, if he had a defence, to state it. When he made his statement the authorities could examine into the truth of it; and in not a few cases, if his statement turned out to be true, he was set at liberty at once. So completely was it not an obligation on the part of the accused to make a declaration, that he remembered one declaration in these terms—

> "A person who, on being interrogated, refused to tell his name, being further interrogated, refused to answer any question."

He did not think anybody could say that a person was subjected to an inquisition by a system of that kind. It was really a system for the protection of the innocent. As to what had been said about the change of venue, that was a perfectly appropriate expression in England; but it was hardly appropriate in Scotland, because it implied that there was an original venue which had been changed. That was not so. ["Hear, hear!"] The Lord Advocate had the power of directing an accused person to be tried either in the locality where the crime was committed, or in the High Court of Justiciary. It was not always easy to please people as to the place where they were to be tried, because while they had heard a good deal of complaint in regard to the persons recently brought up to the High Court, complaints had been made against him because he directed the Braes people to be tried summarily in Inverness. A statement had been made which he did not think it would be right to allow to pass uncontradicted, because it must have been made under some misapprehension. It had been said that all the persons connected with the administration of justice in Skye were in some way associated with, or dependent upon, the landlords. Now, he did not know a single person who had anything to do with the administration of the law in that island who had any such association with the landlords. ["Hear, hear!"] When the troubles began in Skye, it was laid down by the Procurator Fiscal there, as a rule, for his own guidance, that he should not take private employment from anyone connected with the land during his action in these matters, and he (Mr. J. B. Balfour) thought he was correct in stating that he had not taken any such private employment. He was sure that if his hon. Friends on his own side of the House had had the same opportunities and means that he had had of obtaining personal knowledge of the various facts of the case they would hardly have made some of the statements they had made. With those observations, he thought it right to say that an Amendment, so conceived and so expressed, he should find it altogether impossible to support.

Mr. WALLACE (Edinburgh, E.) said, he had listened to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland and the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Lord Advocate with a desire to be convinced, but had not received the satisfaction he expected. He did not think sufficient reasons had been given for refusing the inquiry asked for. The part of the Amendment that interested him was the expression that the alleged facts that they had been discussing "have caused serious concern to the people of Scotland, and demand full inquiry." He believed that such serious concern existed; and he did not think anything that had fallen from the two right hon. Gentlemen who had spoken would be sufficient to meet that serious concern. He had no hesitation in saying that the feeling in Scotland was one of widespread and intense dissatisfaction—["Oh!"]—with the manner in which they had been taught to believe or to suspect that the people of Skye and Tiree had been treated. He did not deny that there was a small Party in Scotland who did not share that dissatisfaction; but that feeling was very much identified with the Party who were prone to despise the people and to trample upon them. ["Oh!"] The people of Scotland knew the character of the population of Skye, and, knowing it, they felt that the fault must be either in the law or in its administration. The people of Skye were a people of intelligence and piety. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen on the other side might laugh at intelligence or piety, or at both combined. But there had been a long tradition of education in that Island; and the result was that the population there were, in point of intelligence, superior to the same class in England. He felt no shame in asserting it to be a most valuable quality in the people of Skye that they were devout and reverent. The character of their religious creed, worship, and government was well known to be conducive, not only to the formation of pious aspirations and moral habits, but also of a remarkable keenness of dialectic intelligence. Whatever might be the faults of the Presbyterian system—and he, for his part, had faults to find with it, otherwise he should not have been at that moment addressing the House—it could not be denied that, to all those who were conscientiously attached to it, it tended to give those moral and religious habits, as well as intellectual aptitudes, of which he had spoken. The people of Scotland, therefore, suspected that a gross indignity had been vicariously perpetrated upon themselves in the persons of the Skye people. They thought those people had been dragooned, driven about, trespassed upon, and generally harassed, in a way that looked as if there were one law for the rich and another for the poor; and they thought that insulting and harassing treatment of this description had an effect that communicated itself to the whole population. There were two things which the people of Scotland especially resented in this matter. They resented the uncalled-for and exasperating theatricality of sending a portion of the

British Army and Navy against a half-starved population; and they resented the apparently tyrannical conduct of Sheriff Ivory, which seemed to them to have been dictated by an extraordinary egotism on the one hand, and, on the other, by something like a determination to crush the crofters in favour of the landlords. Those suspicions were shared by the people of Scotland as a whole. At all the public meetings which he had attended, allusion to what was going on in Skye had been received with shouts of execration; and he had had invitation after invitation to attend meetings in Scotland for the purpose of expressing sympathy with the crofters in their present position. That was another indication of the universality of this feeling amongst the people of Scotland. With the exception of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Clackmannan (Mr. J. B. Balfour) and the hon. Member for the St. Rollox Division of Glasgow (Mr. Caldwell), not a single Scotch Member had risen, except to express himself in favour of the Amendment. The course adopted by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate was only to be expected from a Gentleman in his official position; and, however much they might respect the right hon. Gentleman, they could not consider him as the Representative of a popular constituency in Scotland, but of one of those fancy constituencies which was not destined to immortality. If the Representatives of Scotland were representing the minds of their constituencies, it was evident that the whole of the popular part of the country sympathized with the position of the people in these Islands. One of their own Colleagues in the representation of Scotland, who shook the dust off his shoes the other night as a testimony against the degradation of that Chamber by his co-Representatives, had returned to the fold upon that particular Amendment. He (Mr. Wallace) thought that was a very striking testimony of the force of popular opinion in this matter in all the constituencies throughout the country. What reply had been given by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland in the way of meeting that feeling on the part of the people of Scotland, and satisfying them that no inquiry need be made into the matter? The right hon. Gentleman had told them that the naval expedition was not sent to collect rates, but to vindicate the law, which had been broken. But it seemed to him (Mr. Wallace) that the right hon. Gentleman afterwards contradicted himself as to that portion of his answer. He began by telling them that the expedition had not been sent to collect rates, and wound up that portion of his speech by telling them that the expedition had been particularly successful in collecting the rates; that it had compelled all the landlords to fulfil their obligations, and that it required in some cases three military visits to make some of the crofters pay their rates. He could not help thinking that the right hon. Gentleman had made some confusion in his own mind when he told them that the expedition was not sent to collect rates. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to be desirous of explaining how it was necessary that a military expedition should be sent for the purpose of vindicating the law that had been broken. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Clackmannan had laid it down that recourse should not be had to military aid unless in cases of sudden riot, and in cases of extraordinary emergency, to deal with which police could not be obtained, and soldiers should not be employed on police duty which was likely to prove of a continuous character. Having been taught such a doctrine as that by a competent authority, whom they all respected, he (Mr. Wallace) did not think the people of Scotland would be satisfied with the application which the right hon. and learned Gentleman had made of the doctrine in connection with the affairs of Skye. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland had told them that if he had only got a sufficient body of police he could have enforced these rates without calling in the military arm.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.): I said nothing of the sort.

MR. WALLACE said, he certainly understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that he might have done it if there had been a sufficient number of police.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What I said was that if there had been a body of police larger than that which could be supplied by the district, it was possible they might have been able to do it without bloodshed.

MR. WALLACE: That was that they could do it, since the doing of it was possible; he must say his mind was not sufficiently acute to discern the difference. The people of Scotland were familiar with these Constitutional doctrines, and were not convinced that a sufficient police force could not have done all that was required in Skye. He contended that it was possible, with a sufficient number of police, to perform the civil duty required there, and that it was not necessary to call in the aid of the military. There was no sudden riot or extraordinary emergency. The whole basis of the action of the Government in the matter had been founded, not upon ascertained fact, but simply upon conjecture and upon their own prediction; and the people of Scotland would not be satisfied with the answer of the right hon. Gentleman. It was possible that if the Government granted an inquiry the whole facts of the situation might be fully and properly drawn up, and that a statement might be made that would satisfy the people that there was a pressing necessity with the Government to employ this military force. He regretted to say that the right hon. Gentleman passed very lightly over the case of Sheriff Ivory. He must say, if that judicial officer actually conducted himself in the way described by his hon. Friends, that he was not a man of sufficient common sense to occupy the position he did. In the giving of those miscellaneous nursery decorations to men for doing their duty there was an injudicial animus exhibited. The effect of stimulating the police in this way was to tempt them into the perpetration of injustice. They would not be too finical in what they did to obtain the reward. Sheriff Ivory had also been charged with vindictiveness in some of his arrests. The right hon. Gentleman denied that Sheriff Ivory had known of some of those arrests. He accepted the right hon. Gentleman's statement; but that fact should be brought out in such a way that the people of Scotland would have an opportunity of knowing it, and that could only be done as part of the general inquiry which was asked and demanded by the facts of the case. Sheriff Ivory had shown a certain absurd sense of dignity in his whole connection with this matter. ["Divide!"] He had only one other remark to make before he sat down. The fact that the right hon. Gentleman was himself perfectly satisfied with the administration of justice in the Highlands was no reason for his refusing the inquiry. His (Mr. Wallace's) whole argument was rested upon the claims of the people of Scotland to have their righteous concern considered and satisfied in this matter. The right hon. Gentleman refused this inquiry on two grounds—because he did not believe that the Scottish judicial system required revision; and because he did not believe the allegations that had been made against Sheriff Ivory and others. There might not be much concern in Scotland about the revision of the Scotch laws, but there was a desire for this inquiry; and though the right hon. Gentleman might not believe the allegations that had been made, others did, and an inquiry ought to be granted.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 136; Noes 253: Majority 117.—(Div. List, No. 9.)

Main Question again proposed.

MR. SEXTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER asked whether the hon. Member had not already spoken in the debate upon the Address?

MR. SEXTON said, he had spoken on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), but not on the Main Question.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster) said, he hoped the hon. Gentleman would allow the first stage of the Address to be now taken. If he had any observations to make he could make them on the Report stage. Looking to the fact that the House had now been sitting three weeks, and that they had only got to the disposal of the last Amendment on the Paper, and that the Address was not yet accepted, he thought the hon. Gentleman himself and the House, and he was sure the country, would feel that sufficient time had been expended on the first debate on that stage of the Address.

MR. PARNELL (Cork) said, it had grown very much into a habit of recent years to exhaust the various subjects of discussion in which the House took an interest in the various debates upon the first stage of the Address. As importance was not usually attached to discussions on Report, he, therefore, did not think that his hon. Friend (Mr. Sexton), in view of the very grave state of affairs which existed in Ireland at the present moment, and in view of the fact that the Government proposed to take all the time of the House for the discussion of their Resolutions with regard to the Procedure of the House, would be justified, under these circumstances, in withdrawing his Motion, or refraining from pressing his claim to speak upon the Main Question, if he should so desire, when the House resumed to-morrow. He, therefore, trusted that the Government would not oppose the Motion which his hon. Friend had made. It was not a usual thing to oppose a Motion made just as the clock was coming to the hour when Opposed Business ceased; and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would not shut out his hon. Friend from the right of speaking on the Main Question—a right which he had not yet exercised—by taking a Division against his Motion. Otherwise, they would have to adopt means to prevent that Division from being taken.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said, there seemed to be a sort of implication in the observations of the Leader of the House that time had been wasted on the Opposition side of the House. [*Ministerial Cheers.*] He gathered from those cheers that that was the view of the supporters of the right hon. Gentleman. Well, he would only make one reply—namely, that there had been during the debate upon the Address 65 Conservative speeches made.

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid) said, he thought that the Government were not acting fairly in desiring to prevent discussions on subjects affecting Ireland, as since the discussion on the hon. Member for Cork's Amendment, other questions of a grave and serious character had been raised in Ireland which made it necessary for them to insist on their right to continue the discussion to-morrow. The hon. Member was pursuing this line of argument, when——

It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

NOTICE OF MOTION.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (RULES OF PROCEDURE).

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I beg to give Notice that at the Sitting of the House to-morrow I shall move—

> "That the consideration of the proposed Rules of Procedure have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motions on every day on which the consideration of those Rules may be set down by the Government."

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he can give the House any indication when it is proposed to set down the new Rules for consideration?

MR. W. H. SMITH: Immediately the House has disposed of the Address, or perhaps before.

MOTIONS.

METROPOLITAN OPEN SPACES ACT (1881) EXTENSION BILL.

On Motion of Sir John Lubbock, Bill for extending certain provisions of "The Metropolitan Open Spaces Act, 1881," with amendments to urban sanitary districts throughout England and Wales, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Dalrymple, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Houldsworth, Mr. Reid, Sir Albert Rollit, and Mr. Salt.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 171.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (SIMULTANEOUS VOTING) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. H. F. Beaumont, Bill to provide that Parliamentary Elections in England and Wales be held on the same day, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. H. F. Beaumont, Sir John St. Aubyn, and Mr. Craven.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 172.]

MUNICIPAL RATES ASSESSMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Rowntree, Bill to make provision for the making, assessment, and collection of Municipal Rates, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Dodds, Sir Albert Rollit, and Mr. Craig.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 173.]

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 17*th February*, 1887.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Law of Evidence Amendment* (23); Justices' Jurisdiction (24).
Report—Appellate Jurisdiction * (15-25).

RESIGNATION OF THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

THE EARL OF **DUNRAVEN**: My Lords, I am anxious to make some statement in the way of personal explanation, and as this is the first opportunity I have to do so, I would ask your Lordships to be kind enough to grant me your indulgence for a short time. My Lords, I am particularly anxious to ask for that indulgence; because I believe what I have to do is unusual and, I believe I shall be right in saying, unprecedented. But, my Lords, the position which I am in is somewhat unusual also. As a general rule, when a subordinate Member of a Government finds it incumbent upon him to resign his appointment he is enabled in the course of a few days, or as soon as is practicable, to give a personal explanation of his motives by speaking on some Bill or some Motion before the House. But my Lords, as some of the strongest motives which influenced me are connected with questions which never come before this House, and cannot come before this House, it is obvious that I should never in this respect have any opportunity of explaining myself to your Lordships. My Lords, I am painfully aware that, in taking this course, I may lay myself open to the imputation of desiring to make much of a matter which practically speaking concerns myself alone; but I am sure your Lordships will believe me when I say that this is not the case. Could I have received an opportunity of explaining myself to the House in the ordinary course, I should have adopted that means of making a personal explanation to the House; because I am sure your Lordships will sympathize with me when I say that I am anxious to give some explanation of my motives to that branch of the Legislature in which I have the honour to sit. As regards the Department in which I had the honour to serve Her Majesty, it is probable that the points on which I differed from the policy of my colleagues in Her Majesty's Government will come before your Lordships' House, and therefore I will say but little about them. I took an opportunity, my Lords, after resigning, to state that I had not resigned my appointment on any matter connected with Colonial policy, and I wish to repeat that statement. There is no question connected with the Colonial policy which Her Majesty's Government has pursued, which in my opinion would in itself have justified me in resigning my office, and I was anxious there should be no misunderstanding on this point; because it occurred to me that it was possible in view of difficulties connected with differences between ourselves and the United States in connection with the Fishery question and between Canada and the United States—I thought it would be possible that my resignation might have given rise to false impressions that I differed in any way from the course which Her Majesty's Government has pursued with regard to matters in dispute between the United States and Canada. My Lords, as that is not the case, I am very anxious to avoid the possibility of stultifying myself in the future. If I had to criticize the Colonial policy of Her Majesty's Government in the future, I do not wish it even to appear as if I were indulging in captious criticism of Her Majesty's Government. Therefore, I wish to say that on some matters, and on one matter in particular, I do not approve; but I very much disapprove of the action taken by Her Majesty's Government—action which I did not anticipate would be taken on the question of the Fisheries in Newfoundland. The action of Her Majesty's Government here towards the Legislature of Newfoundland will probably come before your Lordships' House; and, when it does, I may, if necessary, take further opportunity of speaking upon that subject. I only wish to say that, upon that point, as well as upon some other points, I did not find myself in accord with the Colonial policy of Her Majesty's Government; but, at the same time, I did not differ in any respect sufficiently, in my mind, to justify me in resigning my appointment exclusively upon the question of Colonial Policy. My Lords, there is another subject—I might almost say a group of subjects—likely to come before the House, and these are matters connected with Ireland. It would be impossible for me to pretend that I view with complete satisfaction the action of the Government—the action of the Executive in Ireland. My Lords, I saw with regret—with great regret—that Her Majesty's Government had found it necessary, or would find it necessary, to apply to Parliament for additional powers for exceptional legislation in regard to Ireland. I regret it, because, in my opinion, if by any possibility Ireland could have been governed, and the law maintained, and law-abiding people protected in their rights, without asking Parliament for exceptional legislation, the vexed question of that Union would have been practically set at rest. The only justification that I can see for Liberal Separatists confusing their sense of right and wrong in the matter, is that there is any ground for the belief that it is impossible for the inhabitants of Great Britain and Ireland to govern Ireland. We all know that it is the whole aim and object of agitators in Ireland, and still more of agitators in the United States, to make it impossible for this Parliament to govern Ireland. I do not propose to criticize, in any way, the wisdom of the determination at which Her Majesty's Government have arrived. The main point is, that order shall be maintained in Ireland; that law-abiding people shall be protected in Ireland; and if Her Majesty's Government should find it necessary to obtain additional powers, there can be no doubt Parliament will readily grant these powers to them. At the same time, I regret that the necessity has arisen; and I believe that the necessity might have been avoided. I confess I do not understand the methods which Her Majesty's Government have employed. We heard the other night, in this House, a very interesting and instructive conversation on the subject of the refusal of the Mayor and Corporation of Limerick to pay their debts to the Government. The noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Fitzgerald)—to whom I readily defer on Irish matters—stated that, in his opinion, the proper course for the Government of the day, that of the noble Earl (Earl Spencer) to pursue was that which he did pursue—namely, to ask for additional legislation, in order to enable him to enforce his demand. With all due deference to the noble and learned Lord, in my opinion, that is not the way in which matters should be conducted in Ireland. A demand was made by the Executive. They must have known that demand would be refused by the Mayor and Corporation of Limerick. Therefore, it ought never to have been made, or it should have been made with a fixed determination to enforce it by the powers the Executive then had. That is to say, the demand should not have been made, or, in default of the demand being acceded to, the Executive should have put the Mayor and Corporation of Limerick in prison. The proper course for the Executive would have been to put them in prison, and then to have come to Parliament for legislation, in order to avoid such a catastrophe in future. It is the principle involved in that view that has brought the law into disrepute in Ireland; it is the principle of making demands which are not carried out; the principle of taking action in matters and not pushing that action to its logical conclusion and to the bitter end. I confess I do not understand how the maintenance of law and order in Ireland will be in any way made easier by the appointment, as High Sheriff of the County of Wexford, of the man who has made himself prominent by identifying himself with a combination which Her Majesty's Government have pronounced to be an illegal conspiracy. I do not see how the cause of the Union will be strengthened in Ireland by appointing as High Sheriff a noted Separatist and Nationalist, who will be assisted by a Nationalist sub-Sheriff, and who will be supported by a still more noted Separatist as foreman of the grand jury. These things to me are mysteries; and I can only bow to the superior, and I may call it inscrutable, wisdom of the noble and learned lord the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. Law is not respected in Ireland; and why? Not because of the origin of the law, not because of any foolish and absurd nonsense as to the foreign origin of the law, or as to the nature of the law, but simply and solely because the law is not carried out. I do most sincerely and earnestly hope that Her Majesty's Government, pending the time when they receive the further powers they require, will rigidly enforce the law as it now exists. I hope when they obtain the additional powers they want, they will bear in mind that it is of no use giving them additional powers unless they try to use them. If a man will not strike with a short sword there is no use in giving him a longer sword; it is strength of arm that is required, and not increased scope to the weapon. I believe that one ounce of law, promptly and fairly administered in Ireland, is worth a ton of law set in motion after long delays, carried out with too much deliberation, and executed by officers of an inquisitive and an inquiring turn of mind. These are matters which may come before us, and about which I may in future have more to say. But the main point which influenced me is one which does not come before this House; and that is the question of economy. The Estimates are not discussed in this House; and, practically speaking, there is no opportunity of expressing any opinions upon them. I may be told that therefore this is a matter which does not concern us, and that I, personally, have got nothing to do with it; but the question of the expenditure of the country is one so important that it must be interesting to every Member of either branch of the Legislature of this country. I believe that a great deal of saving may be made in our public Departments by increased efficiency and better management; I believe it is generally admitted, on all sides, that such may be the case; and I believe, further, that no inquiry, however searching it may appear to be, will produce any good and practical result unless it is preceded by a firm determination on the part of the Government to make retrenchment a living thing. I believe that, in order to effect retrenchment, the positive cutting down of expenses to a certain extent must be a preliminary to any such thorough overhauling of the great public Departments as will result in a real saving of expenses, and in a practical and sensible remission of the taxation of the country. After all, it is in public as in private life—the management of a large property or household is very much in miniature what the business of this country, or of any country, is. It has come to my knowledge, and has possibly come to the notice of some of your Lordships, that, owing to the depression in agriculture and other causes, people are sometimes bound to curtail their expenses; but I never knew a case in which a man anxious to economize succeeded in effecting a large economy by going to those responsible for different Departments, and asking them to be kind enough to make some little economy if they could, this year or next year, or some time or other. Such a method of proceeding generally results in your being told that, after all, very little saving can be made, and that if it is made it will only result in the necessity for greater expenditure in the future. But I have very often seen, when a determination has been come to that expense shall be curtailed—of course, in a reasonable way, and to a reasonable amount—that then, by better management, and by a firm and rigid economy, a saving has been made, not only without detriment, but with positive advantage to different departments of the property or estate. I believe it is precisely the same thing in the public affairs of this country. I believe that, until the Government address themselves to the question whether the nation gets full value for its money, and whether the condition of the world is sufficient to justify the abnormal and unnatural extent to which the Expenditure has swelled—until the Government address themselves to those subjects with the determination to make an attempt—a reasonable attempt—to cut down the Estimates—we shall never see any practical financial reform, and we never shall see any thorough economy practised in the great Departments of the State. I think your Lordships will bear me out, when I say that I believe I have never shown myself unmindful of the honour of England or careless of the interests of the country. I have not had many opportunities, and I have not any great power of making use of them; but as far as I have had opportunity, I have always done what in me lay to explain to my countrymen the vast importance of the Empire to them, and the necessity of maintaining and safeguarding it; and I do not think that I can be fairly accused of any remissness in that respect. But I cannot see that, at the present time, any of the great or vital interests of the Empire are menaced, or at stake. I remember that the circumstance which arose to enable me to overcome my natural timidity with regard to addressing your Lordships was when the state of affairs in this country was extremely critical, and when, as I thought, the unpatriotic attitude of the Opposition, on which side of the House I then sat, tended to precipitate this country into war. I can see nothing whatever now which approaches the condition of things that existed then in 1878. My Lords, I am aware that the late Chancellor of the Exchequer has received a great deal of abuse, on the ground that he had resigned his high position solely because he desired that sums of money voted for the express purpose should not be expended in fortifying our coaling stations. I only allude to that, because no human being could have given a stronger denial than the late Chancellor of the Exchequer did in the other House of Parliament. But after he had done so, an attack was made upon him precisely on the same ground. He distinctly stated that he resigned on the question whether there was, or was not to be, retrenchment, and not on the question of the coaling stations. I believe that great harm will be done by narrowing down what, after all, whatever view your Lordships may take of it, you must allow is a great and important question to a very small and a very false issue; and a very great reaction will take place in the minds and feeling of the people of this country when they find out how completely one of the greatest issues that can be put before them has been narrowed down, and that they have been misled on the subject. I believe strongly in the old Tory doctrine that a British Government should concentrate its attention on maintaining our Colonies, defending our position at home, and safeguarding and protecting our commerce. Outside the sphere of the British Empire our foreign policy ought to approach as near as possible to non-intervention; and, if these old Tory doctrines are carried out, I cannot see any reason why the expenditure of this country on its military forces should continue in abnormal condition. During the last few years the whole tendency has been for the Estimates to rise, and they never drop. Whenever there is a war, or a rumour of war, or anything that is abnormal in the aspect of affairs, the Estimates go up with an elasticity and a rapidity that proceeds by leaps and bounds, but unfortunately that elasticity of expenditure is never shared by the Revenue. The Estimates never come down again. The abnormal level of expenditure in one year becomes the normal level of another year; and if some strong check is not applied to this process, it is difficult to see where matters are to end. We have seen one Chancellor of the Exchequer sacrifice himself on what he calls the altar of economy. We do not see that the manner in which he has been treated by the Press will give much encouragement to other Chancellors of the Exchequer to sacrifice themselves on the same altar. But the present Chancellor of the Exchequer is very deeply pledged in that direction, and it would not be surprising if he finds himself compelled to follow the example of his Predecessor. I remember, about a year ago, an important speech in which the present Chancellor of the Exchequer said it was necessary to exercise a ferocious guardianship over the public purse. The right hon. Gentleman has now got charge of the public purse, and he will have to exercise a ferocious guardianship over it. And if he does exercise that ferocity, it appears to me that one of two things will happen; either we shall see a large reduction of expenditure, at which we shall all rejoice, or we shall have to witness the immolation of another Chancellor of the Exchequer. I do not know how far the series of human sacrifice is likely to go, and I do not wish to obtrude my opinion on the point upon your Lordships; but I would venture to suggest that it would be for the public convenience, and would save a deal of trouble, if the Prime Minister could manage to lay in a store of Chancellors of the Exchequer, whether of home-make or of foreign importation, in order to fill up the vacancies that are likely to arise. There is only one other point to which I wish to refer. The principal motive which influenced me in my resignation was economy. The Tory Party were once the practical guardians of the principles of economy. I confess that I am tired of hearing men out of Office thundering about economy, and when in Office barely whispering about it. I have heard others denounce, and I myself have denounced, and justly denounced, the Radical Party for the wild and rash extravagance of Mr.

Gladstone's Administration. I think it is time that the Tory Party began to put in practice that which they have preached. I cannot see why it is impossible that it should do so now, and if it be possible by any means to do so, it is time that the Tory Party made it plain to the people that economy, financial reform, and retrenchment are not with them mere words used for electioneering purposes, but are real living principles to be carried out. The other principles which I hope to see embodied in legislation before long are principles which should find expression in a practical large Bill, enabling labourers and others to obtain allotments and in a liberal, broad, and comprehensive measure of county government, placing county government on a broad representative basis. I am aware that such measures are sometimes designated as Radical measures. In my opinion, they are exactly the opposite—are exactly the negation of Radicalism. Radicalism tends to overturn and destroy the existing institutions of the country, and to upset the existing structure of society. The Tory principle, as I take it, is to maintain the great institutions of the country, and in order to maintain them, to maintain the existing order of society on which those institutions rest. I believe that can only be done by relieving the various orders which form our society from the trammels of what once were privileges, but which have ceased to be privileges and exclusive advantages; and by so doing to give their just weight to all classes, and more especially to enable the territorial aristocracy of this country to exercise the great influence which, free from prejudices and privileges, they can exercise over the whole mass of their fellow-countrymen. The reason why I ardently hope that these principles will be carried out is because I believe they are necessary for the healthy continuance, and for the strength of the Tory Party; and I believe that the maintenance of the Union depends entirely on the strength of the Tory Party. I am aware that the late Chancellor of the Exchequer has been much abused for some metaphorical remarks that he made about the Unionist Liberals. I will not insult my noble Friends on the other side by supposing that they are so hysterical and so thin-skinned as to be offended at being likened to a crutch. They do not object to being called Whigs. Wigs are not very ornamental, and are mostly used by coachmen, whereas a crutch is a very useful article. I do not wish to utter a word against the Liberal Unionists, but this I do say most emphatically, that I think a great principle—a principle absolutely vital to the future welfare of this country and the British Empire—like that of the Union, is in a most unsatisfactory and precarious condition when it depends upon coalitions and alliances. Coalitions never, or but very rarely, last very long. Alliances may depend upon death, they may be affected by individuals of great personal influence being removed from one branch of the Legislature to the other. They depend upon a great variety of accidents and incidents to which human nature is liable. And I am sure that no individual who has the principle of the Union at heart will object to me when I say that I hope to see the time when that great principle will be safe in the hands of the Tory Party, even if those hands are not upheld by the Unionist Liberals. It is for that reason that I think it is of such vast importance at the present moment to see the great principle of economy put in practice—to see larger numbers of the people made directly interested in the land, and to see the local government of the country made representative and popular, and to see legislation designed for the benefit of the people. It is because I believe that unless the Tory Party can now strengthen themselves, strengthen their position by resting themselves on the respect and affection of the people—unless they are able to do that, I fear that the great and vital principle of the Union of the United Kingdom will not be able to maintain itself in the future. My Lords, I am afraid I have taken up your Lordships' time longer than I ought to have done in such a case. Your Lordships will understand why I wish to say something for myself in this House, in which I have the honour to sit. I wish to avoid a piecemeal explanation of the motives for my resignation. I am anxious to avoid the appearance even of cavilling at the Government, and I therefore preferred to enter into as full an explanation as is open to me instead of taking opportunities as they may occur. I fear that I am liable to be misrepresented in this matter, and to appear as if I wanted to make a thing of importance out of a matter only personal to myself. I am sure your Lordships will absolve me from any idea of that kind, and will simply understand why it is that I wish to give some explanation of my motives. I thank your Lordships very much for the attention you have given to me.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (The MARQUESS OF SALISBURY): My Lords, out of courtesy, I rise to say a few words in answer to my noble Friend's speech, which, I think, he has designated somewhat strangely, when he called it "a personal explanation." His speech involves a great many other things which would have been very interesting and fit subjects for discussion in this House, and which I hope, at some future time, he will enable us to discuss in a regular and more definite manner. I confess that I was as much at a loss at the end of my noble Friend's explanation as I was at the beginning of it to understand the reasons for which he has resigned. He appears to have objected to our Irish policy, but I cannot understand the points of his objections. At least, he says, we ought to have enforced the law; but he does not tell us in what respect the law has not been enforced. For the rest of his speech, it showed a capacity for thought-reading which will be of very great value to him in the future. He has resigned, as I understand, partly because he doubted our foreign policy, and because he disapproved of the Estimates; and he covers himself with the example of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. It is fair, however, to the late Chancellor of the Exchequer to say that he saw the Estimates to which he objected; but my noble Friend has not seen them. It is also fair to the late Chancellor of the Exchequer to say that, if he took exception to our legislation, he had, at all events, seen the first draft of it, which my noble Friend had not. The noble Lord the late Chancellor of the Exchequer took exception to some points of our foreign policy, and so does my noble Friend; but I am not aware that my noble Friend knows anything of it beyond thought-reading. I can only say I very much regret that my noble Friend has deprived us of the great value of his support, but it is to be hoped that he will devote himself to the question of economy, which, I agree with him, is admittedly one of the greatest importance. But I doubt whether it can be dealt with on the principle of Jedburgh justice—that is to say, by condemning and cutting down the Estimates first and examining into their items afterwards. The only method and hope for economy is by careful examination of the items of expenditure, and the objects to which they are devoted. In the hope that a careful scrutiny in this way will diminish the force of the arguments which fell from my noble Friend, as well as a burden which no one is more anxious to diminish than Her Majesty's Government; I accept my noble Friend's parallel as to private life, for I am sure that neither in public, nor in private life, will any wholesome economy be effected by cutting off a sum arbitrarily without inquiring into what effect that economy will have, or to what items it is directed.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL.

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

(NO. 15.) REPORT.

Amendment *reported* (according to Order).

LORD DENMAN said, it must be recollected by their Lordships that formerly an ecclesiastic often occupied the Woolsack, and that the term "Lay Peers" applied to all other Lords. In the case of Bradlaugh *v.* the Queen, if the noble and learned Lord (Lord Halsbury) had been a Peer, instead of counsel, in the case, his opinion would have made the numbers on each side equal; and if the noble and learned Baron (Baron Bramwell) had given his judgment in their Lordships' House, instead of in the Court of Appeal—always counting the vote of himself (Lord Denman) —the appeal must have been dismissed. He had expressed before his regret that the Attorney General (Sir Henry James) and the Solicitor General (Sir Farrer Herschell) had given their opinion that Mr. Bradlaugh was entitled to affirm—as it was, he had paid his fines—but he (Lord Denman) thought it of importance that a lecturer against religion should not be allowed to affirm, instead of to swear the oath of allegiance. Ministers of the Churches of England and Scotland were liable to a fine of £500 a-day if they sat and voted as Members of Parliament, the proof of their ministry being that they had officiated in the service of each of those Churches. He believed that Lord Blackburn's judgment was right; and Sir Theodore Martin brought about the action of maintenance against Mr. Newdegate, founded on the above appeal was wrong. He would ask their Lordships' attention to what had been said on the Resolution, by the House of Lords, for the establishment of the Union with Ireland, by the Marquess of Lansdowne in 1799. That noble Lord, great grandfather of the present Marquess, said—

> "The question is not what religion you shall have, but whether you shall be permitted to have any. It is not whether this or that religion shall be destroyed, but whether all religion shall be destroyed. Under this situation of things, every good man is called upon to join the standard of Jesus Christ—to keep the religion of Jesus Christ; any religion is better than none; at all events, unite to oppose and keep from entering among you those who have no religion, and who are enemies to all."—(*Parl. Hist.* [34] 677-8.)

He (Lord Denman) wished to maintain the opinion he had given on a former occasion—that Lay Peers, hearing the whole of a case, might sit and vote.

Amendment *moved*, to insert the following new clause after Clause 4—

> "The expression 'high judicial office' as defined in the 25th section of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, shall be deemed to include the office of a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary and the office of a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council."

THE EARL OF SELBORNE, who had a similar Amendment to propose, assented to that of his noble and learned Friend.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Further Amendments made; Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow;* and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 25.)

LAW OF EVIDENCE AMENDMENT BILL.

[H.L.] (NO. 23.)

A Bill further to amend the law of evidence: And

JUSTICES' JURISDICTION BILL [H.L.]

(NO. 24.)

A Bill to extend the jurisdiction of justices in general and quarter sessions of the peace—Were *presented* by The Lord Bramwell; read 1ª.

House adjourned at a quarter past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 17*th February*, 1887.

MINUTES.]—NEW MEMBER SWORN—Charles Edward Lewis, esquire, *for* the North Antrim Division of the County of Antrim.

PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*) — *Second Reading* — Ambleside Railway.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered—First Reading*—Petty Sessions Districts Boundaries (Ireland) * [174].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

——o——

AMBLESIDE RAILWAY BILL (*by Order*).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I have placed an Amendment on the Paper for the rejection of this Bill. I had expected that the hon. Member in charge of it would have offered some explanation of its necessity, but he has not thought fit to do so. Now, Sir, I ask the House to reject the Bill on two grounds—first, that it is not needed; and, secondly, that it will inflict an irreparable injury on the scenery of one of the most beautiful parts of England. I quite admit that considerations of the picturesque beauty of scenery must have their limits, and that there may be cases where it becomes necessary to sacrifice our love of scenery where substantial benefit is to be conferred upon the public, and that the public benefit must be secured even at the cost of injuring the natural beauties of the district. The St. Gothard Railway, for instance, has destroyed the charm of some of the most beautiful parts of the Valley of the Renn and of Val Levantina, but here the interests of Italy, Germany, and Switzerland were so great that the mischief had to be faced and endured. So the Highland Railway has ruined the pass of Killiecrankie; but a railway to the North of Scotland was needed, and possibly no other route could have been found. But my contention is that in this case no such benefit would be bestowed as that which was conferred on the public by the making of the Highland Railway; but that, on the contrary, the construction of this railway will inflict irreparable injury upon the scenery of the beautiful region through which it is proposed to carry it, without any public advantage at all. I quite admit that considerations of scenery—or, if hon. Gentlemen choose to call it so, considerations of sentiment—must give way when a large and appreciable public benefit is to be conferred; but my case in regard to this Bill is that there is no substantial benefit whatever to be conferred by it; but, on the contrary, public annoyance and wanton encroachment. What are the benefits which are alleged by the promoters of the Bill? What good will be conferred upon the people of the district by the making of the line? The district is a tourist district, and in consequence there is no traffic during nine months of the year. The only traffic which could make a railway like this pay would be a tourist traffic during the three summer months. Therefore, there is no case for the Bill so far as the permanent interests of the inhabitants are concerned. The best proof of that is that the Kendal and Windermere Railway, which runs by means of a junction with the main line of the London and North-Western Railway Company at Oxenholme through Kendal to Windermere, has not been a successful line, although the population served by it is much larger than that which will be served by the proposed line, which is, in fact, a continuation of the Kendal and Windermere Railway. It is quite clear, therefore, that this line is one which is even less likely to pay a dividend. We are told that the railway will develop the industries of the district. That is an argument which this House would be disposed to pay some regard to, if it were to turn out that there was anything in it; but I shall, I think, be able to show the House that there is absolutely nothing at all in it. It is a district in which there is no important industry, and no hope of it; in fact, the district is purely pastoral and agricultural. The reasons circulated among Members by the promoters of the Bill for the making of the railway assert that there are manufactories at Troutbeck—for instance, a bobbin mill, gasworks at Ambleside, and also numerous surrounding populations to be served at Hawkshead, Elter Water, and elsewhere. I think this statement is somewhat disingenuous on the part of the promoters of the Bill, because they have entirely ignored the fact that there is already a railroad in the district which supplies all that is wanted in that direction. Indeed, it is somewhat remarkable how many railways there are which give an entrance on every side of the Lake District to the region where the most beautiful scenery begins; and this, I think, is as it ought to be. Troutbeck is only two miles from the Windermere Station of the Kendal and Windermere Railway; and there can be no particular hardship in the Troutbeck bobbin mills having to send their goods to a railway two miles off. Elter Water is only five miles from a station which already exists at Coniston, and it is four miles from Ambleside; practically, therefore, the people of that neighbourhood have as good an access to railroad accommodation as they can obtain by going to Ambleside and Windermere. As regards Hawkshead, that town also is much nearer Coniston than Ambleside. It is only three miles from Coniston, five from Ambleside Station, and it is four miles from Windermere; so that, in point of fact, the people of Hawkshead have better railway accommodation than they would get if this railway were made to Ambleside from Windermere, so the Langdales are nearer to Coniston Station than to Ambleside. These facts will, I think, entirely dispose, as hon. Members will see, of the allegations contained in the Paper which has been supplied to them as to the necessity of making the line for the development of the industries of the district. I have shown that in every case except in regard to Ambleside itself there is railway accommodation near, or nearer than the station at Ambleside would give. In point of fact, the only industry left that requires the making of this railroad is the gasworks at Ambleside, which wants to get its coals cheaper. We are also told that it would have the effect of enabling the publicans of Ambleside to pay less for the carriage of their beer. These, therefore, are the so-called industrial reasons for the making of this line. Although there is at present no railroad communication to Ambleside, there are plenty of other means of communication. [Mr. J. W. LOWTHER: No.] The railroad at present comes to the station at Windermere immediately above Windermere Lake; and from that station there is a service of coaches and omnibuses running to Ambleside. There is also a steamboat service on the Lake; and I believe the fare is only 9*d.* for the whole distance from Bowness to Ambleside. There is a constant and regular service in the summer months, although not so frequent or regular in the winter. Indeed, there are few places so well-off in regard to road and steamboat accommodation, and which less require railroad communication. As regards the Lake District generally, any hon. Member who looks at the map will find that there are a number of railways approaching it on every side. The London and North-Western Railway runs along the east side with numerous branches. The Furness Railway has various branches on the south side. The Whitehaven Railway serves the district in the west. These lines set people down on the edge of the Lake country, which I have stated is exactly what they ought to do; while the Penrith, Keswick, and Cockermouth Railway carries them through the middle, perhaps a more doubtful benefit. Of course, it is for the benefit both of the tourists and the locality that a railroad should be made up to the point where the scenery begins to be fine; but if it were carried further it would spoil the scenery itself. The best proof that the communications which now exist are ample, and that there is no great passenger traffic to be served, is to be found in the fact that the London and North-Western Railway Company are opposing the Bill. The London and North-Western Railway Company, as a Railway Company, would make a profit if there was any chance of a profit being realized, because it is that Company which would carry the additional passengers from Kendal to Windermere. Therefore, if this scheme were likely to be profitable, the London and North-Western Railway Company would assist it, instead of which the London and North-Western Railway Company are, as I understand, substantially hostile to the Bill. Petitions have been presented in favour of the Bill from Ambleside; but that is only a small town, containing about 2,000 inhabitants; and I am informed that a great many of the Petitions have been signed by boys and girls. [Mr. J. W. LOWTHER: No.] Hon. Members well know how easy it is for active agents to pick up signatures to a Petition of this kind. In the most populous parts of the district—namely, Windermere and Bowness—the inhabitants are opposed to the Bill. The only other population is to be found at Hawkshead and Elter Water; but I have told the House that those places are already better served by the railway communication which already exists, *viâ* Coniston, than they would be by Ambleside. As a matter of fact, this is a line purely promoted by contractors. It is a contractor's and innkeeper's scheme, and it has no substantial support from the best part of the local population of the district. At a meeting which was held at Ambleside in support of the Bill only one local landowner could be induced to appear and speak in its favour, and the only other persons who appeared on the platform were Sir Charles Fox, the engineer, and Mr. Nelson, the solicitor. The House will naturally ask what particular harm this railway will do? I think it is enough to say that it will simply destroy the charms of the scenery of one of the most beautiful parts of our country. The line will have to be made over a tract of undulating ground by means of cuttings and embankments, and it will pass across two beautiful valleys, which it will cross by means of viaducts and bridges. It will also destroy many of the public footpaths which now exist. [Mr. J. W. LOWTHER: No, no!] The hon. Gentleman need not say "No, no!" because what I am stating is the fact. It will interfere with public footpaths leading to the hills from the Lake, and will destroy the copses and woodlands. Persons who are now able to enjoy the scenery will be deprived of the ancient footpaths, by means of which they are enabled to climb the hills; and the Bill will work all this destruction to the beauty of the scenery in order that people may be carried to Ambleside for 6*d.* less, and a saving of half-an-hour of time. The railway will, moreover, carry them along a line from which it is impossible to see the loveliness of Windermere. The promoters say it will be possible to see Lake Windermere out of the railway carriage; but that is somewhat inconsistent with their other case, that it will be impossible to see the railway from Windermere. The fact is that the railway, though it will afford no continuous view of the landscape from its line, will be in view from the Lake at so many points and in so obtrusively disagreeable a way as to destroy the peculiar charms which the scenery now possesses. No doubt, I shall be told that this is all sentiment. I am quite prepared to be told that, and do not, in the least, regard what is meant to be a sneer. If a regard for the beauty of scenery be sentiment, then sentiment is a good thing. It is a good thing that people should value the beauties of their country. It is a good thing that they should be able to go somewhere to enjoy Nature, and enjoy it in peace and quiet. It is desirable that they should have a perfect and complete change from the surroundings in which they live during the rest of their lives. Is it contended that the untouched nature of the Lake country would be improved by the introduction of railway engines and steam, by the construction of brick viaducts, spoil heaps, and straight embankments? Is it desirable that for the sound of sheep-bells, murmuring brooks, and waterfalls, there should be substituted the shriek of the locomotive and the clatter of the train? There is already plenty of that in Lancashire, and when the people of Lancashire want to get rid of their own surroundings they go to the Lake Country for quiet and enjoyment. It would appear that the promoters of the Bill want to import the scenery of Bolton, Wigan, and Clapham Junction into the most delightful retreat in England. If this kind of legislation is to be carried out there will soon be no scrap of country left to show those who come after us what England was like 100 years ago. The fortune of the Lake Country is its beauty. It depends upon the charms of its scenery for its attraction, and its scenery has secured for its people exceptional prosperity. Those are certainly its worst friends who endeavour to destroy what has hitherto constituted its charm. It is a very small district, and its beauty is beauty in miniature. If you destroy that exquisite combination of beauties, delicate and singularly harmonized beauties, which Nature seems to have here laboured consciously to produce, blending into a perfect whole all the elements of form and colour which have power to touch the eye and awaken the imagination, you will destroy what never can be replaced, and the loss of which will be a loss to the whole life and mind of our people. I feel the less hesitation in urging this so-called sentimental views, because it is generally entertained by the masses of the people. I should like to add that since Notice of opposition was given to this Bill I have received abundant evidence of the existence of this feeling, not only from Lancashire and Yorkshire, but even from the manufacturing districts of Yorkshire, Northumberland, and Durham. The people in those localities feel the greatest interest in the preservation of this piece of scenery. They want to go to the Lake Country; but they do not want to be carried by a railway through the Lake country. Many hon. Members who have country houses have parks surrounding them. They are glad to have a railway made near to the gate of their park; but they have no desire that a railway should run through the park itself. Now, the people look upon the Lake District as their national park, and they desire to preserve it. They desire to reach it easily—as they can now do—but not to be hurried through it inside a railway carriage, still less to see it robbed of those very beauties which have drawn them to it. Even supposing that a majority of the residents were in favour of making this railway, I should maintain that the residents are not the only people in the Three Kingdoms who have to be considered. We might as well say that the only people to be considered in determining what is to be done with Hyde Park are the people who live in the Edgware Road and Park Lane. Hyde Park is an object of concern to the whole of the people of London, and the Lake District belongs to the whole of England, and especially to the North of England. It is the recreation ground of the people who go there to enjoy their holidays. Members of this House can afford to take a trip to Norway or Switzerland; but many millions of their countrymen who cannot afford to go to Norway and Switzerland desire to enjoy the one piece of scenery it is possible for them to get at; and you would be doing them the worst service you could do them if you endeavoured to destroy that scenery. Bring them there by all means; give them every facility to get there; but do not destroy the place they go to see. There are persons all over the English-speaking world who entertain great respect and affection for the Lake Country. It has been hallowed by the genius of some of our greatest poets; and when visitors come from the Colonies and America to see the Lake Country, they do honour there to the memory of Wordsworth and other illustrious men with whose names the Lake Country is associated, they desire to see the country such as it was in the days when the presence of those men made it famous. Are we to show ourselves less sensitive to the value of natural beauty than the people of California, who have set apart their Yosemite Valley to be kept sacred from the intrusion of railways? The people of New York have, at immense cost, removed all the obstacles which prevent a full view from being obtained of the Falls of Niagara. Are we to fall behind them by allowing works to be made which will destroy what Nature has bestowed? These are the reasons why I oppose this Bill on the second reading. It is, of course, as a general rule, a sound principle that a Private Bill should be sent to a Committee, and I should not ask the House to depart from that rule now without good reason. The reason why that principle should not be adopted in the present case, but the measure should be dealt with by the whole House, is this—that the people of England, and particularly the people of the manufacturing districts of Lancashire, who have sent up numerous Petitions against the Bill, would have no *locus standi* before a Private Bill Committee. They cannot be heard there; the arguments on which they rely would have no place there, and for this reason we are obliged to ask the House to reject the Bill on the second reading. A Private Bill Committee can only consider questions of finance and engineering matters, and would have no power to go into, nor, indeed, much capacity to consider and decide, the questions which I have respectfully endeavoured to put before the House as the grounds upon which the Bill ought to be rejected. A Committee of four Members is no fit tribunal to determine the issues which this Bill raises, nor could its determination of them command acceptance. It is a small railway, no doubt—only a railway of five miles—which is sought to be made; but the principle involved is a very large one, and the interests of the people involved are also large interests. It is on behalf of the people who desire to retain the full enjoyment of this piece of scenery that I ask the House to reject the Bill. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time on this day six months.

Mr. HOWORTH (Salford, S.): I rise for the purpose of seconding the Amendment. It seems to me that when questions of this kind are submitted to the House, the interests of the people, which are so largely involved in them, should not be excluded from consideration; yet that would be the case if this Bill is read a second time, and referred to a Select Committee. I believe that those who represent important districts in the North of England have been strongly pressed to vote against this Bill. All the representations which have reached me from Lancashire, both from the town populations and from the inhabitants of the rural parts of Lancashire, are distinctly and decidedly against the Bill. The people who live in the crowded towns of Lancashire and Yorkshire, immediately around the Lake District, look upon that district as their great picnicking ground. The Lake is as well known to them as Pall Mall is to hon. Members here. It is because they know it so well, and because it is the only part of England where they can see Nature without such adornments as Rosherville, which appears to be so attractive to other minds, that they desire to preserve it intact. It may be said that the complaint we make is one of sentiment urged by æsthetic people; but what we maintain is that the House ought not only to regard the desires of a small population in the immediate neighbourhood of Windermere, but of the great masses of the people of this country who daily find the area in which Nature can be studied and enjoyed shrinking rapidly. When issues of this kind are raised it seems to me that a different principle from that which is generally employed in support of railway undertakings is evoked. People who are fortunate or unfortunate enough to have possessions which contain objects of interest to the great mass of their countrymen not only have proprietary rights, but are trustees for the people. They have no right to come to this House and ask this House to give them exceptional advantages in the Bill, which has for its object an infringement of wider rights than proprietary rights—namely, the general right of the community to enjoy humanizing scenery. The Americans have recently enclosed a very large tract in one of their States. They have engaged to preserve the Yellowstone District absolutely intact from railways or the other vulgarities of modern life, and to preserve it as a great national park. Wherever a railway is intruded it undoubtedly brings in its wake a great amount of vulgarity; and it is the wish of those who oppose this Bill to preserve, as far as possible, the only area in England where Nature can be seen without modern vulgar embellishment. For these reasons I beg to second the Amendment which has been moved by the hon. Member opposite.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith): As my name is on the back of the Bill, and as I have the honour to represent a constituency immediately contiguous to the district in which it is proposed this railway shall be made, I wish to state briefly why I think the House ought to allow the second reading of the Bill to pass. My complete answer to the hon. Member who moved the rejection of the Bill, when he asserted that there is no industry in the district, and that the vast majority of persons living in the district have no desire to see this railway made, is that yesterday I presented 8 or 10 Petitions from Ambleside itself, and from the neighbouring villages, in favour of the Bill. Those who briefed the hon. Gentleman, and who object to this Bill have not been able to secure, as far as I am aware, one single Petition against the Bill from the district. Now, I maintain that if the inhabitants of a district desire to have a railway in their midst it behoves those who are opposed to such a scheme to make out a very strong case indeed for opposing the line, and I say that the hon. Gentleman has completely failed to make out such a case. The hon. Gentleman talked of the railway destroying the scenery, and he referred to Clapham Junction, as if it were proposed to make a Clapham Junction at a wayside station, such as that at Ambleside would be. The hon. Gentleman must have known that such talk was mere claptrap. I do not know on whose behalf the hon. Gentleman has made his speech this afternoon. It certainly was not on behalf of the inhabitants of the district, because he does not seem to have been in communication with them, or, at all events, with only a very small portion of them; and I do not think that his speech was made on behalf of the great communities of Lancashire and Yorkshire, because, if it had been so, his desire ought rather to have been to bring railway communication to a point which would be the most suitable for them to see the Lake scenery. Instead of that, how does the case stand? Under present arangement, "trippers"—as we call them in Westmoreland—that is to say, the excursionists from Lancashire and Yorkshire, arrive at the Windermere Station, where they are landed high and dry—dry, I may say, in more senses than one. They are landed high up on the side of a hill some five miles distant from where the best of the scenery begins—namely, the head of the Lake. [*Cries of* "Oh!"] Of course, compared with Aberdeenshire and Finsbury Circus, the Members for which, I believe, are opposing this Bill, all the scenery of Westmoreland and Cumberland is beautiful; but what I maintain is that the real beauty of the Lake scenery does not begin until Ambleside is reached. When the "trippers" are landed at Windermere Station they have to make their way to Ambleside by means of a long and dusty road for a good many miles before they can reach Rydal or Grasmere, which are some three or four miles further on than Ambleside. Then, again, if they desire to reach the Lake, they have to go half-a-mile below the station before they can get to the pier at Bowness. In fact, they have actually to go south before they can pick up a steamer to take them from Bowness to Ambleside. If the sole question before us is whether the scenery is likely to be interfered with, that is essentially a question for a Committee upstairs, and a Committee alone can decide it. This House is altogether incompetent to judge whether the construction of the proposed railway will destroy the scenery or not. I have been at some pains to consult the plans and look at the photographs of the district; and, as far as my judgment goes, I think the line has been laid out so as to destroy the scenery, as the hon. Member calls it, to the least possible extent. The hon. Member knows perfectly well that the whole question can be raised before a Committee if he chooses to raise it. Why, Sir, what happened in the case of the Ennerdale Railway Bills in 1883 and 1884? The hon. Gentleman objected to those Bills on precisely the same grounds, and twice he was defeated. The House of Commons, acting upon the principle that it would not exercise its judgment on mere matters of detail, passed the second reading of those Bills; but, at the same time, it accepted, and perhaps not wrongly, the Instruction moved by the hon. Gentleman to the Committee to take into consideration questions dealing with the fact whether the scenery would be spoilt or not. I now invite the House humbly and respectfully to follow the same course as that which it took in 1883 and 1884, and to allow the second reading of the Bill to be taken. It will then be in the power of the hon. Member or any other hon. Member to move an Instruction to the Committee to take into consideration this question of scenery. I, for one, shall not object to any such Instruction being sent to the Committee. There were one or two other matters stated by the hon. Gentleman; but I do not think they are of sufficient importance to justify me in detaining the House upon them. There was, however, one point which he made which I think shows that he has had very little experience of the Rules and Regulations of the House of Commons. The hon. Member said that the London and North-Western Company are opposing the Bill. Of course, they are opposing the Bill, because it gives them a *locus standi* to appear before the Committee in order to obtain terms as to the connection which it will be necessary to make with the Kendal and Windermere Railway at Windermere. The hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Howorth), who seconded the Amendment, referred to the Yellowstone National Park, and gave that as an instance of the way in which the Americans preserve the land for those who desire to use it for holiday purposes. Now, the Yellowstone Park is a complete fraud; because it is a park for rich men only, and not for the poor. I think I am well within the mark when I say that it is 1,000 miles from New York. My contention is that if you continue the existing railway from Windermere to Ambleside you will, at all events, bring into the district those poor inhabitants of Lancashire who desire to see the Lake District. You will enable them to get nearer to the most beautiful parts of the scenery than if you land them at Windermere. On these general principles, which I have attempted to lay before the House, I, therefore, humbly trust the House will allow the second reading of this Bill to pass. It is a Bill which is strongly desired by the vast majority of the inhabitants of the district.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I, like the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Bryce), am of a somewhat sentimental turn; but I must really protest against the false sentimentality contained in the tone of the observations of my hon. Friends. Who are the objectors to this Bill? They are sentimentalists, poets, and æsthetes. Who are those who are the supporters of the Bill? They are the best judges of the matter—namely, the inhabitants of the district. My hon. Friend the Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Bryce) has stated that it is desirable to retain portions of old English scenery free from the disfigurement of railways, as specimens of old England; but what would he say if it were proposed by the inhabitants of London to retain portions of Aberdeen, without an omnibus, without a railway, a tramcar, or anything connected with modern civilization, in order that it might be kept as a specimen of an old Scotch town? My hon. Friend seems to be under the delusion that the introduction of a railway must necessarily destroy the beauty of the scenery. I am sure that my hon. Friend has seen the railways in Savoy, Switzerland, and Italy. Why, the railroad in itself is a beautiful object. I know of nothing more pretty than the viaducts, against which my hon. Friend protests, when we see them either on the Corniche or the St. Gothard Railway. My hon. Friend stated that persons going into the Lake District would object to the shrieking of trains. Well, but the trains will not shriek. Why should trains shriek? There may be steam coming from the engine; but, after all, what is steam? It is only a vapour; and we have heard a good deal about the beauty of clouds. The railway engine will only give out artificial clouds. My hon. Friend alluded to the Yellowstone Park and the Yosemite Valley, and he said that the Americans have converted them into national playgrounds. But the American people have paid for them. I protest against these attacks upon property. Is my hon. Friend prepared to pay for the national playground he is going to establish for the benefit of sentimentalists, poets, and æsthetes? If this playground is to be reserved free from the disfigurement of railways let it be paid for. I sympathize with the "tripper." I know very well that the "tripper" who goes for a day to the Lake District wants to be deposited in the middle of the district, so that he may look about him for a few hours, and then go to his home. I was once a "tripper" myself, and I went down to this district. I was turned loose at Windermere, or Bowness, and I found great difficulty in getting a carriage to carry me on to Ambleside. I forget what I had to pay; but I see from the statement put forth by the promoters that it costs from 3*s.* to 5*s.* to get from Kendal to Ambleside. My hon. Friend scoffs at the opinions of the inhabitants of the district. They are to be entirely sacrificed to gentlemen from Aberdeen and other places who may probably never go there, but who may want to go. He says that the people of Ambleside will only have to pay a little more for their gas if this Bill is rejected. At present they have to pay 3*s.* 6*d.* more for the carriage of their coals. He says there is a bobbin factory which feels aggrieved; but he adds that it is only two miles from the railway. Now, in these days of competition it is absolutely necessary to bring a railroad as near as possible to a manufactory in order to enable it to pay. My hon. Friend says that the Bill ought not to be referred to a Committee upstairs, because in that case the people of England cannot appear before the Committee. Why should the people of England appear before any Committee? The "people of England" is a very vague term, and it is generally made use of by an hon. Gentleman when he merely wants to state his own opinions. My hon. Friend always says—"The people of England are in my favour." Now, I do not pay much attention to this vague impersonality of the people of England. When a district containing—not 2,000 as my hon. Friend asserted—but 7,000 persons wishes to have a railroad to connect it with the rest of England I think it is the best judge of what it wants; and if you want to make any country a playground buy it up. I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill, as I shall in favour of any Railway Bill which may come before this House, because I believe that a railroad means civilization, and the more we have of them the better.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK (Whitehaven): As an old Cumberland Member—I believe technically the oldest Cumberland Member now in this House—I desire to say a few words in support of the second reading of this Bill. Nothing has more surprised me than the remarkable speech of the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Bryce). I do not hesitate to say, for my own part, that I agree with the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) who has just sat down that railways need not involve any interference with the picturesque scenery of a country. On the contrary, I believe they add to the beauty of the scenery instead of detracting from it. I am familiar with the railways in Switzerland, Savoy, and Italy, and also with the railways which now exist in Cumberland itself. When the hon. Gentleman talks about intruding a system of railways into Cumberland, is he aware that there is a railway at this moment at the very foot of Scawfell by way of Eskdale—one of the most beautiful valleys in the whole of England. How is it that he did not oppose that railway or make a protest against it? Is he not also aware that there is a railway running along the shore of Bassenthwaite Lake and another over Shapfells; and does he mean to allege in any reasonable moment that these railways are an interference with the enjoyment of the people? No assertion of that kind would be received by this House. However the sentimental idea may be treated, and whatever weight it may have with the House, I take objection to the hon. Member's speech, on the ground that he told us that there was substantially no support to the Bill except among the people he enumerated. I do not know from whence the hon. Member got his information. On the West Coast of Cumberland there is a large mining population, and that population, almost to a man, is in favour of this project. Within the last few days I have received a considerable number of letters, not only from my own constituency in North-West Cumberland, but also from South-West Cumberland, asking me to give all the support I can to this Bill. At this moment this district, which the hon. Gentleman is so desirous of preserving, is absolutely inaccessible to the working population of West Cumberland. If they desire to visit Ambleside, they have to take the railway which goes to the foot of Scawfell, and from thence they have a weary walk of 14 miles in order to reach the head of Windermere. If this railway is authorized they ought to be able on great holidays to reach Ambleside in three hours, with ample time to enjoy the scenery and return to their homes the same day. There is another point to which I think it absolutely necessary that I should call the attention of the House—namely, the issue of a document called "Reasons against the second reading of the Bill by the Commons Preservation Society." I must say that in so short a space I have never seen reasons put forth so absolutely destitute of foundation. It is surprising to me that the hon. Member for Aberdeen should have identified himself with the Society which has put forward such a series of false accusations as are contained in this document against the Bill. I will not go through the first three or four reasons, because they have already been dealt with by my hon. Friend the Member for Mid Cumberland (Mr. J. W. Lowther); but the last of them, and perhaps the most important, because it bears materially upon this case, states, among other things, that "Parliament has hitherto steadily refused to permit any railway to traverse this district and the four railway schemes have been successively rejected." Now, the truth is that the Ennerdale Bill was twice sent to a Select Committee, and not rejected upon any picturesque or sentimental ideas, nor because it interfered with the enjoyment of the public. The Ennerdale Bill was rejected, not by the House, but by a Committee, because the financial proposals it contained did not meet with the acceptance of the Committee. Therefore, I say it is perfectly monstrous that this so-called "Commons Preservation Society" with whom the hon. Member is connected, and I believe other hon. Members, probably on both sides of the House, should allow such false and misleading statements to be put forth. It is nothing of the sort. The Ennerdale Scheme passed a second reading on two occasions; and, as I have told the House, the Bill was rejected by a Select Committee for other reasons. The hon. Member flatters the working man, and, when it suits him, upholds the great necessity that he should have the opportunity of rational enjoyment. Now, it is on that very ground that I support this Bill. The working man in this part of the country has the British Museum, the Tower of London, and the Brompton Boilers, as the South Kensington Museum is properly called; but in the Lake District there are no exhibitions of the kind. I have not the slightest doubt that it is very disagreeable to some hon. Members on the other side of the House that we should endeavour to do something to assist the working man. I see sitting on the Front Opposition Bench the hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Committees (Mr. Courtney). Before the House consents to reject this Bill, I think it is desirable that the hon. Gentleman should rise in his place and give the House the full benefit of his advice. At this stage I shall certainly give my strenuous support to the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAME GRAHAM (Lanark, N.W.): I ask the indulgence of the House for three or four minutes by that clock while I explain my reasons for opposing this Bill. The whirligig of time has brought with it its revenge in giving me the position of answering the senior Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). I oppose this Bill upon that principle which animates us both, and which animates many other Members of this honourable House, although it rarely extends its influence to the occupants of the Treasury Bench—the true democratic principle—that is to say, I prefer the interests of the greater number of the inhabitants of the country to those of the lesser. That is a principle upon which the whole of this House—Conservative as well as Liberal—is supposed to act, although I must confess that it occasionally nods. I wish to put before the House three reasons why the Bill ought to be rejected. Firstly, it ought to be rejected on utilitarian principles. The hon. Member for Northampton has proved to demonstration, in his own paper, that the railway which it is proposed to construct cannot be a commercial success. Why, then, should we run a railroad into a district where it is not wanted? No one presumes to say that a railroad is beautiful in itself, or desirable except for the advantage of the public, although I know there are those who would be prepared to run a railroad through Westminster Abbey in order to get a more ready access to this Chamber. Taking the artistic view, I think I speak the mind of every artist, of every true Democrat, of every Conservative, in the proper meaning of the word, and of every Englishman who loves his country, when I ask all sides in the House to join in protesting against and rejecting this most unnecessary Bill. I know that the opponents of the Bill have been termed artists, poets, sentimentalists, æsthetes, and selfish people. I am not going to stand up and argue that a mountain may not be improved by the presence of man and of that of woman sometimes; but I protest against robbing the poor of the nation of one of their playgrounds. The time has gone by when, by the permission of the House, and through the agency of some of those processes facetiously called "law," most of the commons has been stolen from that great goose—the British public. I know, Sir, that it is of no use to urge the example of the Yellowstone Park; and, therefore, I shall not proceed to do so. It seems to me that, like the Yellowstone Park, this Ambleside district might be most advantageously bought by the nation, and preserved for the people of our great towns as a Democratic playground. In this country the rich have their enclosed parks, in which the noble owner can walk or commune with his gamekeeper beneath the shadow of the neat white-painted board—"No Trespassers;" but his poorer neighbour can only ramble about his well-flavoured open slum, and saunter between that and the public-house, where refreshment is provided both for his body and soul—for I am even prepared to advance that the poor have souls. I will not ask the House to accompany me very far in a flight of fancy; but I would ask hon. Members to imagine Ambleside when all the pomp and circumstance of glorious commerce shall have descended upon it, when refreshment rooms and shilling teas prevail, and when lads and lasses no longer go a-courting—I do not mention the circumstance as any reflection upon the morality of the district, which I believe stands high, and will compare favourably with that of any other parts of the Kingdom in which the people are equally as well fed, and enjoy the privileges of an Established Church—when lads and lasses no longer go a-courting amongst the groves to the song of the nightingale, but stagger amidst gasometers and scoria, and listen to the dulcet tones of the steam whistle. In conclusion, I would venture to ask the House, irrespective of Party, to show that small portion of humanity outside its walls that they have some sympathy with legislation of a popular character. For these reasons I oppose the second reading of this Bill.

MR. AINSLIE (Lancashire, N. Lonsdale): I support the Bill on behalf of the constituents whom I have the honour to represent, who desire to obtain access to this most beautiful district, and who have presented Petitions in favour of the measure. They object to have the beautiful scenery of the Lake District shut out from the great body of people; and I would remind the hon. Gentleman who has moved the rejection of the Bill that some of the support which is given to the second reading is based upon a desire to get rid of the flooding of people which now takes place at Windermere alone, in order to carry them a little further on, and afford them an opportunity of seeing those beauties of Nature which have been so graphically described by the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Bryce). Well, Sir, are the sentimentalists, who desire to shut up our fells and valleys, and confine them only to the people who inhabit them, to prevent the manufacturing population from visiting them? Do they wish to set a seal on it, and allow no one to get out of it; and do they desire to build up a kind of Chinese wall, which is to prevent access from either side? We invite the whole population of the United Kingdom to enter the district. We have no selfish motives, even against the æsthetic cause they may have at heart. If this railroad is not made, is the district to be converted into a happy hunting ground for the spirits of the poets, æsthetes, and sentimentalists who take such deep interest in its reservation and seclusion? The objections to the Bill seem to emanate entirely from those who have no present business in the district; while the inhabitants who live in the murky cities bordering on the proposed line wish to have an opportunity of getting to Ambleside, but do not at present possess the necessary facilities. I feel that I should fail in the duty I owe to my constituents if I did not give my support to this Bill. Living, as I do, in the midst of this scenery, I am prepared to say that the construction of this railway will in no sense injure the beauty of the Lake Country; and probably I know the locality as intimately as any man who has ever visited it. More than that, the fear I have is that if you do not sanction this railway, you will have the still more objectionable tramways laid down in its place; for the means of communication we must have, and if the House of Commons refuses to give us a railroad we must obtain what we desire by some other means.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE (Bradford, Central): The question before the House has been so fully discussed, that I will promise not to detain hon. Members long. I only rise for the purpose of answering the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck), who has, in strong terms, denounced a Circular issued in opposition to this Bill by the Commons Preservation Society, of which I have the honour to be Chairman. I am fully prepared to maintain substantially the accuracy of every word contained in that Circular, although the right hon. Gentleman only cited one of the various reasons which the Society give for objecting to the Bill. The statement to which the right hon. Gentleman specifically objects is that the Society has, on four occasions, successfully prevented railroads from invading the Lake District. That statement is perfectly true. On every occasion their opposition has been attended with success. Whether in every case the proposal was rejected on the ground of sentiment or from some other cause I am not able to say; but our opposition was in every case successful, and we prevented the railroad proposed from entering the district. I should be very sorry to enter into a controversy with the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) as to what is true or false in sentiment. On numerous occasions an appeal of this kind has been fought in the interests of the public against private interests, and always with success. If the matter were a private matter, dealing only with private rights and interests, I should not have interposed to prevent the Bill going to a Committee; but my experience of Select Committees is that they do not sufficiently regard the interests of the public, and that it is only in this House that the interests of the public are properly maintained. It is on that principle that I have, over and over again, dealt with matters of this kind, and shall do so again whenever they come before us. The hon. Member for Penrith (Mr. Lowther) has put the case very fairly before the House; but his case is that the railway will be a benefit to tourists. Now, would it be better for the tourists to have this railway, or to be without it? Surely, if we are to enter into the consideration of what is for the benefit of tourists, we ought to take a broader view when the interests of tourists are likely, by the construction of a railway, to encroach upon the general interests of the community. That is really the question before the House; and I hope the House will decide, as upon former occasions, by rejecting the Bill.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 189; Noes 177: Majority 12.—(Div. List, No. 10.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read a second time, and *committed*.

QUESTIONS.

BURMAH (UPPER)—THE MILITARY EXPEDITION.

Mr. RICHARD (Merthyr Tydvil) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If he can state how many men have been engaged in the invasion and conquest of Upper Burmah, how many of them have been killed or have died of disease, how many Burmese have been slaughtered, and what amount of money has been hitherto spent on that enterprize?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Sir John Gorst) (Chatham): The number of men engaged in the invasion and conquest of Upper Burmah up to December 31, 1885, was 9,546. Of these, nine were killed in action, one died of wounds received, 78 of disease. Twenty lakhs of rupees were spent on the enterprize. In the operations for the suppression of brigandage and establishment of order that have taken place subsequent to the invasion and conquest, up to December 31, 1886, there have been engaged 31,571 men. Of these, 100 have been killed in action, 31 have died of wounds received, and 967 have died of disease. The mortality has been much aggravated by occasional outbreaks of cholera. The cost of these subsequent operations has been 121½ lakhs. It is impossible to ascertain the number of Burmese villagers who have been slaughtered by dacoits, or the number of the latter who have been killed in resisting the British Forces.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—SLIGO COUNTY.

MR. MULHOLLAND (Londonderry, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that the Chief Land Commissioners have not visited County Sligo for more than a year, for the purpose of hearing appeals, and when they intend to do so?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): It is true that the Chief Commission has not visited Sligo for some time; but I am informed by the Secretary to the Commission that they expect to visit that town again next May.

CELEBRATION OF THE JUBILEE YEAR—THE VOLUNTEERS.

COLONEL LAURIE (Bath) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the Volunteer Force will be afforded an opportunity of taking part in any military review or other celebration in honour of Her Majesty's Jubilee?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): No decision has yet been arrived at as to the holding of a special review in honour of Her Majesty's Jubilee. If a review takes place, the desire of the Volunteer Force to be represented at it will certainly not be lost sight of; and if a similar desire is expressed on behalf of the Yeomanry it will also be borne in mind.

INCOME TAX—THE MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT.

CAPTAIN SELWYN (Cambridge, Wisbeach) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, notwithstanding that, since the coming into operation of "The Married Women's Property Act, 1882," a husband has no legal control over his wife's income, yet he is compelled to pay Income Tax on the joint incomes of himself and his wife, when together they exceed £150, although the separate income of each may be under £150?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. GOSCHEN) (St. George's, Hanover Square), in reply, said, that where the joint incomes of husband and wife came to over £150 they were taxed, the income being treated as the joint income of a family, and not as that of two separate persons lodging together in the same house. The hon. and gallant Member would find that if the husband and wife were to be treated separately, the wife, in the case of the death of her husband, would have to pay Legacy and Succession Duty as a stranger, so that they would gain little by being treated as separate persons.

EGYPT—WAR DECORATIONS TO THE ENGLISH TROOPS.

GENERAL SIR WILLIAM CROSSMAN (Portsmouth) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether His Highness the Khedive of Egypt, whose troops received the English War medal for service in the Nile Expedition, has been invited to confer on the English troops similarly engaged the bronze star conferred by him on the English troops engaged in 1884 in the Eastern Soudan?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): No, Sir; Her Majesty's Government has not invited the Khedive to confer the bronze star on the troops engaged in the Nile Expedition. It is not the practice of Her Majesty's Government to invite the bestowal of decorations by Foreign Potentates on British troops. In the former case the bronze star was conferred by His Highness on his own initiative.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS—RATHDRUM UNION.

MR. W. J. CORBET (Wicklow, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord

Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is a fact that a labourer named Waters, living in Newtown Mount Kennedy, County Wicklow, whose house was certified by the sanitary officer as unfit for human habitation, applied to the Board of Guardians, Rathdrum Union, for a cottage under the Act; whether his application was granted and a cottage built for him amongst others; and, whether the cottage intended in the first instance for Waters was assigned to an *employé* of one of the Guardians?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Local Government Board have submitted a Report from the Clerk of the Union from which it appears that the statement in the first paragraph of the Question is correct. But cottages were built to supply the wants of the locality, and no cottage was intended expressly for any individual. A person employed by one of the Guardians was preferred to Waters as a tenant, because he was living in lodgings. The Local Government Board have no power to interfere with the discretion of the Guardians in the matter.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND) — GREYSTONES, COUNTY WICKLOW.

MR. W. J. CORBET (Wicklow, E.): asked the Secretary to the Treasury, with reference to a memorial submitted on behalf of the people of Greystones, County Wicklow, relative to the harbour works at that place, Whether the Treasury will sanction the expenditure of £1,000, at present in the hands of the Board of Works in connection with Greystones, in excavating a small dock, as recommended in the Memorial, to give employment to the fishermen who are prevented from following their calling regularly owing to the present condition of the harbour?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.): The Board of Public Works have not £1,000 to spare from the amount sanctioned for the harbour at Greystones, as they have in this and all similar cases to meet the charge for a clerk of the works and other incidental expenses from the difference between the amount of the contract and the total amount sanctioned for the execution of the works. They hope, however, in this particular case to be enabled to excavate the small dock recommended by the Memorialists, and have made arrangements for giving effect to the recommendation, as far as is possible, with the funds available.

PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE—INSPECTION OF IRISH RECORDS.

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL (Hackney, S.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether there is any objection, and, if so, what, to the inspection by proper persons of the Irish records now in the Public Record Office of date subsequent to 1769; to what date may such records be inspected; and, whether there are any written or other Rules, and, if so, what, regulating such inspection?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): It has been held by successive Secretaries of State of both Parties that the inspection of certain Irish Papers now in the Record Office would be detrimental to the public interests. It is purely a matter for the discretion of the Secretary of State whether he shall allow access to these records. He is not guided by any written Rules; but solely by what he considers his duty as trustee of confidential documents which have been committed to his charge. The inspection of these records is open to the public up to 1772.

POST OFFICE—INVESTMENTS IN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES OF SMALL SUMS.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that by means of the system of selling, through the Post Office, Government Securities in sums of £10 at a time and upwards, more than £2,500,000 of such Government Securities is now held by about 30,000 persons; and, whether he is willing to extend the system by reducing the £10 minimum investment, so as to bring this mode of investment in the National Securities more within the reach of the working classes, as is the case in France with the French Rentes?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): The question of fixing a minimum amount for investment in Government Securities through the medium of the Post Office Savings Bank was very carefully considered in 1880, when the Savings Bank

Act of that year was passed, and the minimum is fixed by the Act. It was thought that the Savings Bank itself afforded ample facility for the deposit and safe keeping of sums under £10, and that for less than that amount it would not be worth while for an individual to incur the expense of commission chargeable on the purchase and sale of a portion of so small an amount. The interest on a Savings Bank deposit is 2½ per cent; while the interest on a Stock investment at the present time barely reaches 3 per cent. Therefore, on a sum of, say, £9, the Savings Bank would give 4*s.* 6*d.*; and, taking the Government Stock at 3 per cent, the interest would be 5*s.* 5*d.*, while the commission would be 9*d.* Judging by the average amount of each investment, which is about £50, there does not appear to be any demand on the part of the public for a reduction of the minimum; but I shall be glad to consider any representations on the subject.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—ARMY MANUFACTURING ACCOUNTS.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether the balances shown in the Army Manufacturing Accounts are any better than paper balances; and, whether these paper balances are ever checked against actual balances by any auditor or stock-taker, independent of the War Office itself?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter): The balances shown in the Army Manufacturing Accounts are actual balances, and represent Government property actually held by the several Departments. Stock is frequently taken, independently of the Departments concerned, by the accountant and auditor who represent the War Office. There is no audit whatever applied to the accounts and balances in question by any other Department than the War Office; but the question of introducing an audit altogether independent of the War Office is now under consideration.

POST OFFICE — DISTRIBUTION OF TRADE SAMPLES THROUGH THE BELGIAN POST OFFICE.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether he is aware that, owing to existing rates of postage, a manufacturer in the North of England distributes his trade samples throughout the United Kingdom by means of the Belgian Post Office, effecting thereby a considerable saving; and, whether this does not represent a loss of income to the Post Office Authorities here?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): The subject to which the hon. Member refers has already been brought before me, and is now under my consideration. I am, at the present moment, actively engaged in endeavouring to ascertain upon what system a satisfactory Pattern Post can be established without injury to the Revenue, and without affording opportunities for fraud.

COMMISSIONERS OF ENDOWED SCHOOLS (IRELAND)—ABATEMENT OF RENTS.

MR. BIGGAR (Cavan, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether a quorum attended the meeting of Commissioners of Endowed Schools, Ireland, on 13th January, 1887; whether J. J. Berrison, the land agent, was in attendance; whether any of the Commissioners who wrote advising an increased abatement of rent to tenants were present; whether the Board has repeatedly refused the admission of any deputation from the Cavan tenantry; and, whether the Commissioners will now reconsider the matter, and receive a deputation from the tenants at their next meeting?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): No reply has yet been received from the Commissioners, whose stated meeting, it is understood, will be held to-day.

CRIMINAL LUNATIC ASYLUM, DUNDRUM—CASE OF LAMBE.

MR. W. J. CORBET (Wicklow, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been called to a case reported in *The Freeman's Journal* of the 12th instant, in which it is stated that a man named Lambe, recently an inmate of the Criminal Lunatic Asylum at Dundrum—

> "Was punished by administering to him a cold plunge bath, and by solitary confinement;"

whether he is aware that punishment by ducking in a cold bath is frequently resorted to in the Criminal Asylum;

and, whether he will put a stop to this practice?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH (Bristol, W.): The newspaper paragraph referred to mentions that an action arising out of this case is pending, and will be heard at the approaching Quarter Sessions at Kilmainham. This being so, it would be obviously improper to enter into any discussion of its merits. But I understand that this punishment, under careful regulations, has been sanctioned in the Asylum since its opening.

POST OFFICE—MONEY ORDER OFFICE REMITTANCES FROM AUSTRALIA.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury) asked the Postmaster General, If he could state to the House the amount of money received by friends, relatives, &c., in England from Australia last year through the Money Order Office; and, the number of remitters?

MR. O'HEA asked, Whether the Postmaster General was not aware that the postal rate of letters to Australia under half an ounce was 6*d*., and that this was a prohibitive rate to the poorer classes?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): In reply to the hon. Member (Mr. Henniker Heaton), I have to state that the value of the money orders issued on the United Kingdom in Australia in the year 1885-6, which is the last year in respect of which the Returns are completed, was £346,645, as will be seen at page 52 of the last Annual Report of the Post Office; and the number of orders was about 100,000. The number of remitters could not be ascertained without an examination of each order, involving much labour and expense. The Returns for the current year cannot be made up until the receipt of the accounts from Australia up to the 31st of March next. I am fully aware of the importance of the subject referred to in the second Question. I believe that it is to be brought before the House in another form.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT, 1885—PAYMENT OF OFFICIALS.

MR. SHEIL (Meath, S.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he proposes to renew the grant for the remuneration of Union Officers for their services under the Representation of the People Act?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): As the Irish Government are advised, this is a proposal which could not be carried out without legislation. It is one which concerns the whole Kingdom rather than Ireland exclusively; and it is a question more for the Treasury than the Irish Executive whether they would sanction the introduction of a Bill for the purpose of legalizing the proposed payment.

INSPECTION OF IRISH FISHERIES—COLLECTION OF STATISTICS.

MR. J. A. BLAKE (Carlow) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What steps have been taken by the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries for the collection of statistics of the quantity of fish landed in Ireland, for which a sum of £350 was voted by Parliament last Session, and if the next Report of the Inspectors will contain such statistics; and, how soon that Report, which is directed by Act of Parliament to be laid upon the Table of the House three weeks after the commencement of the Session, will be presented?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): This Question was referred to the Inspectors of Fisheries for report immediately when it appeared on the Notice Paper (two days ago); but, as they are absent from Dublin on duty, there has not been time for a reply to come to hand. The same observation applies to the Question which stands in the name of the hon. Member for North Tipperary (Mr. P. J. O'Brien).

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM.

MR. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether the precept addressed to Sheriffs for the summoning of jurors in Ireland specifies the number of jurors to be summoned; whether, if not, the number of jurors to be placed on any panel is entirely in the discretion of the Sheriff; and, whether, if the precept does specify the number, there was any change in the form of the precept addressed to the High Sheriff of the County of Dublin at the present Commission?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): In answer to this Question, I have to say that the precept does not specify the number of jurors to be summoned, and the matter is left to the discretion of the Sheriff. I am informed there has been no change in the form of the precept addressed to the High Sheriff of the County of Dublin at the present Commission.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—AVERAGE COST OF PROSECUTIONS.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he can state what the average cost of prosecutions at Assizes and Commissions in Ireland is?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): Table 25 of the Judicial and Criminal Statistics, laid on the Table last year, and the corresponding tables for previous years, contain the fullest information that the Government can obtain on the subject.

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—COST OF PROSECUTIONS AT WINTER ASSIZES.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he can state the average relative cost of prosecutions at Winter Assizes in England, as compared with prosecutions at the other Assizes?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): I regret to say that I am unable to give the hon. Member the information he asks for. I am informed by the Examiner of Criminal Law Accounts that the compilation of such a Return would entail much labour, and occupy a considerable time, and he cannot undertake it without great inconvenience to his existing staff.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—SUB-INSPECTOR MILLING, CORK COUNTY.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY (Cork) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether, in December last, Sub-Inspector Milling, of Cork, was charged at the Cork Police Court with a serious assault on Dr. Tanner, M.P.; whether it was proved against him that he had ordered his men to disperse a legal and orderly meeting of the citizens of Cork, under circumstances of great brutality; whether the magistrates returned Mr. Milling for trial; and, whether the Government have since refused to prosecute the accused; and, if so, on what grounds?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) (Dublin University): Sub-Inspector Milling was charged with an assault on Dr. Tanner, M.P., in December last. The case will be submitted to me in the usual way, for direction as to what further steps shall be taken in the matter, which is still pending.

Mr. MAURICE HEALY: Do I understand the right hon. and learned Gentleman to say the case has not yet been submitted?

Mr. HOLMES: No, Sir; it has not been submitted for my direction as to prosecution.

ADMIRALTY—DEFECTIVE WEAPONS—CUTLASSES AND SWORD BAYONETS.

Mr. HANBURY (Preston) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he can state how many vessels and what number of men of Her Majesty's Navy are armed with weapons of the same description as those of which complaints have been received from H.M.S. *Indus*; and, whether any, and which, of such vessels are engaged on active service?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): The pattern of the cutlasses with which the men in Her Majesty's Navy are armed is uniform throughout the Service; but there would appear to be a considerable difference in the quality and temper of the material which, from time to time, has been used in their manufacture. The Committee recently appointed, and now sitting, will ascertain how far this contention is true; and, if true, what is the cause of it.

THE IRISH LAND COURT—SITTINGS IN COUNTY LOUTH.

Mr. NOLAN (Louth, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is true that there has been no sitting of the Land Court in County Louth since May, 1886; and, if so, will he consider the necessity for a Session being held in Dundalk at an early date to dispose of a number of pressing cases in that neighbourhood, many of which were listed last year?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.):

The Land Commissioners report that the last sitting of a Sub-Commission in Louth was at the date named, and that the next will probably be in May. Of the cases pending in the county the majority are of recent date.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND) — ALLEGED "POLICE OUTRAGE AT HOSPITAL, COUNTY LIMERICK."

Mr. FINUCANE (Limerick, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If his attention has been directed to the following report in *The Cork Herald* of last Saturday, headed—

> "Police outrage at Hospital, County Limerick. A man was arrested for being drunk, was dragged into a public house. Mrs. M'Carthy, its owner, being violently expelled, the police began to ill-treat the prisoner, when two young girls screamed, and said they would not see the man killed in their house;"

if the police removed the man to the barrack, no resistance being offered by the people; and if the entire force, including the man on guard, went through the town with loaded rifles threatening to shoot every person they met, actually striking and seriously wounding many inoffensive people; if one of the police went into the house of Dr. Gubbins, a county magistrate, and threatened to shoot his servant, actually presenting his rifle at her; if the police acted without orders, the sergeant being absent; and if it be true that they were all under the influence of drink, and that a number of cartridges were found in the streets in the morning; if those are the same policemen who recently batoned the Kilteely fife and drum band at the instance of District Inspector Greene; and, will the Government order an immediate inquiry into their conduct?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): The newspaper paragraph quoted in the Question gives a very inaccurate report of what occurred. I am informed that a constable off duty was savagely assaulted by a man against whom he had given evidence some time ago. He was nearly strangled, and while insensible on the ground was rescued by two police, who arrested the man who had assaulted him. They took refuge in a public house, with their prisoner, from a mob which had collected, and conveyed him as soon as possible to the barrack. Mrs. M'Carthy was not expelled from her house. The police entirely deny the statements in the second, third, and fourth paragraphs of the Question. Charges of assault have been made against the police, and are now being investigated at Petty Sessions.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—ACHILL PETTY SESSIONS — CONVICTION OF POLICEMEN.

Mr. COX (Clare, E.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether three convictions have been recorded within the last month at Achill Petty Sessions against policemen, one being a wanton assault committed by Sub-constable Conalty on a boatman named John Patten for refusing to bring him illicit whiskey (poteen); and, whether information has reached him that many of the Coastguards in the Island of Achill are in the habit of procuring illicit whiskey, through Neil Gallagher Dagort and others, and encouraging into the Island the importation of illicit whiskey, to the detriment and demoralization of the inhabitants; and, if so, will the Government grant an inquiry into the matter?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) (Bristol, W.): I am informed that three convictions for assault were recorded against a policeman named Conalty at Achill Petty Sessions. In one case the person assaulted was a man named John Patten, who had been arrested for drunkenness. There was nothing during the hearing of the case to show that the assault was caused by Patten's refusing to bring the constable illicit spirits. The constable has been removed from Achill. It is not a fact, so far as is known, that the Coastguard procure the importation of whiskey into the Island.

ARMS (IRELAND) ACT—THE BANTRY DISTRICT.

Mr. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If a respectable farmer named James O'Mahoney has been refused a licence to carry firearms by Mr. Warburton, R.M., Bantry; and, whether Mr. Warburton, when applied to by farmers in the Bantry District for licences to carry firearms, usually demands a certificate from two local magistrates; and, if so, will Mr. Warburton be informed that the Law requiring such a certificate has been repealed?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The Licensing Officer, in the exercise of the discretion vested in him by law, refused to grant an arms licence to James O'Mahoney because he failed to produce satisfactory evidence that he was a proper person to be entitled to carry arms. Mr. Warburton is of course acquainted with the alteration in the law.

POLICE PROTECTION—HEGARTY.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork, W.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If a smith named Hegarty, residing at Dunmanus, County Cork, is under police protection; whether Hegarty has been paid for the conveyance of the police escort who travel on his (Hegarty's) car; if Hegarty sometimes travels without an escort; and, if the escort has been a source of revenue to Hegarty, will it be continued?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): Hegarty receives police protection, which it is considered he requires. He is unpopular in consequence of his having supplied cars to police, and because he works for boycotted persons and for the Cork Defence Union. He was on a few occasions paid for the use of his car when no other was available, but this has been stopped for some time past. He sometimes goes short distances without an escort.

MR. GILHOOLY asked if Hegarty would continue to be paid if his car were used by the police escort.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I have stated that it has been stopped for some time past.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS—EFFECTS OF SUSPENSION.

MR. HOWORTH (Salford, S.) asked the Secretary of State for War, If he can inform the House, or lay Returns upon the Table, showing the effects which have followed from the lapse of the Contagious Diseases Acts in the garrison towns?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): Some Returns on this subject of the suspension of these Acts were presented to this House in August, 1885. No other Returns have since been compiled, except the ordinary information contained in the Annual Reports of the Army Medical Department. But if my hon. Friend likes to move for a Return on the subject I shall offer no objection.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE JURY SYSTEM—CHALLENGES IN CRIMINAL CASES—THE QUEEN *v.* DILLON.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford, W.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, If he can inform the House how many jurors have been directed to "stand by" by the Crown, and have been challenged by by the traversers, in the trial "Queen *v.* Dillon and others" now proceeding in Dublin?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): The hon. Member will see from the newspapers what has been done in this case. Twenty-eight jurors were ordered to "stand by," six were peremptorily challenged, and several others were challenged "for cause," which was disallowed by triers under the direction of the Judge.

INLAND REVENUE—INHABITED HOUSE DUTY—LODGING HOUSES.

MR. SEALE-HAYNE (Devon, Ashburton) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Why lodging houses are charged for Inhabited House Duty at the rate of 9*d.*, whilst farm houses, public houses, shops, and other places of business are only charged at the rate of 6*d.*; and, whether he will take any steps to remove this anomaly?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. GOSCHEN) (St. George's, Hanover Square), in reply, said, that the exemptions from taxation created innumerable anomalies, and led up to such questions as that of the hon. Member. There seemed to him to be a vital distinction between places of business, properly so-called, and lodging houses, which were exclusively used as dwellings, and were distinctly "inhabited houses." He was afraid that if the concession asked for were given it would open a wide door to evasion of the duty, to fraud, and to a still further weight of taxation which it was already very difficult to collect without considerable inconvenience.

ARMY—ROYAL BARRACKS, DUBLIN, INSANITARY CONDITION.

COLONEL **HUGHES-HALLETT** (Rochester) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in view of the insanitary condition of the Royal Barracks, in Dublin, which has occasioned several instances of typhoid fever among the troops stationed there, chiefly among the officers—one or two cases being attended with fatal results—any steps are being taken, or will be taken, to render these barracks safe to inhabit in the future; and, whether the troops will be moved to more healthy quarters and the barracks condemned?

THE **SURVEYOR GENERAL** OF THE **ORDNANCE** (Mr. NORTHCOTE) (Exeter) (who replied) said: All precautions which can be taken to insure good ventilation and drainage in the Royal Barracks in Dublin are thoroughly attended to, and money is provided in next year's Estimates for this purpose. It cannot, however, be denied that the barracks are too crowded, and that the site is disadvantageous in a hygienic point of view. Although from military reasons it is improbable that the site can be abandoned, it is in contemplation to erect barracks in a more healthy situation, which will enable the number of men in the Royal Barracks to be materially reduced, and allow of the ventilation being improved by the demolition of some of the buildings which now crowd the area.

CORNISH AND DEVON MINES—INSANITARY CONDITION.

MR. **CONYBEARE** (Cornwall, Camborne) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, in preparing the Mining Bill which he is about to introduce, he will take into especial consideration the insanitary condition of the mines of Cornwall and Devon, which, according to Mr. Frecheville's latest Report, causes the death rate among the Cornish miners to be more than double that of the miners of the coal-fields; and, whether he will consider the desirability of appointing one assistant Inspector from the class of the working miners to assist Mr. Frecheville in his increasingly arduous duties?

THE **SECRETARY** OF **STATE** (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): I do not propose in the Mines Bill, which I am about to introduce, in any way to alter the law as to metalliferous mines. I am aware of the high rate of mortality among Cornish miners, due chiefly to difficulties of ventilation arising from the irregular and tortuous character of the workings, and to the unhealthy conditions of the silicious and metallic strata, which would not be removable by an increase of inspection. I have been informed, however, on high authority that the ventilation of these mines is improving, and that steps are being taken to make the working less dangerous, so that I hope a lesser rate of mortality may result.

THE JURY SYSTEM (IRELAND)—MARKED PANELS — THE JURORS' ACTS.

MR. J. E. **ELLIS** (Nottingham, Rushcliffe) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been drawn to the following incident at the Connaught Winter Assizes held at Sligo, as reported in *The Freeman's Journal*, 21st December, 1886—

> "J. Cochrane Davys, Clerk of the Crown and Peace, was then sworn, and, in reply to Mr. Leamy, stated that he was appointed to the office previous to the Spring Assizes of 1886. For some years previous he had been Assistant Clerk of the Crown.
>
> "Did you mark the panel of the Spring Assizes, 1886?—Yes.
>
> "Did you send that marked panel to the sub-sheriff?—No.
>
> "Why?—Because I did not think it my duty to do so.
>
> "Have you read the Jurors' Acts. Surely you, a solicitor, must have read these Acts?—I declare to you I have never read them in my life."

And, whether he will take steps to insure that Crown officials in Ireland make themselves acquainted with Acts of Parliament relating to their duties?

THE **CHIEF SECRETARY** (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): It was thought right to refer this Question to the official named for any statement he might wish to offer with regard to the allegations contained in it. The Notice has been only one day on the Paper, and the reply has, of course, not yet been received from Sligo.

THE PARKS (METROPOLIS)—GREENWICH PARK.

COLONEL **DUNCAN** (Finsbury, Holborn) (for Mr. BOORD, Greenwich) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether the Regulations for the control of Greenwich Park have been revised; and, if so, what alterations have been made to suit the convenience of residents in the neighbourhood?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) (Dublin University): The Rules for Greenwich Park have been altered so as to admit carriages, equestrians, and cyclists to travel on the road between St. Mary's Gate and Blackheath Gate, and between Blackheath Gate and the Observatory. These Rules will come into operation by the end of March.

TITHE RENT-CHARGE (IRELAND).

MR. P. J. O'BRIEN (Tipperary, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, In what way the tithe rent-charge as at present collected in Ireland is appropriated; and, whether he would consider the propriety and expediency of its being applied to the reduction of the Poor Rates in the different unions in which it is collected?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): The entire income of the Church Estate, including the tithe rent-charge, is appropriated to discharging the liabilities and charges on the estate, and could not be diverted for the purpose of reducing the Poor Rates in the different unions in which it is collected.

ARMY—CASE OF PRIVATE JAMES GILLEN.

MR. PETER M'DONALD (Sligo, N.) asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any arrears of pay are due to Private James Gillen of the 9th Regiment of Foot, invalided from China for impaired sight; and, if he received only £30 16*s.* 6*d.* out of seven years' pay; and, whether, in consequence of his loss of sight while in the Service, he is entitled to a pension?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (MR. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): No arrears of pay are due to Private Gillen. The last payment made to him was one of £9. Gillen made no application whatever for a pension for seven years.

COLLECTORS OF INLAND REVENUE (IRELAND).

MR. PETER M'DONALD (Sligo, N.) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether, of the 12 head offices of collectors of Inland Revenue in Ireland, three collectorships are at present vacant, and a fourth expected to be soon abolished, thereby reducing the number of Irish collectors to eight; whether the Chief Inspector has reported in favour of the abolition of the Sligo office; and, if so, whether the entire West Coast of Ireland, from Londonderry to Cork, will have only one collector, and thereby cause very great inconvenience to the trading population of the ports of Sligo, Ballina, Westport, Kilrush, and Tralee; whether the aggregate amount of Customs and Inland Revenue collected at Sligo is considerably greater than the amounts collected at each of two of the eastern ports where collectors are to be retained; and, whether the Sligo Harbour Board and the Corporation have by Resolution and Memorial protested against the contemplated abolition of the Sligo office?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. JACKSON) (Leeds, N.) (who replied) said: Three Inland Revenue collections are vacant in Ireland. Of these Cork is one, and the vacancy there will be filled up in the ordinary course. The question of filling up Coleraine and Sligo is under consideration; but no decision has been come to by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue in the matter. Should the abolition of Sligo be determined on, it would not inconvenience Ballina, Westport, Kilrush, and Tralee, as, besides the collector at Cork, there will still be a collector at Galway and Limerick. The amount of Customs and Inland Revenue collected at Sligo in the year ending March 31 last was about £120,000, and is considerably less than the amounts collected at each of the two eastern ports referred to where collectors are to be retained. The Memorial of the Corporation of Sligo against the abolition of the Sligo office and the copy of the resolution of the Harbour Board were received; and when the proposal for the abolition of Excise collections is submitted to the Board of Inland Revenue, the Memorial and Resolution will be carefully considered.

THE RIOTS AT BELFAST—BELFAST PRIVATE ACT, 1865.

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.) asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether it is the fact that, while in other parts of Ireland compensation can be levied off the ratepayers in the case of witnesses, magistrates, and peace officers killed or injured on account of their efforts to bring disturbers of the peace to justice: this is not the case in the Borough of Belfast, owing to an omission in the Belfast Private Act of 1865 (28 & 29 *Vict.* c. 183), transferring the jurisdiction of the Grand Jury of the County Antrim to the Belfast Town Council; whether, owing to this defect in the Law, a number of persons, including Sub-Inspector Stretch and the representatives of Head Constable Gardiner, have been deprived of compensation to which they would otherwise be entitled; whether, as promised last Session, he has looked into the matter with a view to having the law amended; and, whether he intends to propose any legislation on the subject?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) (Dublin University): I have considered the matter carefully since the last Session, and it seems to me that the law is unsatisfactory. The Report of the Belfast Riots Commission is now being considered by myself and Colleagues as a whole, and this matter will receive careful consideration.

MR. SEXTON: Can the right hon. and learned Gentleman state how soon the Report will be before the House?

MR. HOLMES: I cannot answer that Question. That should be addressed to my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary.

MERCHANT SHIPPING—REFUGE AND LIFE HARBOURS.

ADMIRAL MAYNE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, in view of the admitted annual loss of £1,500,000 to £2,000,000 of property, and a great number of lives of Her Majesty's subjects upon the coasts of the United Kingdom, and the representations of the Board of Trade to the Treasury upon the subject, he will make some provision in the Estimates for the construction of Refuge and Life Harbours?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. GOSCHEN) (St. George's, Hanover Square): The only provision in the Estimates about to be laid before the House for the construction of a Harbour of Refuge will be for the harbour at Peterhead. I am not prepared on such short notice, my attention having only just been called to the subject, to propose a further Estimate, or to pronounce an opinion upon a subject involving so vast an expenditure of money.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—LIMIT OF DEPOSITS.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) asked the Postmaster General, Whether he is prepared now to raise the limit of the amount which may be deposited in the Post Office Savings Bank in any one year from £30 to £50, and also the limit of the total sum which may stand to the credit of an individual depositor?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. RAIKES) (Cambridge University): If there is any evidence of a general desire on the part of the House to aid in promoting legislation to carry out the objects which the hon. Member has in view, I shall be very glad to introduce a Bill for that purpose.

ADMIRALTY—PENSIONS TO WIDOWS OF SEAMEN AND MARINES—UNCLAIMED PRIZE MONEY, &c.

ADMIRAL MAYNE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether any, and, if so, what, steps are being taken to obtain from the Treasury the proceeds of Naval mulcts, fines, unclaimed prize money, unclaimed deceased men's estates, and the sale of stock, in order that this money, properly belonging to the Royal Navy, may be appropriated to the carrying out of the scheme of pensions to widows of seamen and marines, as recommended by the Committee under the presidency of H.R.H. The Duke of Edinburgh?

THE FIRST LORD (LORD GEORGE HAMILTON) (Middlesex, Ealing): Considerable financial difficulties have been experienced when endeavouring to give effect to the recommendations of the Duke of Edinburgh's Committee, and up to the present moment no satisfactory method of surmounting the difficulties has been arranged.

BURMAH (UPPER)—THE SHAN CHIEFS—CHINA.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Under Secretary of State for

India, Whether, 12 months ago, the Viceroy did not, in reference to the probable action of China upon our northern frontier "in Burmah," state that there would be no attempt to bring the Shan Chiefs "under direct administrative control," and that it was "of great importance to secure the acquiescence of China;" and, whether any, and what, steps have since been taken to secure such acquiescence?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The words quoted are to be found in the Blue Book. A Convention was made with China on July 24, 1886, which has been laid on the Table of the House.

BURMAH (UPPER)—THE RUBY MINES.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether a proposal for a three years' lease of the Ruby Mines, Burmah, with details of the proposal, has already been communicated to Parliament; and, why the same publicity cannot be accorded to the other proposals as to the Ruby Mines received by the Government?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir JOHN GORST) (Chatham): The Viceroy, in a Minute of February 17, 1886, which has been communicated to Parliament, appears to have mentioned, as an illustration of the revenue resources of Burmah, the offer made by a Calcutta firm to lease the Ruby Mines. This offer constituted part of the negotiations to which I referred some days ago as having taken place in the Spring of last year. The Secretary of State is of opinion that it would not be for the public interest to publish the details of negotiations which are not yet concluded.

MR. BRADLAUGH asked whether the negotiations with the Calcutta firm had been brought to a conclusion?

SIR JOHN GORST: The whole of the negotiations in connection with the Ruby Mines are still pending. However ingenious the hon. Member may be in putting Questions of this kind to me, I do not think that I shall be able to answer any of them until the negotiations are concluded.

MR. BRADLAUGH: Will the hon. and learned Gentleman tell me what distinguishes communications which can be properly made to the House from those which cannot.

[No reply.]

SALMON FISHING (SCOTLAND)—TWEED FISHERIES ACTS

MR. THORBURN (Peebles and Selkirk) asked the Lord Advocate, Whether he is aware that great dissatisfaction exists among all classes of the community with certain provisions of the Tweed Fisheries Acts; and, whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a measure which will bring the River Tweed under a General Act for Scotland, and thus afford an opportunity to get rid of the provisions in the Acts complained of?

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) (Manchester, E.) (who replied) said: The dissatisfaction referred to by the hon. Member in regard to the Tweed Fisheries Acts has been frequently represented to my Predecessors in Office and to myself, and is at present under my consideration, with a view to rectifying anomalies which undoubtedly exist. I have been engaged in making inquiries to which I am awaiting reply. There are considerable difficulties to contend with in dealing with the matter; but I can assure the hon. Member that it will not be neglected.

LIMITED LIABILITIES ACTS—REGISTRATION OF LIMITED COMPANIES.

MR. J. M. MACLEAN (Oldham) asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether, having regard to the Memorial lately presented to the Marquess of Salisbury by a deputation of employers of labour and working men delegates from Lancashire, and to the Resolution passed last week by the Associated Chambers of Commerce in favour of a double registration of Limited Companies, and of not allowing them to commence business till a considerable percentage of their capital has been paid up, Her Majesty's Government will undertake to legislate this Session for the amendment of the Limited Liability Acts?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) (Liverpool, East Toxteth): The Board of Trade are considering the important subject referred to in the Question with a view to legislation; but I am not in a position at present to hold out any definite promise to the hon. Member.

DEFECTIVE WEAPONS — CUTLASSES AND SWORD BAYONETS.

Sir HENRY TYLER (Great Yarmouth) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Under what authority and by whose orders the recent trials to test the cutlasses and bayonets on board the *Active*, the *Volage*, the *Rover*, the *Devastation*, and the *Indus* were carried out, and why those ships were especially selected for such tests; whether those trials were made without previous reference to or communication with the War Department, as the Department responsible for the proper quality of the weapons supplied to the Navy; were the trials thus made of a character satisfactorily to determine whether the weapons tested were of a quality to comply with reasonable requirement "in attack or defence" on active service, especially the test of

> "Placing the point of a sword in the deck and applying pressure at the handle till the point was turned about 50° from the straight line;"

Were any, and if so what, precautions taken to insure uniformity in the results, as affording indications of the quality and temper of the metal of the weapons tested; and in regard to weapons reported to be "defective," were they to be considered defective as regards the particular tests applied, or in respect of their use "in attack or defence" in actual warfare?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton) (Middlesex, Ealing): In the case of the *Active*, *Volage*, and *Rover*, one of the weapons having become bent in use, the order for testing the others was given by Commodore Fitzroy, commanding the Training Squadron. In the case of the *Indus*, the Commander-in-Chief at the port issued the order. The order for testing the weapons on the *Devastation* was given by the captain of the ship. The above ships were not specially selected; and the trials were made without previous reference to or communication with either the Admiralty or War Office. I stated the other day what the nature of the test was. And as that test will form the subject of the inquiry by the independent Committee nominated by the Secretary of State for War, my hon. and gallant Friend will not expect me to enter into controversial points connected with that investigation. It was clearly the duty of any officer, if he thought the arms defective, to test them.

LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART— THE NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.

Mr. COCHRANE - BAILLIE (St. Pancras, N.) asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether, as a fulfilment of the understanding on which the pictures of the National Portrait Gallery were allowed to be removed from their old premises, he has made any provision in the Estimates for this year for the purchase of grounds on which suitable buildings may be erected to receive this valuable collection, in many instances unique, and got together both by the generosity of private donors and from contributions of the Nation during the last 30 years.

The FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. Plunket) (Dublin University): I quite sympathize in the desire that a suitable and permanent abode may, as soon as possible, be provided for the very interesting and valuable Collection known as the National Portrait Gallery; but I regret that I cannot hope, during the present year, to obtain money for that purpose.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY— THE ASSESSMENT.

Mr. WOOTTON ISAACSON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Government will interfere in the relief of the ratepayers, either by monopolizing the supply of water to the Metropolis, or controlling the present rates of the Water Companies; whereby the present system of assessing the inhabitants of the Metropolis to the water rate upon the gross rental of their premises rather than upon the consumption, as in the case of gas, being especially felt by the trading community of the East End of London, who are heavily rated for their business, as distinguished from other residential premises, and are consequently charged to an amount wholly disproportionate to their limited consumption?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Matthews) (Birmingham, E.): My hon. Friend must be aware that the Government have no power by law to interfere with the statutory right of the Water Companies to charge water rates upon the rental of premises rather than upon the consumption. They could, doubtless, propose by legislation to buy up and extinguish the rights of the Water Companies; but they contemplate no such legislation this Session.

TREES (IRELAND)—RE-AFFORESTING.

MR. MARUM (Kilkenny, N.) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is aware of the failing supply of native timber trees in Ireland, mainly owing to the defective state of the Law in regard to planting of the same, notwithstanding that, during the passing of the Land Law Act of 1881 and since then, efforts have been made strenuously and unsuccessfully every Session by private Members to remedy the same by introducing Bills; whether the Government are prepared to introduce a measure upon the subject, or afford facilities for the passing of a Trees Planting Bill; and, whether the Government will take the question of re-afforesting in Ireland, even partially into consideration, for the purpose of developing the resources of the country?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): I fear that any failure in the supply of trees in Ireland is due to other causes besides the defective state of the Law. But I may remind the hon. Member that he was successful in passing a Bill on this subject through the House last Session. I shall be glad if I can aid him in dealing with it; but I cannot promise any special facilities.

ARMY (SMALL ARMS)—THE LEE-BURTON MAGAZINE RIFLE.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, Camlachie) asked the Secretary of State for War, If the paragraph, which appeared in *The Daily Telegraph* on Saturday last, the 12th instant, as follows:—

> "It is stated that the War Office Committee, appointed to consider the question of the adoption of a new rifle, held what was practically their last sitting yesterday, and have decided to recommend the Lee-Burton Magazine Rifle . . ."

is correct; and, if he is in a position to give the House any further information on the subject?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. E. STANHOPE) (Lincolnshire, Horncastle): No, Sir; the paragraph is not correct. No magazine rifle has yet been adopted; but trials, which we hope may be final, are about to take place. It is my earnest desire to arrive at a decision on this subject at the earliest date possible; and when I do, it will be communicated to the House.

THE STATIONERY OFFICE—COPYRIGHT IN GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS.

MR. MUNDELLA (Sheffield, Brightside) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether his attention has been called to a paragraph appearing in *The Gazette* of November 23rd, 1886, issued by the authority of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, and referring to the enforcement of an alleged copyright in Government publications—

Extract from *Gazette*—

> "Printers and publishers are reminded that any one reprinting, without due authority, matter which has appeared in any Government publication, renders himself liable to the same penalties as those which he might, under like circumstances, have incurred had the copyright been in private hands.
>
> "T. Digby Pigott, Controller.
>
> "Her Majesty's Stationery Office,
> "Westminster, November 22, 1886."

what is the scope and object of the announcement in question; whether it is intended to interfere with the right of any member of the public to reprint documents prepared and printed at the public expense; if so, under what Law does Her Majesty's Stationery Office propose to proceed; and, how far does Her Majesty's Government propose to support the Controller in this new departure?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): The Government issue numerous publications. In a great number of instances the information is given in order to be widely circulated, and in such instances the Government do not intend or wish to interfere with the action of private individuals; but in some cases the Government consider that the cost of publication should be recouped to the taxpayer by the sale of the work. This object would not be attained if private individuals were allowed to take advantage of Government work in order to undersell the Government. The Treasury propose that a Memorandum should be drawn up defining, as clearly as possible, the cases in which the Government right should be asserted; and they are at present in communication with their Legal Advisers on the subject. I shall be happy to lay this Memorandum, in due time, upon the Table.

CELEBRATION OF THE JUBILEE YEAR —CLERKS AND OTHER EMPLOYES IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (London) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, in connection with the Jubilee, Her Majesty's Government will grant additional holidays to the clerks and other *employés* in the Civil Service?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I can hold out no prospect of the leave suggested being granted. My hon. Friend will see that in order to give it we should have to impose extra work upon those to whom the leave could not be given.

TRADE AND COMMERCE—INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE SUGAR BOUNTIES.

COLONEL HILL (Bristol, S.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether, in view of the vast importance to this Country and the Colonies of the question of bounties upon sugar, Her Majesty's Government will not seriously consider the desirability of approaching the Governments of the Foreign Countries affected, by means of representatives from the Foreign Office and the Board of Trade, as was done in the case of the Fisheries Convention, and in other similar instances?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): A Question on this subject was addressed to the Secretary to the Board of Trade on the 15th instant, when it was stated that the Government had approached certain Governments on the question, some of whom had replied not unfavourably on the subject. The proceedings have not arrived at a stage at which Papers could be produced; but when they have they will be laid on the Table.

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS—THE BISHOP STORTFORD BANK.

MR. HOWELL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether information has reached the Government with respect to serious defalcations on the part of the Secretary to the Bishop Stortford Trustee Savings Bank; and, whether the Government will take action to protect, as far as possible, the poor people whose hard earning are thus jeopardized by the dishonesty of a public official?

THE FIRST LORD (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): It has been notified to the National Debt Commissioners by the trustees and managers of the Bishop Stortford Savings Bank that an examination of the books of that Institution discloses a deficiency of £8,250. The Secretary admits his defalcations to that amount, and has been arrested with a view to his prosecution. It would appear, from a statement made to the National Debt Office, that the trustees and managers have neglected, in their administration of the bank, to comply with the requirements of the Savings Banks Act. If, on investigation, such should prove to be the case, they will have forfeited the exemption from liability afforded by the Statute, and will have to make good the deficiency. The Secretary of the bank is in no sense a "public official." He is a servant of the trustees, who, and not the Government, are responsible for the manner in which he performs his duty.

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—PADDINGTON WORKHOUSE—INCARCERATION OF A FEMALE NOT A LUNATIC.

MR. W. CORBET (Wicklow, E.) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to a resolution of the Paddington Board of Guardians to the effect that an inmate of the workhouse has been incarcerated for seven years in a lunatic asylum though she is not only quite sane, but a woman of more than ordinary intellect, and that there are many other similar cases; and, whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman will direct an inquiry into those cases?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. MATTHEWS) (Birmingham, E.): I can only say that I have not seen or heard of the resolution to which the hon. Gentleman refers. If I find that a woman perfectly sane, and of more than ordinary intellect, has been incarcerated for seven years in a lunatic asylum, I shall certainly order a very stringent inquiry.

PARLIAMENT — THE NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE (1882) — RULE 2. — ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. DILLWYN (Swansea): I beg to move the Adjournment of the House, in order to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the irregularities that have taken place in a trial at law, whereby certain Members of this House are prejudiced.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) proposes to move the Adjournment of the House, in order that he may "call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, the irregularities that have taken place in a trial at law whereby certain Members of this House are prejudiced." The hon. Member showed me a Notice a few minutes ago which was substantially the same as this, and which I informed him I could not put to the House. Nor shall I put this Notice to the House. My Predecessor in the chair was asked a question in 1882, shortly after the new Rule had been passed respecting the making of Motions for Adjournment, previous to Public Business being entered upon. He was asked whether a Member proposing to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, would be debarred from doing so by the fact of a Motion standing on the Notice Paper which dealt with the same subject, in pursuance of the practice that no Motion can be submitted to the House upon a question on which there is a Motion already standing on the Order Book. My Predecessor, acting on the practice of the House, said that a Member would be debarred by the established and fundamental Rules of Debate. Now, there is already a Notice on the Paper standing in the name of the hon. Gentleman for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) for Tuesday, the 1st of March, in these terms—

> "Mr. Sexton — Jury-packing: To call attention to the purpose, method and effects of the system of jury-packing pursued by agents of Her Majesty's Government in Ireland; and to move a Resolution."

That is a Motion which is down for a particular day, and the Motion which the hon. Gentleman has just proposed to move is a distinct anticipation of that Motion. Therefore, I cannot put it to the House.

Mr. SEXTON (West Belfast): Upon your ruling, Sir, I would respectfully submit to you, firstly, that the terms of my Resolution are not on the Paper; and secondly, that my Resolution does not bear, nor is it intended to bear, on any proceedings by which any Member of this House is prejudiced.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Resolution which is down on the Paper for Tuesday, the 1st of March, in the name of the hon. Member, specifically mentions the question of jury-packing. When the hon. Member for Swansea some time ago, gave me a Notice of Motion for the Adjournment of the House in a slightly altered form to that which he has now made, the question of jury-packing was specially referred to in it.

The following is the Entry in the Votes:—

Adjournment of the House.—Mr. Dillwyn, Member for Swansea, asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "to call attention to irregularities which have taken place in a trial at law, whereby certain Members of this House are prejudiced:"—

But it appearing to Mr. Speaker that the subject which the honourable Member asked leave to discuss was included in the Notice of Motion which stood upon the Notice Paper for Tuesday, the 1st of March, in the name of the honourable Member for West Belfast, Mr. Speaker declined to submit that Motion to the pleasure of the House.

MOTION.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—RULES OF PROCEDURE—RESOLUTION.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster), in rising to move the following Resolution—

> "That the consideration of the proposed Rules of Procedure have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motions on every day on which the consideration of those Rules may be set down by the Government,"

said: It is not my intention to occupy the time of the House at any great length in order to persuade the House of the necessity for the Order which I desire the House to make this evening. The House is very well aware of the circumstances under which it has become necessary for the Government to propose new Rules of Procedure for the adoption of the House. The grounds upon which I propose to urge the necessity of these Rules, and the necessity of proceeding expeditiously with them, are not grounds which have regard to the advantage of this or any other Government. But the grounds upon which I recommend them is that these Rules are designed to secure the dignity, honour, and capacity of the House to discharge the duties it has undertaken in coming here. I, Sir, have some sense of pain and humiliation as a Member of this House in finding that it is necessary to ask the House to place restrictions upon its own liberty of speech; but the occasion is one which, I think, it will be acknowledged by the House as well as by the country, demands the Order which I desire to move, and requires such a self-restraint as will enable the House, as I believe, to discharge its duties of legislation, and maintain that decorum which should mark the proceedings of the Parliament of this great country. Sir, I have only to point out to the House the number of days that the discussion upon the Address has this Session already occupied, to bring home to every hon. Member a sense of the necessity for the imposition of some restraints upon the prolongation of debate. We are now, Sir, on the first day of the fourth week of the present Session; and we have now arrived at the 16th day of the debate on the Address in the present Session of Parliament. I will state to the House the number of days occupied in the discussion of the Address in past years. In the first Session of 1880 four sitting days were occupied in the discussion of the Address, and in the second Session one day; in the Session of 1881, 11 days; and of 1882, six days; the Session of 1883-84, 10 days; and of 1884, eight days; 1884-85, nine days; in the first Session of 1886, five days; and in the second Session, 10 days were occupied in the debate upon the Address. Under those circumstances, I think the House will admit that it is necessary it should impose some restraint upon itself in the conduct of debate, and in the transaction of the Business necessary for the great interests of the country which are entrusted to it for protection and advancement. I may, no doubt, be told that I have individually opposed the restrictions which are now sought to be imposed. That, as it appears to me, does not enter into the consideration of this question at all. I say I make this proposition to the House with a sense of humiliation, but I admit its absolute necessity. I think nothing short of the course it is now proposed to the House to take will save the House and Parliament from that which will virtually amount to self-destruction—the abnegation of the duties which belong to the Parliament of an enlightened country. I have no doubt I shall be appealed to by hon. Gentlemen to make exceptions in regard to this proposal in favour of a particular Motion or a particular Order which may stand on the Order Book. I say, in advance, that I cannot promise to the House to make any exception whatever. The necessity for the course which I ask the House to take is so extreme—the necessity is so obvious—that the only course we can now pursue is to consider these Rules with as much deliberation as may be necessary, but not more than is necessary, for a proper decision to be arrived at; and then when those Rules, which are absolutely essential, are adopted by the House, I hope we may be able to proceed to Business with as little delay as possible, with as much deliberation and as much discussion, but not more than is necessary for the proper solution of the questions which we have to decide. I beg to move the Resolution which stands in my name.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the consideration of the proposed Rules of Procedure have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motions on every day on which the consideration of those Rules may be set down by the Government."—(*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

Mr. DILLWYN (Swansea, Town) said, he must appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith) not to begin the consideration of the proposed Rules until after Tuesday next. His reason was that—on the first day of the Session—he had secured—in the ballot—for Tuesday, the first place for the discussion of the question of the "Disestablishment of the Church in Wales."

[*Laughter.*] Hon. Gentlemen laughed. He (Mr. Dillwyn) knew they had got the upper hand in Wales, and they wished to keep it. The question was one which excited the keenest interest in Wales, and, as it had been brought before the last Parliament, he thought his request was not unreasonable.

MR. OSBORNE MORGAN (Denbighshire, E.) said, he was as anxious as anyone to get to the Procedure Rules, but he trusted the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) (whose courtesy they all acknowledged) would accept the proposal of his hon. Friend the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn). His position was a peculiar one, for he had been fortunate enough to secure the first place out of 180 Members on the first night of the Session, and, if he was now displaced, the chances against him of getting another night would be something like 20 to 1. His hon. Friend had not attempted, as he might have done, to bring his Motion on by way of Amendment to the Address, and, unlike other Members in similar positions, had a nation behind him; for no one who did not know Wales could conceive how intense was the interest taken by its 1,500,000 inhabitants in the subject. Looking to the disappointment which would otherwise be caused among so large a proportion of Her Majesty's most loyal and law-abiding subjects, he urged the right hon. Gentleman to give way and accede to his hon. Friend's appeal.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby): I hope the Government may see their way to grant some concession to the request which has been made by my two hon. Friends. I only rise for the purpose of saying that as far as I am concerned, and, I believe, my hon. Friends around me, there is no desire to interpose any obstacle whatever to the proposal of the Government to proceed to the consideration of the amendment of the Rules of Procedure in this House. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury has said that the delay of Public Business in late years has been very remarkable. That is quite true. His enumeration began at 1880, and ended at 1886; and the figures he gave were very instructive, and I think experience has shown how a bad example grows. I have been told—I have not checked the figures myself—that from 1874 to 1880 the debates on the Address during the whole of that Parliament did not take up 11 days. Therefore, we see how this thing has arisen. How did it arise? It arose upon a system much criticized and much condemned in the present debate—that is to say, on Amendments on the Address. But from what quarter and in what manner did these Amendments proceed? Why, I remember one occasion that after four or five days' debate on the Address, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford (Mr. Chaplin) moved an Amendment on foot-and-mouth disease, merely in order to demand that the Motion should take precedence of all other Motions; admitting that the Government had undertaken to legislate as he wished on the matter. I offer that as an illustration of the manner in which these delays on the Address have arisen. I agree with all that has been said by the right hon. Gentleman on the subject. I think it is greatly to be regretted that so much time is expended in these debates. We, upon this side of the House, have shown every desire to forward an Amendment of the Rules of the House, in order to enable it better to transact the business of the country. In 1882 we proposed a number of new Rules to the House. I can assure the right hon. Gentleman opposite that I am not going to offer any recriminations, and I am not going to remind him of his opinions at that time; but, unfortunately, the question of Procedure was then made a strictly Party question. I hope it will not be made a Party question now. When the penultimate Government of Lord Salisbury came into office, the then Leader of the House (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) laid upon the Table a plan for amending the Procedure of the House. The Government was displaced soon after the plan was laid on the Table; but so far were we on this side of the House from opposing the Amendment of Procedure, that we immediately took up the plan of the right hon. Gentleman, and endeavoured, with certain amendments, to base a plan of our own upon it. Now, I have the permission of the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington) to say that that plan, which it was my business to lay before the Committee of last year, was not a plan only of the late Government, and still less of my own; it was a plan drawn up by a private Committee which sat under the auspices of my noble Friend the Member for Rossendale, and of which the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, the present Chairman of Ways and Means, my hon. Friend the Member for the borough of Bedford (Mr. Whitbread), and the present Lord Herschell were Members. That was the authority under which the plan was drawn up, and it was based upon the plan of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). I do not know how far I should be in Order—perhaps, not at all—in referring to the particulars of these Rules. I only want to show that we were desirous not to treat this as a Party question. We referred the plan to a very strong Committee of the House of Commons, presided over by the noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale, and it was as strong a Committee as could have been got in this House. All I can say is that, with every desire to forward any proposal for facilitating the Business of this House, I cannot but very deeply regret that the plan the Government have laid upon the Table is a plan that widely differs from, and wholly overthrows, first of all, their own plan of 1886; and then, in its most fundamental principles, the plan approved by that strong Committee of the House of Commons presided over by the noble Marquess. I am sorry to say, generally, that I consider the plan that the Government have laid on the Table is very inefficient. I do not object to it because it is too strong; I object to it because it is not half strong enough. My belief is that they have thrown overboard altogether what was really the main part of the plan of the Committee presided over by my noble Friend—namely, the referring of all the Committee stages of the Bills to Standing Committees of the House, and thereby relieving the House. —[*Cries of* "Order!"] I do not wish to say anything to arouse opposition on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite; I am only saying I wish that the plan had been a plan corresponding to that recommended by the Committee of the House, and that it was one likely to prove more efficient; but so far as the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman to proceed with the discussion of the plan is concerned, I have no word to say against it. The responsibility, after all, rests with the Government. But there is one question upon which I should like to have an answer from the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. It was, I think, in 1882 there was some opportunity given of discussing the plan as a whole. It is obvious that many particular parts of it depend one upon another, and you cannot discuss one without referring to the other. What I should like to know is, on what stage it will be possible to discuss these Resolutions as a whole, as upon a second reading, so as to be able to discuss the bearings of one Resolution upon another? I venture to hope that some such opportunity will be given.

Sir HUSSEY VIVIAN (Swansea, District), in rising to support the appeal to the Government on behalf of the Motion of the hon. Member for Swansea, said, he wished to do so in the strongest possible manner. The question which it brought up was really a national one, besides being of the last importance to the inhabitants of the whole Principality. It was no obstructive Motion. Indeed he would remind the Government that Welsh Members had never in any way interfered with the progress of Business. He acknowledged the importance of taking the earliest possible day for the Resolutions on Procedure, and he himself would do his best to support the right hon. Gentleman opposite; but he ventured to suggest that it would be most cruel to take away the only opportunity of discussing in the House of Commons the question brought forward by the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn). He could assure the Government that any such attempt would be most bitterly resented in Wales.

Mr. RICHARD: I must very earnestly support the respectful appeal made to the right hon. Gentleman, the First Lord of the Treasury, by my hon. Colleagues from the Principality. The right hon. Gentleman knows very well how difficult it is amid the hot competition which now prevails in this House for a private Member to secure a place for bringing forward any Motion or Bill. And when a Member has been fortunate at the ballot, it is very hard that the advantage he has gained should be wrested from his hands by the Government. Indeed, one of the crying sins of recent proceedings in this House is the tendency shown by Governments—by all Governments—to encroach on the right of private Members. All who are acquainted with the history of progress in this country are aware that almost every step that has been taken in advance, in the reform of every kind, of our institutions has begun by Resolutions, generally what are called abstract Resolutions, moved by private Members, and usually in the first instance, and sometimes for a long time, opposed and defeated by a combination among the Leaders of both Parties. But we also know that the seed thus sown in adverse circumstances has afterwards borne ample and valuable fruit, when the so-called 'men of light and leading,' have slowly admitted the light into their minds, and followed the lead of more courageous and enterprising spirits than themselves. I think the time must come when private Members on both sides must confederate to protect themselves against this kind of official conspiracy to rob them of their rights. I hold that the Members for Wales have a special right to complain of the hardship inflicted upon them by depriving my hon. Friend the Member for Swansea Mr. Dillwyn), of the opportunity he had gained, to bring before the House a subject in which the overwhelming majority of the Welsh people are intensely interested. No one can charge Wales with having been too importunate in its demands on the attention of this House. It is a question whether it would not have been better for Wales to have been more importunate. My countrymen, as everybody knows, are a singularly patient, loyal, and law-abiding people. But their patience has limits, and there are ominous indications, that if its claims are habitually postponed and neglected, that patience will come to an end. You should take warning by your experience of Ireland. The Representatives of the Irish people in this House have from time to time, ever since the Union, until a few years ago, done all they could by what are called legitimate and constitutional means to interest this House in the condition of their country; and to induce it to do something to redress the wrongs and grievances of their countrymen. But they were persistently pooh-poohed, their Motions were rejected, their Bills were outvoted, and all their suggestions and endeavours for the benefit of the Irish people were set at naught. At last the Irish Members were driven to take other means to force Irish questions upon the attention of the House. I should be very sorry to see my countrymen driven by similar neglect to the use of similar means. I beg to propose as an Amendment to the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the insertion of the following words:—

> "That the consideration of the proposed Rules of Procedure have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motion on every day except Tuesday, the 22nd instant."

MR. SPEAKER: Would it not be more convenient if the hon. Member simply added, after the word "Day," "except Tuesday, the 22nd instant."

MR. RICHARD assented to the suggestion.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Bradford), who seconded the Amendment, said, he was disposed to think that, having regard to the object the Government had in view, it would be the wiser course to hold a short special Session at the end of the present one to discuss the New Rules than the one now taken by the Government. At any rate, as the Government could not make much progress with their Rules of Procedure by acting severely on this occasion, he thought they might make a compromise by yielding to the appeal of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), especially as the subject referred to was a demand made by almost the entire Principality.

Amendment proposed, after the second word "day," in line 3, to insert the words "except on Tuesday, the 22nd instant."—(*Mr. Richard.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said that the right hon. Gentleman the present Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) had stated some time ago that he objected to give a blank cheque to the Marquess of Salisbury. He confessed that he too entirely objected to give a blank cheque to the Marquess of Salisbury and his Colleagues simply because one of the latter happened to be the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith) had said when he made his proposal that it was a humiliation to the House. Most unquestionably it was a humiliation, because it was a penal proposal. They were called upon in the midst of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne to suspend all action on the Address and to put it aside in order to pass a Resolution with regard to Procedure, which no doubt was deliberately to be used to put an end to all debate on the Address. He (Mr. Labouchere) did not deny that the debate had gone on a considerable time. As he pointed out the day before, he had heard with great interest some of the 65 speeches which had been delivered by hon. Gentlemen opposite in their anxiety to shorten the proceedings of the House. Moreover, there was a sort of bargain entered into with an hon. Gentleman opposite, to the effect that if he and his agricultural friends did not discuss the agricultural question upon the Address they should be allowed to do so upon the Report. Well, but if the Address was to be put aside, how was that bargain to be carried out? There was also an Amendment of which he (Mr. Labouchere) had ventured to give Notice that evening in regard to Bulgaria. He was not now going into the question; but he might point out that most important action had been taken by Her Majesty's Government during the Recess — action which he thought the House ought to have an opportunity of considering; and it certainly seemed to him that if they were to put off the Address until the Rules of Procedure were passed, it was exceedingly improbable that they would have any opportunity of discussing the Bulgarian Question. [An hon. MEMBER: Or anything else.] When it was stated that 16 days had been taken up in debating the Address—a thing unknown in times past—it should be remembered that in times past Ministers were not so eager to take for themselves the time of the House and of Private Members. When they asked for a day for the second reading of a Bill that was a very different thing from asking for the whole time of the House for a matter which would probably take up several weeks. He would ask whether it was reasonable that the right hon. Gentleman should stop the debate on the Address in order to bring in the Rules of Procedure. The right hon. Gentleman had frequently told them that they ought to devote themselves to the Business of the country. Well, what he (Mr. Labouchere) and his Friends considered the Business of the Country was the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales. The question of Disestablishment in Wales was a subject of paramount importance, and therefore he could not understand what was the Business with superior claims which the right hon. Gentleman alluded to. It was absolutely impossible that the present Government could bring in any sound legislation, and the reason was because they were Conservatives who had not got a Conservative majority, but were supported by hon. Gentlemen who were kind enough to perch themselves on the front Opposition Bench; and one of the most important of whom stated the other day that he agreed with Her Majesty's Government upon one question and disagreed with them upon 99. It seemed to him (Mr. Labouchere) that this ought to be made an educational Session, and that the very best use they could turn it to was to occupy the time of Her Majesty's Government as long as possible by making speeches; because the Government, if left to their own devices, would only produce what the majority of the House would consider bad legislation, and so every moment that hon. Members did not occupy with their speeches would be devoted to a bad use. Therefore they ought seriously to consider the matter in view of the fact that a Coercion Bill for Ireland was to be brought in; and, that the Marquess of Salisbury—that great perturbator of the peace of Europe—was at the head of the Government, they should voluntarily agree to give up every opportunity of taking into consideration the action of the Government. If the Government took every day, hon. Members, in all probability, would not be able to raise questions of importance, even by way of Motions for Adjournment; for the result of the Ruling which had been lately given—a Ruling no doubt perfectly correct—was that it would be open to any hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House to put down any general Amendment with regard to foreign affairs—or Ireland for example—and so prevent an hon. Member on that (the Opposition) side from bringing forward an urgent question which he might wish to raise. He should therefore vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for

Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. Richard), though he should like to go a good deal further. He should like to make it Tuesdays instead of Tuesday. He should also prefer that the Government should take into their consideration the suggestion of his hon. Friend the Member for West Bradford (Mr. Illingworth). Anxious as he was that their Rules of Procedure should be strengthened, he was not prepared to give that blank cheque to Her Majesty's Government for an indefinite time. Let the Government, when they wanted a day, come to the House and ask for it—perhaps they would get it; perhaps they would not—but at any rate the House would be in a position to consider the matter.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) Strand, Westminster) said: I think that the speech of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) is probably the best argument that could possibly be used in favour of the Motion that I had the honour to propose to the House. He stated plainly what line he considered it his duty to pursue for the rest of the Session, and that was to occupy the House in discussion, and to take care that no Business was done—not to allow the House to do any of the Business which it ought to do, and which Her Majesty's Government are prepared to lay before it. That may be the view that the hon. Gentleman takes of his duty; but I confess I do not share it, and I do not think that it is the view that other hon. Gentlemen will take of their duty as Members of this House. The hon. Member has made a remark that, as the Address is not to be disposed of for some weeks—and no doubt, if the House follows the line proposed by the hon. Member, that will be so—we might accede to the Motion of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn).

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I said the Rules of Procedure, and not the Address.

MR. W. H. SMITH: I beg the hon. Member's pardon. I certainly understood the hon. Gentleman to say the Address. With regard to the speech made by the hon. Member for Swansea, I may say that a more honoured and respected Member of this House does not exist; and, if it had been possible, we should have been most glad to have made an exception in his favour. I think he is entitled to the consideration of this House, and I had hoped that it might have been possible to make an exception in favour of one who bears such an honoured name, and who has attained to the position that the hon. Member has; but it is impossible to make a concession to one hon. Gentleman without laying ourselves open to claims of an equally strong character on the part of others. I would wish to appeal to the House to enter on the consideration of these Rules as soon as possible, to dispose of them as quickly as possible, and, if the House will do that, the object of the hon. Member for Merthyr (Mr. Richard) will be attained. The hon. Member for Merthyr complains of an official conspiracy to deprive the hon. Gentlemen of their place on the Notice Paper, in order that the Government might proceed with Bills of their own. There has been no such conspiracy on the other side of the House or on this; but the House itself has placed obstacles in the way of the transaction of Business, which from time to time—and this I say perfectly frankly—compelled right hon. Gentlemen opposite who then sat on these Benches to ask for the time of private Members. Only the necessary and reasonable time has been occupied in the despatch of Public Business. I regret as much as any hon. Member of this House that proceedings as regards Committee have rendered it inevitable that Parliament should be asked to give up time on certain occasions to the Government, and to propose new Rules of Procedure. I hope that the House will take the matter in hand, and prevent the possibility of its recurrence. I believe it can do so if it exercises its power. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) has asked a very reasonable Question as to whether an opportunity will be afforded of discussing the Rules as a whole. I think that that opportunity should be afforded, and that it should be given on the first reading. I think I have referred to the general objections that have been made. I can only say that I must press the Motion that I have made. I do so with deep regret; but a sense of the responsibility and the duty that are imposed on me, not merely as a Member of the Government, but as Leader of the House, in the endeavour to restore the House to a proper control of its own Business.

Sir EDWARD REED (Cardiff) said, he was desirous of expressing his regret at the course taken by the Government with respect to the Motion of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn). He would bear his testimony to the strong feeling which existed throughout the whole of South Wales on the question of Disestablishment. The announcement just made would be received in Wales with keen regret. He would be willing to support any measure which would enable the House to do its Business; but they were trying to do a great deal more—they were trying to adapt that great Parliamentary Institution to conditions to which it was not suited. They had already made away with some of the Privileges of Parliament for which their forefathers fought and bled. They had sacrificed the right of putting grievance before Supply. Last year he (Sir Edward Reed) endeavoured in vain to bring before the House the wrongs and grievances of the Navy, which were now universally acknowledged, and he failed, because that House had almost ceased to be a Parliament in the only sense in which it was worthy to be called a Parliament. The House, by accepting these Rules, was about not simply to facilitate Business, but to take away Parliamentary rights and to shut the mouths of its own Members. He was afraid that the result of passing these Rules would be fraught with the greatest injuries to the State in the future of our history. The effect of these Rules would be to stifle the voices of the Representatives of the people. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members opposite might laugh; but they did not like even the present Rules of Procedure when they were in Opposition. A Parliament was not worthy of the name in which any hon. Member, who reasonably, intelligently, and honourably desired to represent the opinion of his constituents upon any particular subject before the House was systematically deprived of the opportunity of doing so. He should not offer any obstruction to the progress of the discussion of the new Rules, although he should vote against many of them; nevertheless, he thought that there was much force in what had fallen from his hon. and venerable friend the Member for Merthyr—that Ireland had, by misgovernment, been brought into a position in which it could not be governed except by stifling it; and if Wales were to be similarly treated, fresh difficulties would be created which would call for even more drastic and disastrous remedies than were now about to be proposed. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith) would have done well if he had yielded the point with regard to Tuesday, because, by his refusal, he would deprive the Government of the last vestige of *prestige* and regard in which it had been held by the Welsh people.

Colonel CORNWALLIS WEST (Denbigh, W.) said, that no one could feel more disappointed than he did at the decision that had been arrived at by the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith). There was no question which raised such a strong feeling as the question of the Disestablishment of the Church did in Wales. Even the Church people themselves desired that the matter should be decided. The time was very soon coming when a great many Welsh Members would demand—in a stronger voice than hitherto—the settlement of many Welsh questions which had been repeatedly put before the House. It would, in his opinion, have been far better if the Motion of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) had been allowed to be thoroughly threshed out and discussed in that House. Without wishing in any way to emulate the tactics of hon. Members from Ireland, he must express his regret that the Government had refused to allow the Motion of the hon. Member for Swansea to be discussed next Tuesday.

Dr. CAMERON (Glasgow, College) said, that it was pretty evident that the Welsh people required some safety-valve for their feelings, and he therefore advised Welsh Members to imitate the example of the Scotch and Irish Members, and to bring on the discussion they desired in the form of an Amendment to the Address; instead of making appeals which they knew would not be regarded. If, as seemed to be the case, Wales would be saved from revolution by that simple mode, and he trusted the Welsh Members should not hesitate to avail themselves of what yet remained to them of their Parliamentary rights. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith) had promised to allow a second reading debate upon the discussion of the first Resolution; but sometimes arrangements of that kind had subsequently been found not to be in Order. He (Dr. Cameron) wished to know from the right hon. Gentleman the Speaker whether it would be in Order for the House to enter upon a sort of second reading debate upon the whole of the new Rules on the Motion that the House agree with the first Rule?

MR. SPEAKER: It is impossible for me to anticipate events, and determine now whether such a discussion would be in Order or not. It would be contrary to practice to do that. When the case arises I shall, of course, be prepared to give my decision upon the point.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Derby) said, he should be glad to have the opportunity suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith). If there were any difficulty about it, it would be very easy to make, as was made in the Committee upstairs, a Motion "That these Rules be now taken into consideration." He made that Motion in the Committee; and such a Motion would permit the general question of the Rules being discussed.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 158; Noes 261: Majority 103.—(Div. List, No. 11.)

Main Question again proposed.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Newcastle-upon-Tyne) said, he would venture to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) to a point on which, though he could not suppose there was any doubt of his intention, it would be better to have a distinct understanding. As the Motion stood on the Paper, it was perfectly clear that the Government would be able to put down the Procedure Rules for private Members' nights only, and reserve Government nights for their own Business. Of course, the House understood that the whole time of the House —both Government time and private Members' time—would be devoted to the subject for which urgency was asked; but it was better that the understanding should be distinct.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH), in reply, said, that he had exactly followed precedent in the Motion he had made, and that he would follow precedent also in the course he should adopt under that Motion. It might, possibly, be necessary that urgent Business, such as Supply, should be taken during the debate on the Procedure Rules; but there was no intention of appropriating Mondays and Thursdays to ordinary Government Business, and only the private Members' days to the consideration of this question. Nothing but urgent Business would be permitted to intervene.

MR. PARNELL (Cork): Mr. Speaker, the case of Wales having been rejected by a large majority, it may appear somewhat rash in me to ask the House to consider the case of Ireland. But as I have secured an early day for a very important measure, a Bill which will deal with a question upon which I understand the Government have made up their mind favourably—I refer to Wednesday next, which I have secured for a Bill dealing with the question of the inclusion of leaseholders within the Land Act of 1881—I have considerable and strong hopes that as it is a question I am credibly informed the Government had made up their minds favourably to entertain and to agree to, they will not object to excepting a day from the Resolution which is now under the consideration of the House. In the event of this course being adopted, and the Bill in question being favourably received by Her Majesty's Government, as I am credibly informed it will be, it would probably only take up a short time for discussion and decision on the second reading. Her Majesty's Government would, therefore, if they made an exception in favour of this Bill, be enabled immediately afterwards to resume the discussion of the Rules of Procedure, if they were by that time reached. Consequently, there would be no practical disadvantage to the Government in adopting the course I have in view. On the contrary, they would save the necessity of setting aside a day, or days, hereafter for their own Government measure on the subject, and they would deal with a pressing question, which both sides of the House admit urgently demand a settlement. There are also other considerations of a graver and wider character, which I should not have wished to have imported into this discussion, if I had seen on the other side of the Table a favourable response from the Government with regard to this question of mine respecting the Bill I have previously mentioned; but in the absence of any such favourable sign I fear it will be necessary for me to go further, and considerably enlarge the scope of the matter which it will be my duty to bring before the House. It is very true that if I had seen any intention on the part of the Government to meet me on this question I should not have to propose to enlarge the field of discussion, because I should have looked upon that yielding so far on the part of the Government as an earnest that they are commencing to devote their serious attention to the very grave state of Ireland, and that they are going to take this first step at once in the inclusion of the leaseholders under the Land Act of 1881—a step which formed part of my original Bill of last Session—and that this would be regarded in Ireland as an earnest, a very much-needed earnest, on the part of the Government that they are about to change, or, at all events, to modify, their policy of coercion for one of amelioration. It would be difficult for me, even if I had the power to do so, but not having the power to do so, to exaggerate the importance of such a step on the part of Her Majesty's Government in the present critical state of Ireland. We know what is happening in that country. We know that the Government have thought it necessary to take a series of proceedings against leading and prominent politicians—Irish politicians, Members of this House. We know also that the Government have announced to the House that they intend to bring forward coercive proposals against Ireland; and, so far as we have yet gone, we have only had a very shadowy and vague intimation of any intention on their part to go into the question of ameliorative legislation. Now, Sir, I think that, although the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) may turn from the consideration of the ordinary Business of the House to the question of reforming the Rules of Procedure, like Napoleon III., when he made war upon Germany, "with a light heart," and although the House may grant him those powers with a light heart—powers entailing an interval of four or five weeks, if we are to judge by the precedent set in 1884, when the Rules of the late Government were under consideration, and when over five weeks, from day to day, of the time of the House were occupied with an unintermittent consideration—if we are to judge by this precedent, the probability is that we shall not be able to revert to the question of Ireland, or to any other question, for four or five weeks. Now, the right hon. Gentleman has complained that if hon. Members of the House had not shown a disposition to unduly protract, according to his views, the debate upon the Address by the introduction of a miscellaneous collection of subjects, he would not have felt it necessary to move his Resolution; but we have the remarkable fact, Mr. Speaker, that on the very first day of the Session the Government announced that they were going to ask all the time of the House for the consideration of the Rules of Procedure—therefore, this statement of the right hon. Gentleman will not hold water in his own justification. It is evident that the Government had determined that they would pilfer private Members of the half of their time from the very commencement, and that the subsequent conduct of hon. Members of the House in bringing forward various questions for discussion upon the debate on the Address had nothing whatever to do with it. Now, Sir, I have said that I had intended to narrow my request to one point for securing portion of Wednesday for the question of the consideration of this Bill; but the stern and unyielding appearance of the right hon. Gentleman warns me that I shall gain nothing by adopting that course, so that I am therefore obliged to submit to the House a Resolution which I propose to move at the conclusion of what I have to say—to move to leave out all the words after the word "That," and to add these words—

"In the opinion of this House the state of Ireland is such as to require the disclosure"——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Gentleman; but I must point out that we have got to the word "day," in the third line of the Resolution; and, therefore, it would not be competent to the hon. Member to move the Resolution he proposes.

Mr. PARNELL: I submit, Sir, with the greatest deference to your superior judgment and your ruling; but I was under the impression that no word of the Resolution has yet been affirmed by the House, and that the Question which you have just put is, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no doubt as to what is the Rule of the House—we propose, after the word "day," to insert the words "except Tuesday, February 22"—therefore, we have reached that point in the proposed Resolution.

MR. PARNELL: I was under the impression that the Motion of the hon. Gentleman not having been to leave out any of the words of the right hon. Gentleman, all the words of the Resolution were still before the House, and that we should be entitled to reject the whole of that Resolution if the House thought fit. However, I submit Sir, to your ruling, and will substitute for that Amendment an addition to the end of the Resolution by way of proviso—

> "Provided the said Rules are not set down for consideration before the Government have disclosed to the House the nature of their proposed legislation with regard to Ireland."

Now, Sir, I think that we have valid and good grounds for asking the House to pause before they adopt the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House. We have, in the first place, Mr. Speaker, grave events occurring from day to day in Ireland which surely ought to call for some provision—some safeguard—from the House, in order, if possible, to give some guarantee that those events should not be followed, and that we may have time to meet them. If these events should be followed by others of a similar character, and if the state of affairs in Ireland should become appreciably worse in the interval which must elapse before the proposed Rules of Procedure of the Government can be considered and finally decided in this House; if you give all the time of the House to Her Majesty's Government you will not only close your own mouths, but you absolutely prohibit yourselves from taking up any question which Her Majesty's Government will not choose to take up, no matter how pressing it may be. I understand that no amendment or alteration of the Rule can be moved if once it has been adopted, and any dispensing power with regard to it will be entirely in the hands of the Government. Well, Sir, I, for one, am not disposed to surrender either my own rights or the rights of hon. Gentlemen who are associated with me in order to discuss the Rules of the Government. I think that some consideration should be extended to a body of 86 Members of this House. They have asked through me for permission to bring forward the Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment Bill on next Wednesday. I think also that the conduct of the Government, in springing this Resolution by surprise upon us this afternoon by interpolating it upon the ordinary course of the debate on the Address, is one which ought to be condemned. It is an unusual and unheard-of one. There is no precedent for a Minister of the Crown, or for anybody else, to ask the House to depart from the discussion of the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech of the Queen in order to bring forward or to annex all the time of the House for the purpose of enabling the Government to bring forward proposals connected solely with the reform of the Procedure of the House, and not with the Crown. There is no precedent for the interruption of debate on the Address at such an early time in the season. It was never done except in one instance, and that was in the Session of 1881. But it was not then a question merely of the reform of the Rules of Procedure; but the then Government asked for the time of the House because they were convinced that the state of affairs in Ireland was so stringent that it was absolutely necessary that the House should proceed from day to day and from night to night to, first, pass a Coercion Act, and, secondly, to pass remedial legislation for the reform of the Land Law. That is not the case now. The Government have pushed aside all legislation for Ireland and all parts of the United Kingdom, and they claim from us that we shall surrender the opportunities we have obtained in the ballot for the discussion of Irish and other questions. Now, Sir, what is the urgency for the alteration in these Rules of Procedure? The right hon. Gentleman has spoken of the gravity of the situation of the House; but I deny that there has been any undue prolongation of the debate on the part of any section of the hon. Members of the House. I contend, Sir, that if the Government had announced at the commencement of the Session that they intended to take up all the time of the House, private Members would have been justified in bringing forward matters in which they were interested for discussion on the Address. The right hon. Gentleman may depend upon it that so long as there are attempts made to sit upon hon. Members in one direction he will have them popping up their heads in another direction; and if he filches away the privileges and rights of private Members they will make some attempt to retaliate in another way. The Leader gets on best with this House who is mindful of its traditions and of the fact that it does not consist entirely of Her Majesty's Government, but of Members as a whole, who are supposed to be equal in the law of debate. Of late years, however, we have had invasions of the rights of private Members, who have been thrust on one side as if they were of no account. I believe, Sir, it would be found on examination of the chronicles of this House that all the great measures of reform—measures for remedying the grievances of the people—measures for asserting public rights and putting down public wrong—have been due to the perseverance and often repeated exertion for many years of private Members of this House in bringing forward these questions in which they were interested on the days which the House gives up to private Members. I think it is time that private Members should make some kind of stand against this encroachment on their rights, and I do not think we could have a better case to make a stand upon than this question of Ireland. The Government have not told us what they are going to do with regard to Ireland. They have told us that they are going to bring forward a Coercion Bill of some kind; but they have not told us of what nature that Coercion Bill is going to be. They have told us nothing whatever of their measures of amelioration for Ireland. A very important event is going to happen next Saturday. We are told that on next Saturday the Government will be placed in possession of the Report of Lord Cowper's Commission with regard to the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland. Now, I confess that before this Resolution is agreed to I should like to have seen that Report. I do not know why it has been kept back so long. The Government say that even when they get it into their possession they will refrain for some time longer from disclosing its nature to the House. I do not know why the Government are going to do that. I do not see why the Government should not, without any unnecessary delay, disclose this Report to the House of Commons and to the country, in order that we may be the better judges whether we ought to proceed with the Rules of Procedure first, or with measures of amelioration for Ireland. Why has Her Majesty's Government sprung this Motion now under discussion upon us without Notice? It was only on yesterday afternoon, when it was impossible to frame an Amendment in time to place it on the Paper of the House, that we were informed by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House of his intention to bring forward the Motion this evening. I do not think the House has been well treated in this matter. I think we should have got sufficient Notice—at least 24 hours' Notice—of the intention of Her Majesty's Government to bring forward this very important and grave Resolution. I do not know that things may not go from bad to worse in the meantime in Ireland. I have received a telegram this afternoon from the Westport Board of Guardians—a Board which was in receipt a very few months ago of relief from State sources for the purpose of saving it from bankruptcy. The telegram says—

> "The Westport Board of Guardians have to-day received notice of the eviction of 121 families, numbering 1,000 persons, the landlords being in some cases Lord Sligo and Lord Clive. The guardians consider this attempt at the general extirpation of the people as inhuman and barbarous, and they implore the Government to use their influence to stay the hands of the evictors."

Sir, it is at such a time as this that we are asked to shut ourselves out of the power of raising our voices against grievances such as these in Ireland, to deprive ourselves of the power of bringing any measures or making any suggestions on our own account to meet these terrible acts in Ireland. Sir, the day before yesterday in West Cork Lord Cork invoked the aid of a large body of police to enforce evictions——

MR. SPEAKER, interposing, said, a discussion on the state of affairs in Ireland was not in Order. From what has fallen from the hon. Gentleman I consider that his Amendment will take the form of a negative to the Resolution already agreed to and passed by the House, and I shall point out that an Amendment of that nature cannot be accepted.

MR. PARNELL: Well, Sir, of course I am bound by your ruling. The Resolution reads this way—

> "That the consideration of the proposed Rules of Procedure have precedence of Orders of the Day and Notices of Motion on every day on which the consideration of these Rules may be set down by the Government."

I proposed to add to it this—

> "Provided the said Rules are not set down for consideration before the Government disclosed to the House the nature of their proposed legislation regarding Ireland."

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion, that is in direct opposition to the first proposition. If the Government have power to give precedence among the Orders of the Day to the proposed Rules of Procedure by the first proposition, by the second they are forbidden to do so under the terms of the hon. Gentleman's provision. The two together would have a militating effect one upon the other.

MR. PARNELL: It appears to me, Sir, that the House may fairly require the Government to agree to such a condition as I propose—that before they use this right which the House would be willing to give them they disclose to the House the nature of their proposed legislation. However, I would not on any account set myself up to differ from any ruling which you would make, and if I understand your ruling and judgment I will simply content myself.

MR. SPEAKER: What I object to is the sweeping character of the Amendment proposed by the hon. Gentleman. If the hon. Gentleman moved "that except on certain days," be added to the Resolution it would not be of such a sweeping character.

MR. PARNELL: May I move an Amendment of this character—

> "Except on such Wednesdays as measures concerning Ireland may be set down for consideration."

MR. SPEAKER: I think it will be competent for the hon. Gentleman to do that.

MR. PARNELL: I will substitute for the first Amendment the Amendment I have just recited. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the importance of this question is one which I fear very much will be increased from day to day. In fact, it appears to me, from the occurrences which reach us from Ireland, that the importance of this question is very much graver and exists to a very much larger extent than appears to have impressed itself on the minds of the Members of Her Majesty's Government. I wish to know whether we can really shut the door for considering every question affecting Ireland until these Rules of Procedure have been disposed of? I, for one, would hope that even at the eleventh hour the Government would say they are making demands upon the House, and particularly upon the Irish Members, of an arbitrary character, and that they will consent, at all events, to give up one day, as was done last Session by the then Leader of the House, the noble Lord the Member for South Paddington (Lord Randolph Churchill), for the discussion of the Bill we brought in for the relief of Irish tenants. I do not think that the time of the House will be wasted in that way; on the contrary, I think that the avoidance of arbitrary conduct on the part of the Leader of the House will tend to facilitate Business—that it will be remembered for him, and that one good turn will be held to deserve another. But if the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House insists upon depriving us of our privileges —if he strokes the cat against the grain —if he uses the gag-snaffle when the rein would be sufficient, the right hon. Gentleman will find that he has not adopted the best course. I can but express a hope that the right hon. Gentleman will see his way to give a favourable reply. In conclusion, I beg to move as an Amendment—"Except upon the Wednesdays on which Bills relating to Ireland are set down."

Amendment proposed, at the end of the Question, to add the words "except upon the Wednesdays on which Bills relating to Ireland are set down."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. W. H. SMITH) (Strand, Westminster): I am not at all insensible to the gravity of the situation. I am fully conversant with the necessity of exercising any authority with which the House may be disposed to entrust me with the greatest possible consideration to hon. Members who differ from me, as well as to those hon. Members who agree with me. But there is another duty devolving upon the Leader of this House, and that is to endeavour to guide the House in the way in which it is necessary that the House should go for the performance of the work which it undertakes. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) has appealed to us to consider the measures which relate to Ireland. We are most anxious to approach the consideration of those measures. But I appeal to the hon. Gentleman himself whether the experience of the last three weeks is not sufficient to convince him that no attempt at legislation is possible until the Rules of Procedure are before the House? We are desirous of giving full consideration, not only to the proposals of the hon. Member for Cork and the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell), but also to our own proposals. But we know perfectly well that it would be useless to bring forward these proposals until the House has amended its Code of Procedure, and until it has taken into its own hands the power of conducting its Business in a manner which shall be creditable to the House itself and advantageous to the country. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork has spoken of the struggle of hon. Members for their rights. There is no wish whatever on the part of the Government to interfere with the rights of private Members. From the day on which I had the honour of becoming a Member of this House—a good many years ago—I had, and still have, the highest respect for the rights of private Members. I believe they are a great and cherished privilege which this House is bound to respect. But what I wish to impress upon the hon. Gentleman is that the prolongation of debate, the impossibility of getting Business carried to a conclusion, is in itself the greatest enemy and the greatest obstruction to the rights of private Members. We should not now have to propose to the House that it should give its whole time to the discussion of these Rules of Procedure if there had only been a reasonable discussion on the Address. Not only on the Address, but on every other question brought before the House, there has been an abundance of discussion, so great that the transaction of Business has become impossible. The hon. Member said that this Motion had been sprung upon the House, and a few minutes before he had drawn attention to the fact that it had been my duty to give Notice of this Motion on the first day of the Session. One remark of the hon. Gentleman answers the other. I gave Notice on the first day of the Session that it would be my duty, at the earliest convenient opportunity, to move for the time of the House for the purpose of Procedure. I think it must be admitted that 16 days' sitting is a period long enough to intervene before I proceed with this Motion. The hon. Member complains that 24 hours' Notice was not given. I gave it at a quarter to 6 yesterday afternoon, and I acted upon the Notice at 6 o'clock this evening, so that here, again, the hon. Member's desire has been fulfilled to the letter. But that is not, I am sure, the real objection of the hon. Gentleman. He is anxious that his measure should be proceeded with. Let him, then, exercise the influence which he possesses with his Colleagues on those Benches, and let him and them give no more than is just and proper consideration to Procedure, and he will certainly have the opportunity which he desires of explaining his own Bill to the House. I should be glad that he should have such an opportunity. No difficulty whatever will be thrown in his way by any hon. Member on this Bench, or on this side of the House. No, Sir; let the hon. Member for Cork give the assistance which it is in his power to give to the House to recover the character and reputation which the House had a few years ago. With regard to Lord Cowper's Report, the hon. Gentleman taunts the Government with having kept back that Report. There is not a shadow of foundation for that taunt. The hon. Gentleman ought to be aware that, when a Royal Commission is appointed, the Government has no power whatever over the conduct of the Members of that Commission, and that they are entirely independent of the Government. We have been, at least, as desirous as the hon. Member can be, that the Report should be presented as rapidly as possible. My right hon.

Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), when Notice of the Question was given, wrote to Lord Cowper, and gave me the answer which he had received. It was to the effect that the Report would be agreed to to-morrow, and would be sent to the Home Secretary on Saturday. There will be no delay whatever in the presentation of that Report on the part of the Government. There will be some delay in the way of printing, of course; but the Government will interpose no delay. No, Sir, we are, in good faith, most earnestly desirous of legislating for the benefit of Ireland. It will be the hon. Gentleman himself and his Friends who will hinder us in proposing this legislation to the House, if we are not able to obtain the time of the House for Procedure.

MR. J. E. ELLIS (Nottingham, Rushcliffe): I listened attentively to the reply of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury to the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell); but I think that any hon. Member who has any knowledge of what is going on in Ireland, and who has a due sense of the responsibility which rests upon this House, must deem it a very grave matter to place it beyond the power of this House to consider important questions affecting the well-being of Ireland, unless the consent of the Government is previously obtained. I have looked over carefully the new Rules of Procedure which have been laid upon the Table, and I have also referred to what has taken place in this House in past years with respect to that matter; and I am induced to believe that, after we have entered upon the consideration of the new Rules of Procedure, much time must elapse before we come to a conclusion of our labours upon them. I particularly noticed that the First Lord of the Treasury did not, in any way, attempt to contradict the assertion of the hon. Member for Cork, that there is no precedent for the Motion which he has made this evening. For these reasons I am prepared to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury has refused to accept the Amendment of my hon. Friend the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell). The right hon. Gentleman dwelt upon the fact that he is an old Member of the House; but, by the help of his mechanical Motion, he has just defeated the proposal of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), who is a much older Member of the House than he is. I believe that the hon. Member for Swansea has sat uninterruptedly in this House since the year 1855; while the First Lord of the Treasury, although he has always been an ornament of the House and has been of great value to his Party, has only been here since 1868. Therefore, if the House is to be guided by the lengthened experience of an hon. Member as to the Business of this House, there ought to have been a majority for the Motion of the hon. Member for Swansea. Nevertheless, the First Lord, with his obedient legions, proposes practically to shut out the Nonconformists of Wales, on Tuesday next, from discussing a question which is of the utmost importance to them. I do not propose to refer at any length to an English question, and one which has already been decided by the House; but in the name of the West of Ireland I am prepared to back up every word my hon. Friend and Leader the Member for Cork has said, especially in regard to the West of Ireland. I regret that the First Lord of the Treasury has not thought fit to follow the example of one of the greatest Conservative Leaders who ever sat in this House—Mr. Disraeli—and to act upon the *dicta* he was in the habit of pronouncing in reference to the decisions of this House. I cannot help thinking that the tension of feeling in Ireland will be much aggravated, if it is found that two Wednesdays we have already secured by Ballot for the consideration of the Land Bill, and an important Motion with reference to Poor Law Guardians, have been taken possession of by the Government. I trust that the First Lord of the Treasury will reconsider his determination, and accept the moderate Amendment of my hon. Friend, being satisfied with full possession of four days a week. Four days a week will be ample for discussing the new Rules of Procedure, and we should still have our Wednesdays left. If the Government insist upon having five days a week, let the House, if it is deemed necessary, sit on Saturday. Although it would be extremely inconvenient to me, and I have no doubt it would also be most inconvenient to you, Sir, although, perhaps, as we have a Deputy Speaker, you might be able to get over the difficulty, we Irish Members are so anxious to secure the discussion of these Irish questions that we are perfectly willing to sit here on a Saturday. By that means the First Lord of the Treasury, who is so anxious to pass these New Rules, will secure their discussion upon five days a week, and will leave to those who are anxious that the Imperial Parliament should consider the case of Ireland one or two Wednesdays upon which those Irish Members who have been fortunate enough to secure the Ballot can ventilate the grievances of Ireland. I am aware that the adoption of my suggestion would give to you, Sir, a considerable amount of extra work, and also to the officers of the House; but, in return, you would gain the good-will of the Irish people; and surely the good-will of 5,000,000 of Her Majesty's Irish subjects is worth something. Under these circumstances, I claim that our Wednesday Sittings should be allowed to follow their ordinary course; and if the Government absolutely require five days a week, let them have a Sitting on Saturday. But then there arises another question. Will the Rules of Procedure really make more progress in five days than they would in four, seeing that the Sitting on Wednesday is bound to close at 6 o'clock? I remember Mr. Disraeli, who, next to the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), I look upon as having been the greatest Leader of this House—I remember Mr. Disraeli stating on one occasion that, whatever might be the nature of the Business brought in by the Government or by private Members, there would not be a difference of more than two or three days in the date of the Prorogation of Parliament. Nor do I think that, whether the Government take four or five days a week for the consideration of the New Rules, the slightest difference will be made in the progress of the Rules. Therefore I am of opinion that the Government will derive very little advantage indeed from taking the Wednesday Sittings — certainly none in comparison with the immense mischief that would be done to the Tory Government themselves, and especially to the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Great interest is taken in the Irish cause in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and America; and is it desirable that it shall be possible for people there to say—"The British House of Commons will not even discuss the affairs of Ireland. So intent are they on altering their Rules that they decline even to devote one day a week to the consideration of Irish questions." Surely that is a very strong argument in favour of Home Rule, that even one day a week—those days having been already secured by the Ballot—are to be taken from the Irish Government. It must no be forgotten that this will constitute an argument in favour of the Home Rule Party, not merely in our mouths, but in those of our sympathizers in the Press, and for every English-speaking community in the world which has an Assembly modelled on the institutions of this Mother Parliament. They will be able to say—"Ireland can always be put out in the cold by the simple assertion that the House of Commons desire to remodel their Rules." I am not very strongly of opinion that the House has a very ardent desire to change its Rules, or that there is any absolute necessity for a change of Rules, or that that is a matter of very great concern. It is even desirable for the Irish landlords themselves that they should have the safety-valve of discussion in this House. I fail to see that the question of the New Rules of Procedure is a matter of urgent importance. In the first place, the House of Commons is supposed to have existed for 700 or 800 years. To a certain extent its Rules are simply legendary; but ever since the time of Elizabeth, at any rate, there have been well-understood Rules, and legislation has been able to go on very well without New Rules, and to get on very well too. Twenty years ago—I was not then a Member of this House, but I took great interest in the Procedure of Parliament, and in its debates; and I know that all the London papers at that time were agreed that no House of Commons would ever be able to pass more than one great measure in the course of a single Session; but by concentrating their resources the Government were able to do that. That has certainly been the state of affairs for the last eight or nine years. Any Government which takes an interest in any particular subject can pass one big measure, and is probably able to pass, in addition, a number of small measures. In the face of an active and energetic Opposition, however, they are not able to pass two or three large measures in the course of a single Session. I believe that the capacity of the Government to pass great measures is now precisely the same that it has been for the last 20 or 25 years; and the talk of Obstruction is, to a great extent, a fiction on the part of the Government. Although my experience of the House of Commons is not so long as that of the hon. Member for Swansea, I sat in the same Parliament as that which first introduced the First Lord of the Treasury into the House, and that is the opinion which my experience has enabled me to form. I have been told by a Conservative Member that the freedom of this House was utterly crushed when your Predecessor in Office, Sir, required an hon. Member to second the Motion for the adjournment of the debate. In previous years any hon. Member could make that Motion without a Seconder. But in the course of the last 20 or 25 years our privileges have been gradually curtailed, and a Seconder is required before a Motion for the adjournment of the debate can be moved. Another Conservative Member of much weight in the House, but whose name it is unnecessary to give, although I have no objection to give it privately if desired, has protested to me against the evil which will be done if any Rules are passed which are likely to limit the privileges of Members of this House. Even the right hon. Member for Mid Lothian himself has pointed out what sweeping Radical measures might be carried if the Rules were changed, and the Government, by a mechanical majority, were able to overbear every opposition. My own opinion is that the Conservative Party are taking a rash step in altering the old Rules of this House; but the deleterious effect of the Rules themselves is not so much the question as the immediate harm they will do by their mere discussion during the next four or five weeks. We cannot alter Rules which have been in force for 300 or 400 years without a considerable amount of deliberation and discussion. The discussion of these Rules may occupy the House during the next five or six weeks, and during that time every reform on every other matter will be hung up. As a Representative of Ireland, I am much concerned at the prospect; and I consider it a matter of much importance that, having secured the first place in the Ballot, we should be shut out from having a discussion upon Irish affairs. I, therefore, request the First Lord of the Treasury to reconsider his decision on this point, so far as the Wednesday Sittings are concerned. If the Government adhere to their determination, an hon. and gallant Member opposite will be unable to bring on any question as to naval affairs. My hon. Friend the Member for West Belfast (Mr. Sexton) will find himself in the same boat when he desires to raise the question of jury-packing in Ireland. The Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Bill stands for the 2nd of March; the Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment Bill for the 16th; the County Government (Ireland) Bill for the same day; the Liquor Traffic (Local Veto) Bill for the 6th of April; and the Land Tenure (Scotland) Bill is the second Bill for the 20th of April. These Bills are of the highest importance; but the First Lord of the Treasury at one fell swoop gets rid of the whole of them, and, in the case of Ireland, declines to spare one. We should be satisfied merely to discuss our grievances. We might be out-voted, but we should not be in a position to say that we had not been listened to. I think that any temporary Party advantage which may be gained by closing our mouths will be more than counterbalanced by the feeling of dissatisfaction which will be created. I cannot help feeling that there may be much external danger in denying an opportunity for free discussion; and I would again appeal to the First Lord of the Treasury to allow the Irish Members, at least, one day. I know there will be a strong feeling in Ireland when it is known that Irish questions are to be ignored altogether while we are engaged in discussing our own Rules, and are practically standing still. At the present moment the House of Commons enjoys greater power than it ever enjoyed at any former period of its history. The House of Lords is, of course, a mere second Chamber for the purpose of revision; but, as a Chamber with real power, there is nothing to compare with the House of Commons. Yet Her Majesty's Government propose to tie up our hands for the next five or six weeks, so far as legitimate work is concerned. If we considered the Rules of Procedure on four or five days each week, and devoted, at least, one to the general affairs of the nation, we should be able to maintain our position in the country. We are only wasting time by discussing the fashion in which we are to effect a particular object. In the long run, the House of Commons will be found to be quite capable of setting any grievance right; but, at the present moment, events are marching on very fast. We have got Socialism in London——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. and gallant Member is really travelling beyond the Question. I must ask the hon. and gallant Member to keep to that Question.

COLONEL NOLAN: I do not propose to trespass much longer upon the time of the House, and I must apologize to you, Sir, for having strayed into a general discussion. I have already pointed out the immense necessity of some reform in the Irish Land Law, and in the Poor Laws of that country. At any rate, I feel that an opportunity should be afforded for the discussion of those questions, so that the Irish people may know that their Representatives have had a full and ample opportunity of stating their grievances. As you, Mr. Speaker, think that I ought not longer to trespass on the time of the House, I will, of course, bow to your ruling.

MR. P. J. POWER (Waterford, E.): Mr. Speaker, I think that my hon. Friend and Leader the Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) has made a very reasonable proposition to the Government, and I sincerely trust that in the interest of peace in Ireland——

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. P. J. POWER: I was saying I sincerely trust that in the interest of peace in Ireland the Government may see their way to accept the Amendment of my hon. Friend. In substance, all that my hon. Friend asks of the Government is that they should give three and a-half hours' consideration on Wednesday next to the Irish Bill which has first place on that day. In conformity with the Rules the House will not meet until 2 o'clock on Wednesday next—Ash Wednesday—so that there cannot be more than three hours and a-half discussion, and that is all we ask. It is not competent for me to discuss the provisions of the Bill, the second reading of which my hon. Friend desires to move on Wednesday; but I may say that if the Government were to accept the measure they would thus do more to preserve the peace in Ireland than they can possibly do through the operation of the proposed New Rules of Procedure. The Government complain of the length of the speeches which have been delivered on the Address; but when they do that they should remember that some years ago, when they were in Opposition, they were not averse to give us an example of how to prolong the debate upon the Address. As a matter of fact, Her Majesty's Speech was such as to make it necessary for us on this side of the House to take up a certain portion of the time of the House in discussing it. Indeed, I think it will be generally admitted that the Royal Speech was as verbose a one as was ever framed; and, at the same time, one of the most unsatisfactory. It dealt with little or nothing of interest. Moreover, when the Government charge us with consuming the time of the House unnecessarily, they should remember that they and their supporters have themselves consumed a great deal of time. Now, the practical effect of the Motion which the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith) has made will be to bring legislation to a standstill—while we are discussing the Rules of Procedure all the useful legislation which this country and Ireland so much require will be brought to a standstill. We have not forgotten that not many years since it took the whole of a special Session to pass certain Rules of Procedure; and I ask the House how long is the discussion of the New Rules now proposed likely to occupy? The proposed Rules are drastic in the extreme, and they propose to very greatly curtail the Privileges of private Members. I venture to say that when they do come on for discussion the New Rules will be vigorously opposed; and instead of being passed in a short time, as the Government seem to suppose, they will not be adopted until some weeks have elapsed. As was pointed out by the hon. and gallant

Gentleman the Member for North Galway (Colonel Nolan), the public at large are very little concerned in the Procedure of this House. They wish to see legislation; but the friends of the Government naturally say that the first step towards the passing of useful legislative measures is the adoption of the New Rules of Procedure, and the consequent curtailment of the Privileges of private Members. I predict that they are wrong in their forecast, and that the Rules which the Government propose to bring into force, with a view of enabling them to pass their own measures, will be found to have a contrary effect; that so far from expediting Business they will be found to retard Business. It would have been much better for the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House to have shown a more conciliatory disposition towards those who belong to the minority in the House. He may for the moment possibly obtain a victory; but it will be a dear victory. If he secures the passing of the New Rules he will not be one whit nearer the solution of the Irish Question than he is to-day. There was one remark which fell from him which was very unsatisfactory to us. Replying to the Question addressed to him by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. John Morley), he said he was not in a position to state precisely what Business the Government might think important; while he added that important Business would be taken. Now, the proposal which my hon. Friend the Member for Cork lays before the House for its acceptance is shortly this—that, at any rate, it should not allow the Government to absorb next Wednesday. Next Wednesday we, by the fortune of the Ballot, have first place for the second reading of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, Amendment Bill; and we know from personal experience, and from the reports which are reaching us daily, that some reform of this Act is actually necessary, if peace is to be preserved in Ireland. The very telegrams which my hon. Friend read in proposing his Amendment to the Motion now before the House must convince you that we are in the midst of a great agrarian crisis in Ireland, and that unless something is done in the shape of the Bill which is down for second reading next Wednesday, that crisis will daily increase in gravity. For this reason, and for many others, we on this side of the House intend to offer the most strenuous opposition to the proposition of the Government to absorb the time which usually belongs to private Members, and to thereby encroach upon the Privileges of Members of this House. We know that every great reform which has been passed in this country, or in any other country, has had its origin in a minority. You will generally find brave and daring spirits who lead the way in great reforms—they must necessarily be so—in a minority at first; but as time wears on they gain in strength, and that which was scouted a few years previously as impracticable becomes the question of the day. Now, we know from experience that if the Government obtain their present wish, they will with their large majority, unfortunately recruited by hon. Gentlemen who sit on this side of the House, pass these Procedure Rules, and that, when once they have passed them, they will enforce them with a hand of iron. We know from experience that Ireland and the Irish Members are not in the odour of sanctity on the other side, and that the Rules will be exercised with rigour towards Ireland, and towards the Irish Representatives. Consequently, we believe that it is our duty, in the interest of Ireland, to offer every opposition that we can to the Motion which the Leader of the House has proposed. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the Government imagine that if they obtain the leave of the House to absorb the time of private Members, they will be considerably nearer the solution of the Irish Question, inasmuch as they will secure the power of gagging the Irish Representatives. Events will prove that the Government are wrong in that opinion, and that if the Rules are exercised against us, so far from the Government being nearer the solution of the Irish Question, they will be further off than ever. We believe that the Bill, the second reading of which my hon. Friend desires to move on Wednesday, will tide us over, to a great extent, a serious difficulty in Ireland, because we know upon the very best authority that many of the evictions——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman has now been speaking for some time, but has not at all touched the subject before the House. I must warn him to address himself to the Question.

Mr. P. J. POWER: I am sorry, Sir, I was not dealing with the Amendment before the House. Now, another important measure is set down for an early Wednesday, the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill—a Bill which interests very considerably the people in this country. The Leasehold Enfranchisement Bill has also been put down for the same day; and another Bill in which we are very interested, and which we are anxious to speak upon, is the Belfast Government Bill, and that is fixed for another Wednesday. If the Government carry this Motion, we shall be excluded from speaking on these important matters. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, in reply to my hon. Friend (Mr. Parnell), said that he had given timely Notice of his intention to move this Resolution, and in proof of that he said that at a quarter to 6 last evening he gave Notice of the Motion. Technically, the right hon. Gentleman did give 24 hours' Notice; but it must be recollected that the Motion is one of the greatest importance; and, therefore, it would not have been unreasonable if the right hon. Gentleman had given us a considerably longer Notice, and thus have afforded hon. Members ample opportunity of forming an opinion with regard to it. I hope that when the Government calmly consider the proposition of the hon. Member for Cork they will see that it is a reasonable one, and one made in the interest of the peace of Ireland. We are very often accused, from the other side of the House, of being unfavourable to the peace of Ireland; but I think that, by the measures we bring forward from time to time, we prove conclusively that we are most anxious to preserve peace in Ireland. It is really those who reject what we know to be reasonable measures who are responsible for the present unsatisfactory state of our country. We now appeal to the House to allow us to do what we fully believe will conduce to the peace of Ireland. Last November we told you that the passing of the Tenants' Relief Bill would have a salutary effect in Ireland. Events have justified our action. What has occurred during the winter is solely attributable to yourselves. Under the circumstances — though certainly we have no reason to expect very much from Her Majesty's Government, having regard to what we have received from them in the past—we do expect, in the interest of the preservation of peace, that you will give us next Wednesday for the consideration of a measure most important to the agricultural tenants of Ireland, and to the well-being of the country at large.

Mr. WALLACE (Edinburgh, E.) said, he hoped that, in all the circumstances, the Government would make the concession which had been asked from them in moderate terms by the Irish Representatives. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) had told them that it was a mistake to say that his Motion had been sprung upon the House, and that they had been given Notice of it at the beginning of the Session. Now, although those Resolutions might have been in sight for a long time, still a difference was made when they were suddenly taken from their position of rest, and it was proposed at once to make use of them. If he had seen a gun in his neighbour's house for weeks and weeks, and if one day, when he called again, the neighbour suddenly took the weapon of war and presented it at his head, it would not do to tell him that his neighbour had not suddenly sprung the gun upon him because he had seen it there for weeks before. Yet that seemed to him the argument of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. No doubt these Resolutions had been before them, but they had been hoping that they were in the dim and distant future. If they were suddenly taken, and made use of, as they had been that evening, he would say they had been sprung upon the House. The whole transaction impressed him most unfavourably. It had to him the appearance of something in the nature of a trick. The purpose evidently was to prevent the possibility of general discussions which might be of very great importance, not only to Ireland, but to the country at large. He did not see, for his part, that at the beginning of the Session the announcement should have been made for any alteration of the Rules of Procedure. The reason alleged was the experience of last Session; but, as a new observer, who considered carefully what went on before him, he could not say he had seen much of any discussion that was unreasonably beyond the necessities of the case that was being discussed. If, then, that was the reason, he could only draw the inference that they were not to be at liberty to discuss minutely the Estimates, because, so far as he remembered, the necessity placed on the Speaker from time to time, to keep hon. Members strictly within the Rules of Order, developed itself chiefly in the discussion of the Estimates. He should, therefore, look forward with a degree of alarm to the contingency that might arise when duty imposed on the Representative of a particular constituency to draw attention minutely to Estimates specially affecting his particular locality; and that alarm was not at all allayed by the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury that he had no wish to deprive private Members of their rights. He (Mr. Wallace) believed that it was quite possible that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury was not harbouring any unconstitutional designs; but he would require something more explicit than simply a general declaration of his benevolent intentions with respect to private Members to make him confident that there was no danger lurking under the determination he had taken to press on these Procedure Rules with all the speed that the House would give. It occurred to him that it was not unreasonable on the part of hon. Gentlemen from Ireland to ask the concession which was implied in their Amendment, considering the amount of time that seemed to be proposed for the discussion of these Rules of Procedure. He (Mr. Wallace) thought the Government were asking too much when they asked the whole time of the House. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury had estimated that four or five weeks would be required for the consideration of the Rules of Procedure; but the conclusion he (Mr. Wallace) had come to upon that was that it would be from eight to ten weeks. In reality it seemed to him the effect of these Procedure Resolutions, unless they were very carefully modified by the jealous regard of the House for its own liberties and interests——

MR. SPEAKER: The House is not discussing now the Rules of Procedure, and it would be out of Order to refer to them in detail.

MR. WALLACE, continuing, said, that without dealing with the Rules of Procedure themselves, and merely having respect to the danger from the amount of time that might be required for their consideration, he thought it was not unreasonable to ask the Government that a little portion of the time which they proposed to ask for their consideration should be given to Ireland, in consideration of the special claims which it had in present emergencies as contrasted with the other parts of the country. He could not forget that the position of Ireland and of the Irish people was one of peculiar injustice. He believed at this moment the Irish people should be entrusted with the management of their own affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman is entirely out of Order in discussing the question of Ireland.

MR. WALLACE said, he had purposed to give, as a reason for offering this concession to the people of Ireland, that there was a natural feeling of disappointment in the Irish mind in connection with proceedings which had taken place in that House, which seemed to him to differentiate the case of Ireland very broadly from the case of Wales. Both sides were anxious that something should be done in regard to leaseholders in Ireland, whose interests were involved in the Amendment under consideration; and he could not see how the right hon. Gentleman could, on the ground of expected danger or difficulty, refuse this concession when there was no difficulty to be apprehended. He was not called upon to make the same refusal as in the case of Wales. He ventured, therefore, to express the hope that the Government would not, out of a mere attachment to what they considered uniformity of treatment all over the country, refuse to make an exception in this matter. The question of the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales was on a totally different footing from that of the leaseholders in Ireland, so far as discussion and sympathy were concerned. The Government might, in the most reasonable way, be alarmed at the prospect of a discussion devoted to the question of the Disestablishment of the Church in

Wales. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] He proposed, in spite of the interruptions from the other side, to proceed with the performance of his duty. He considered it perfectly reasonable, from their point of view, that the Government should refuse to allow discussion on Dissestablishment in Wales to be interpolated into the consideration of the Rules of Procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! I have twice reminded the hon. Member that he is dealing most irrelevantly with the subject before the House, and I must now direct him to discontinue his speech.

The hon. Member thereupon resumed his seat.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) said, he did not rise to prolong the discussion, but simply to draw attention to one fact. The hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), in introducing the Amendment before the House, made a very strong appeal on behalf of the Irish leaseholders. The hon. Member said nothing in regard to Irish leaseholders that he (Mr. T. W. Russell) was not prepared to endorse. He was also prepared to join the hon. Member in any reasonable appeal to the Government asking for facilities to discuss the question of Irish leaseholds; but he could not refrain from asking, was this a reasonable appeal which the hon. Member for Cork had made to the Government that evening? The House had already refused to the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) facilities for the discussion of the question of Disestablishing the Church in Wales. Hon. Members who were opposed to the existence of an Established Church in the Principality had voted against the hon. Member for Swansea. Was it then, he asked hon. Members below the Gangway, likely that the House would concede to Ireland what it had distinctly refused to Wales? Was it a reasonable appeal that the hon. Member had made to the Government on behalf of the Irish leaseholders? The hon. Member for Cork was not the only Member of the House who had displayed interest in the case of the Irish leaseholders. He wished to point out, in two sentences, what had already occurred this Session on this matter. He (Mr. T. W. Russell) himself had introduced a Bill on the subject, and that Bill would have been discussed, and in all probability read a second time by the House, but for the action of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway. He just wished to point out to the House that while this appeal was made on behalf of the Irish leaseholders it was as likely to do those leaseholders harm as to do them any good. While he was ready to join the hon. Member for Cork in any reasonable appeal to the Government on behalf of those in whom he was interested, he was not willing to go through the farce of marching through the Division Lobbies of the House of Commons in support of that appeal when he knew it was perfectly useless, and likely to do harm instead of good.

Mr. MURPHY (Dublin, St. Patrick's) said, he repudiated the suggestion that they were opposed to the Bill of the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell); they had taken no part in blocking that Bill. The hon. Member for Cork based his case on the grave state of affairs in Ireland, and he maintained that the condition of that country would be governed very much in the future by the action of the Government, which would act and re-act on the mind of the Irish people. The Government had promised the Report of the Royal Commission dealing with the agrarian difficulties in Ireland; but the result of interposing the discussion of the Rules of Procedure would be to destroy any chance which the House might have had of considering its recommendations. This might suit the policy of the Tory Party, which, in reality, was to initiate no legislation whatever. If the Government were to accede to the request of the hon. Member for Cork, he thought that some earnest would be given to the Irish people that serious legislation of some kind in regard to Ireland was to be proceeded with in this Parliament.

Mr. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid) said, that were it not for the negligence of the hon. Member for South Tyrone (Mr. T. W. Russell) in not getting his Bill printed, it would have been facilitated before it was blocked by Members of the Tory Party. It so happened that Members of the Irish Party had on the Order Book of the House two Bills dealing with the subject of leaseholders, and also with broader issues on the Land Question. The first of those Bills was set down for the 23rd instant, and the second for the 16th of March. If the

Motion of the Government was adopted, those Bills would be thrown aside without any reasonable probability of their being read a second time this Session. Would the hon. Member assist in throwing out these measures by voting for the Motion moved by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith)? He maintained that the Irish Members had not blocked the Bill of the hon. Member for South Tyrone; on the contrary, two supporters of the Government, who might be considered the allies of the hon. Member, if not his Colleagues, had taken measures to block the progress of the hon. Member's Bill. But another Bill in which the hon. Member for South Tyrone was more particularly interested than in land agitation would suffer if the Motion were adopted—that was the Liquor Traffic (Ulster) Local Veto Bill. The hon. Member had, on a recent occasion, given up in an ostentatious fashion the apostleship of temperance; but perhaps a little of the old love yet remained to induce him to keep, by his vote, that measure from destruction. He (Mr. M. J. Kenny) protested against the action of the Government as an encroachment upon the rights of private Members.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said, that a measure of the greatest possible importance to the Irish people was down for Wednesday, the 16th instant; but if the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith) carried his Motion they would lose the day for the discussion of that Bill. There was a still more important measure set down for the following Wednesday, the 23rd instant—the Irish Land Bill, which dealt with all the rights connected with the land, and those improvements in which the Irish people at the present time took such a deep interest. The Government were never tired of telling them they were desirous of bringing forward legislation for the amendment of the Land Act of 1881. Why were they going to prevent the Irish Members from bringing in a Bill dealing with the subject? If the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House were adopted, it would be impossible to deal with this important question. The opportunity would be lost, and in the hurry-skurry of a long Session such an opportunity might never occur again. Another important measure had been arranged to be brought forward by the Irish Members relating to the bad system of election of Poor Law Guardians in Ireland; but not one of these measures for the improvement of the condition of the Irish people could be advanced if the proposed Rules of Procedure were adopted. He trusted, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to withdraw his Motion.

MR. J. O'CONNOR (Tipperary, S.) said, he thought the present moment a most inopportune one for bringing forward such a Motion as that proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Mr. W. H. Smith). If the right hon. Gentleman were serious in his statement that he was anxious to approach the Irish Question, why did he not accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Parnell)? In the present condition of Ireland it was imperative that the Government should state what their remedial or coercive measures might be. At the present moment, from one end of Ireland to the other, there was nothing but distress, nothing but disturbance; and it was incumbent on the Government to bring forward their measures to ameliorate the distress, or put an end to the disturbance. The refusal of the Government to consider the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork would have a bad effect—it would induce the Irish people to take their minds and their eyes off that Assembly, and to seek again the redress of their grievances by other methods. The time had arrived when every private Member of the House ought to take his stand against the Rules of Procedure. He protested against the Government taking steps which would prevent the Irish Members from bringing in a Bill placing the leaseholders of Ireland within the benefit of the Land Act.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 107; Noes 212: Majority 105.

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Glam.)
Abraham, W. (Limerick, W.)
Blake, J. A.
Blake, T.
Blane, A.
Bolton, T. D.
Bradlaugh, C.
Bright, Jacob
Brown, A. L.
Byrne, G. M.
Cameron, C.
Campbell, H.
Carew, J. L.
Clancy, J. J.
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Cobb, H. P.
Coleridge, hon. B.

Conway, M.
Conybeare, C. A. V.
Cox, J. R.
Craig, J.
Craven, J.
Crawford, W.
Cremer, W. R.
Dillon, J.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Ellis, J. E.
Ellis, T. E.
Esslemont, P.
Evershed, S.
Fenwick, C.
Flynn, J. C.
Foley, P. J.
Fox, Dr. J. F.
Fuller, G. P.
Gilhooly, J.
Gill, T. P.
Hayden, L. P.
Healy, M.
Holden, I.
Hooper, J.
Howell, G.
Illingworth, A.
Jordan, J.
Kenny, M. J.
Labouchere, H.
Lalor, R.
Lane, W. J.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leahy, J.
Lefevre, rt. hn. G. J. S.
Lewis, T. P.
Macdonald, W. A.
M'Arthur, A.
M'Cartan, M.
M'Carthy, J. H.
M'Donald, P.
M'Ewan, W.
M'Laren, W. S. B.
Marum, E. M.
Morgan, O. V.
Morley, rt. hon. J.
Murphy, W. M.
Nolan, Colonel J. P.
Nolan, J.
O'Brien, J. F. X.
O'Brien, P.
O'Brien, P. J.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, J. (Tippry.)
O'Hanlon, T.
O'Hea, P.
Parnell, C. S.
Pease, A. E.
Pickersgill, E. H.
Picton, J. A.
Plowden, Sir W. C.
Power, P. J.
Price, T. P.
Priestley, B.
Provand, A. D.
Pyne, J. D.
Quinn, T.
Reed, Sir E. J.
Rendel, S.
Richard, H.
Robinson, T.
Rowlands, J.
Rowlands, W. B.
Rowntree, J.
Russell, E. R.
Sexton, T.
Shaw, T.
Sheehan, J. D.
Stack, J.
Stevenson, F. S.
Stuart, J.
Sullivan, D.
Summers, W.
Thomas, A.
Tuite, J.
Wallace, R.
Warmington, C. M.
Wayman, T.
Williamson, J.
Wilson, H. J.
Woodhead, J.

TELLERS.

Biggar, J. G.
Sheil, E.

NOES.

Addison, J. E. W.
Ainslie, W. G.
Allsopp, hon. G.
Ambrose, W.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Anstruther, H. T.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Baggallay, E.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Baird, J. G. A.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, G. W.
Banes, Major G. E.
Barry, A. H. Smith-
Bartley, G. C. T.
Bates, Sir E.
Baumann, A. A.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Beadel, W. J.
Beaumont, H. F.
Beckett, E. W.
Beresford, Lord C. W. De la Poer
Bethell, Commander G. R.
Bickford-Smith, W.
Biddulph, M.
Birkbeck, Sir E.
Blundell, Col. H. B. H.
Bond, G. H.
Bonsor, H. C. O.
Borthwick, Sir A.
Bridgeman, Col. hon. F. C.
Bright, right hon. J.
Bristowe, T. L.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Bruce, Lord H.
Burdett-Coutts, W. L. Ash.-B.
Burghley, Lord
Caldwell, J.
Campbell, Sir A.
Chamberlain, R.
Chaplin, right hon. H.
Charrington, S.
Clarke, Sir E. G.
Cochrane-Baillie, hon. C. W. A. N.
Coddington, W.
Coghill, D. H.
Cohen, L. L.
Colomb, Capt. J. C. R.
Cooke, C. W. R.
Cotton, Capt. E. T. D.
Courtney, L. H.
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. S.
Crossman, Gen. Sir W.
Currie, Sir D.
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davenport, W. B.
Dawnay, Colonel hon. L. P.
De Cobain, E. S. W.
De Lisle, E. J. L. M. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Dimsdale, Baron R.
Dixon-Hartland, F. D.
Dorington, Sir J. E.
Duncan, Colonel F.
Duncombe, A.
Dyke, rt. hn. Sir W. H.
Edwards-Moss, T. C.
Elliot, hon. A. R. D.
Elton, C. I.
Evelyn, W. J.
Ewart, W.
Ewing, Sir A. O.
Eyre, Colonel H.
Fellowes, W. H.
Field, Admiral E.
Fielden, T.
Finch-Hatton, hon. M. E. G.
Fisher, W. H.
Fitzgerald, R. U. P.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Folkestone, right hon. Viscount
Forwood, A. B.
Fowler, Sir R. N.
Fraser, General C. C.
Fulton, J. F.
Gathorne-Hardy, hon. A. E.
Gedge, S.
Gent-Davis, R.
Giles, A.
Gilliat, J. S.
Godson, A. F.
Goldsmid, Sir J.
Gorst, Sir J. E.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gray, C. W.
Greene, E.
Grimston, Viscount
Gunter, Colonel R.
Hall, C.
Hambro, Col. C. J. T.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, Col. C. E.
Hanbury, R. W.
Hanbury-Tracy, hon. F. S. A.
Hankey, F. A.
Hardcastle, E.
Hardcastle, F.
Havelock - Allan, Sir H. M.
Heath, A. R.
Heathcote, Capt. J. H. Edwards-
Heaton, J. H.
Heneage, right hon. E.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hervey, Lord F.
Hill, right hon. Lord A. W.
Hoare, S.
Holland, rt. hon. Sir H. T.
Holmes, rt. hon. H.
Hornby, W. H.
Houldsworth, W. H.
Howard, J.
Howorth, H. H.
Hozier, J. H. C.
Hughes, Colonel E.
Hughes - Hallett, Col. F. C.
Hunt, F. S.
Hunter, Sir G.
Isaacs, L. H.
Isaacson, F. W.
Jackson, W. L.
Jarvis, A. W.
Jennings, L. J.
Johnston, W.
Kelly, J. R.
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Kenrick, W.
Kerans, F. H.
Kimber, H.
King, H. S.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, hon. H. T.
Knowles, L.
Lafone, A.
Lambert, I. C.
Laurie, Colonel R. P.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Lees, E.
Legh, T. W.
Leighton, S.
Lewis, C. E.
Lewisham, right hon. Viscount
Llewellyn, E. H.
Long, W. H.
Low, M.
Lowther, hon. W.
Lowther, J. W.
Lubbock, Sir J.
Macartney, W. G. E.
Macdonald, right hon. J. H. A.
Maclean, J. M.
Maclure, J. W.
M'Calmont, Captain J.
Malcolm, Col. J. W.
Manners, rt. hon. Lord J. J. R.
Marriott, rt. hn. W. T.

Matthews, rt. hon. H.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Mayne, Admiral R. C.
Mildmay, F. B.
Mills, hon. C. W.
More, R. J.
Mount, W. G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. Sir J. R.
Mowbray, R. G. C.
Mulholland, H. L.
Muntz, P. A.
Murdoch, C. T.
Newark, Viscount
Noble, W.
Norris, E. S.
Northcote, hon. H. S.
Norton, R.
O'Neill, hon. R. T.
Paget, Sir R. H.
Parker, hon. F.
Penton, Captain F. T.
Plunket, right hon. D. R.
Plunkett, hon. J. W.
Pomfret, W. P.
Price, Captain G. E.
Puleston, J. H.
Raikes, rt. hon. H. C.
Rankin, J.
Rasch, Major F. C.
Ritchie, rt. hon. C. T.
Robertson, W. T.
Robinson, B.
Rollit, Sir A. K.
Ross, A. H.
Russell, Sir G.
Russell, T. W.
Salt, T.
Sellar, A. C.
Selwyn, Capt. C. W.
Seton-Karr, H.
Sidebottom, T. H.
Sidebottom, W.
Sinclair, W. P.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smith, A.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Stanley, E. J.
Sutherland, T.
Talbot, J. G.
Tapling, T. K.
Temple, Sir R.
Thorburn, W.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Townsend, G. F.
Tyler, Sir H. W.
Vincent, C. E. H.
Walsh, hon. A. H. J.
Waring, Colonel T.
Watson, J.
Webster, Sir R. E.
Webster, R. G.
White, J. B.
Whitley, E.
Winterbotham, A. B.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wolmer, Viscount
Wood, N.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wright, H. S.
Wroughton, P.
Yerburgh, R. A.

TELLERS.
Douglas, A. Akers-
Walrond, Col. W. H.

Main Question put.

Resolved, That the consideration of the proposed Rules of Procedure have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motion on every day on which the consideration of those Rules may be set down by the Government.

MR. W. H. SMITH: It will be, perhaps, for the convenience of the House, if I state that I propose to put down these Resolutions for consideration on Monday next, in the hope and confident assurance that the Address will be disposed of to-night in its present stage, and the Report on the Address to-morrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HER MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

ADJOURNED DEBATE. [SIXTEENTH NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th January.]—[See page 84.]

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Sir, I believe myself compelled to refer, in the course of the remarks which I propose to make somewhat at length, to a matter in which I myself have the deepest personal interest. I know, Sir, that it will be alleged that, in the course which I am about to pursue, I am doing a thing which is most unusual and inconvenient —it will be even said that it is a course hardly decent for a Member of this House to pursue. ["Hear, hear!"] I find no fault with that expression of opinion from hon. Members opposite; but, at the same time, I am perfectly convinced that, before I have concluded the statement which I feel bound to lay before this House, even hon. Members who have just given expression to their feelings in a sense hostile to me, will admit that, whether I am right or whether I am wrong, the circumstances which surround these proceedings in Dublin fully justify a course which I admit, under ordinary circumstances, would be a most improper and a most indecent course—namely, for a man who is standing his trial, while that trial is actually pending, to leave the Court and appear before this House in order to impeach the manner in which that trial is being taken. Sir, I will now mention what the circumstances of the trial were. The first point is this: I was, in company with some friends of mine, arrested in the town of Loughrea, County Galway, on 16th December last. I was taken immediately before a magistrate and committed for trial before the Petty Sessions Court of the town of Loughrea, under bail. Two or three days afterwards notice was served upon me by the prosecutor in that case, discharging me of my bail; and, at the same time, notice was served, summoning me to appear in the police court of the city of Dublin, and after our case was heard there for a considerable time, we were duly committed to be tried before the Spring Assizes in Green Street, in Dublin—I myself, together with four other Members of this House—and the venue was laid before a city jury in the city of Dublin. Let me say, before proceeding further, that all the great National trials in Ireland for a period extending over 40 years—indeed, I believe for a much longer period—have been held in the city of Dublin before a city jury. Trials of every imaginable complexion

—of the greatest possible gravity—the State Trials of 1848, the Fenian Trials, the Phœnix Park Trials, the Maamtrasna Trials, and a variety of other trials which were moved from other parts of Ireland, were held in the city of Dublin; and during that long period, during which there prevailed in Ireland the greatest and most intense excitement, no Crown lawyer has ever risen in this House to complain that in the city of Dublin they could not get a jury perfectly competent to deal with these cases. But, in the middle of January last, a rumour got abroad in the city of Dublin that the Crown were about to use their statutable power to move the venue in our cases from the city to the county. I will try to explain to the House what the cause of this move was; but, simultaneously with this rumour, there got abroad in Dublin another rumour, which was presently discovered to be founded on fact, and that was, that the Sub-Sheriff of Dublin County (Mr. Ormsby), who had been Sub-Sheriff continuously for 30 years, was to be discharged from his office, and in his place there was to be appointed Captain Hamilton, the honorary president of the Property Defence and Emergency Association in Dublin, and the agent of the Brooke estate. The High Sheriff of the County Dublin is a gentleman by the name of Mr. Harry Hamilton, a landlord, one of the most unpopular landlords, and one of the most active Tory politicians in the County Dublin. At the time at which he appointed Captain Hamilton—which he undoubtedly did, for we have the most positive proof of it—he must have known that our trial was to be shifted from the city into the County Dublin; and I dwell upon the appointment of Captain Hamilton, though I know it will be urged that his appointment was cancelled; because, at the time, Mr. Harry Hamilton appointed him, he knew that this Sub-Sheriff was to strike the panel upon which myself and my Colleagues were to be tried; and, because I want to show the House what are the ideas of the High Sheriff of the County Dublin, as to what is decent and correct in the administration of justice in Ireland. Mr. Harry Hamilton saw nothing indecent, nothing that was not right or proper in dismissing, at the very hour that he knew my trial was to come on, a Sub-Sheriff who had struck panels for 30 years in the Fenian trials and the Nationalist trials, and against whose panels no objection had been taken by the lawyers, and appointing as Sub-Sheriff in his place, a sworn personal enemy of my own, a man who, acting as the agent on the Brooke estate, had come into very nearly personal collision with me at the fair of Gorey, when he appeared walking down the far side of the street with a revolver in his belt, and with seven Emergency bailiffs also with revolvers. In the indictment of this trial, one of the speeches upon which the Crown mainly rely, and for which I am being tried, is a speech made at Arklow, County Wicklow, in which I denounced personally, and by name, in what I will admit was the strongest language, the conduct of Captain Hamilton. The speech is to be used against me at the trial, and Mr. Harry Hamilton saw no shame in putting that individual whom I was to be tried for denouncing, to arrange the panel on which I was to be tried.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) (Bristol, W.): He never was appointed.

MR. DILLON: I know he never was actually appointed; but why was he not appointed? The right hon. Gentleman holds in his possession to-day a letter from Mr. Harry Hamilton appointing Captain Hamilton. He was not appointed, however, because the Chief Secretary for Ireland and Lord Ashbourne saw that the thing would be too indecent, and because they knew that their influence on Mr. Harry Hamilton—

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: With the permission of the hon. Member I will contradict that. Mr. Hamilton, High Sheriff of the County Dublin, had the right to appoint as Sub-Sheriff whom he chose. He did not appoint Captain Hamilton, and he never interfered in the matter at all.

MR. DILLON: What the right hon. Gentleman has said may be perfectly correct; but it is also perfectly consistent with what I said [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"]. I assert what is the common knowledge of the city of Dublin [*Cries of* "Oh, oh!"]. Yes, it is, that Captain Hamilton was offered the appointment. I know perfectly, and will and can prove it; and I will bring forward one fact in a moment which will show how correct I am in making the statement that he was offered the appointment. Though so offered the appointment, of course he was not sworn in. If he was, he would be Sub-Sheriff, and he might strike the panel. The right hon. Gentleman may not know anything about it; but I know positively that the thing was talked about in Dublin Castle, and denounced by the officials in Dublin Castle. I know it from information I received. He has not gained very much by that, because what is the result. Though he is not Sub-Sheriff, I stand to my statement of what the reasons were, that Captain Hamilton was obliged to give up the golden reward of his long services, as the Property Defence Association, being bankrupt, could not pay his salary. But he was obliged to forego his reward. If it is true that Captain Hamilton had not the appointment offered to him, why was Mr. Williamson, the present Sub-Sheriff, not appointed till the 28th of January, when he was brought up for examination as to why the panel was irregularly struck?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member in bringing forward before the House anything he thinks necessary in his own defence; but I must warn him that earlier in the evening I ruled that it was not in Order to anticipate the Motion on the Paper of the hon. Member for West Belfast with reference to the system of jury-packing.

Mr. DILLON: I hardly anticipate that Motion. I am being tried by a panel in Dublin deliberately and maliciously packed by my enemies [*Loud cries* of "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is acting now in flagrant violation of what I have just laid down. If the hon. Member refers to jury-packing, I shall be obliged to interfere.

MR. DILLON: Of course, under these circumstances, I will say no more on the subject. I understand your ruling was with regard to the packing of juries. I am now speaking with regard to the striking of the panel. I will ask you, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling as to whether I am entitled—because, otherwise, there would be no use in my pretending to enter into any personal explanations or defence—but I will ask for your ruling, whether I am entitled to move this Amendment to the Address, or in any other Address, or in any other way to raise the question of the conduct of these present trials in Dublin, in the last line of the Address to insert the words—

> And to assure Her Majesty, that while deeply regretting the action of the Irish Executive in reference to the State trials now proceeding in Dublin.

I wish to move that——

MR. SPEAKER: I consider the hon. Member would not be justified in moving that Amendment.

MR. M. J. KENNY (Tyrone, Mid): On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask, whether an hon. Member would be entitled to discuss any question connected with the Address provided he does not bring forward an Amendment, but raises it by way of Motion?

MR. SPEAKER: It is a distinct Rule of the House that no Motion on the Paper can be anticipated, either by general debate or by an Amendment made to the Address.

MR. DILLON: As, according to the Rules of the House, neither by personal explanation, by way of Motion, nor in any other way, can I expose the conduct of the Government in Ireland, nor be allowed to defend myself, I must, of course, submit to it in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Question is, that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR (Donegal, E.) said, he thought that, after the experience of the last few moments, it would be perfectly plain to a good number of the Members of the House that the temper of the House was scarcely such as to promise a very profitable discussion of the Question which was now about to be put from the Chair. There were a large number of questions which naturally suggested themselves, which were cognate to the matters contained in the Address, each and all of which might, under more favourable circumstances, be considered with public advantage. There were one or two important matters which he desired to bring before the House, but he, for one, at any rate, felt that if he rose to address the House upon them, he could not hope to do so with the prospect of swaying the judgment or leading the opinions of the House to the conclusion to which he desired to lead them with anything like a reasonable prospect of success; but apart from that general consideration, he must say that the circumstances, at the present moment, were so exceptional and so grave as to warrant a departure, more or less unusual, from ordinary procedure. They had had an hon. Member of the House endeavouring to lay before the House his own personal experience in a matter of the most vital importance, not only to him, but to his constituency, and to his Colleagues in the House. There were few men upon those Benches who did not stand in the same position as his hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo. There were few of them who were not closely identified with his hon. Friend in his actions, both in that House and in Ireland. When he was struck, they were struck, and when he was unfairly dealt with, they were also unfairly dealt with.

Mr. E. BECKETT (York, N.R., Whitby): I rise to Order. Is the hon. Member (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) justified in saying that he has been unfairly dealt with?

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, the House would probably not expect Mr. Speaker to trouble himself in answering that interruption. His hon. Friend the Member for East Mayo conceived, rightly or wrongly, that he would have had an opportunity of laying his case before the House. He conceived that, in his person, there had been gross injustice done. If that were so, gross injustice had been done, not only to him, but to many who were Representatives of the people. It was on the point of his hon. Friend's Membership of this House that one of the most important aspects of the present situation arose, which ought to command serious and immediate attention. It appeared to him (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) that the hon. Member would have been perfectly within his right in bringing the matter before the House. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The tendency of the hon. Member's remarks now is to dispute the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said he could assure Mr. Speaker that he had no intention of questioning the ruling of the Chair. He was perfectly alive to the situation—he was perfectly accustomed to that kind of position; but his intentions were the other way. He was extremely anxious not only to comply with the ruling of the Chair, which he had invariably done in the past; but he was anxious to show his deference. He thought his hon. Friend would have been entitled, not after that ruling, to pursue the line of argument or exposition he had taken, but to bring before the House as a personal matter of Privilege that which had occurred in Dublin. Of course, it was clear, after the ruling of the Chair, that it would not do to bring up the matter on the Address, but he should have thought, as a matter of Privilege, it would have been competent to bring the matter before the House. In that thought he (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) was considering not only the hon. Member himself, but all who sat with him on those Benches, and who were in the same position. But whether he was right or not in that opinion, it was clear that the situation at which they had now arrived was a very grave situation, not only from a political, not only from a judicial, but from a Parliamentary point of view; and it was impossible at the present moment, with the Question now under discussion, to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion upon the Question which they had just heard from the Chair. It appeared to him there was no way out of the difficulty than that which he proposed to adopt—namely, that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Arthur O'Connor.*)

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. W. H. Smith) (Strand, Westminster): Sir, It is impossible for the Government to accede to the Motion for adjournment. I can understand the circumstances of political excitement under which the hon. Gentleman has spoken; but I must be allowed to suggest to the House that the time does not warrant an adjournment; nor do the circumstances. There remains yet a period during which, if it is the desire of the hon. Gentleman to address the House on the question that an Address be now presented to Her Majesty—there is still space and opportunity to do so. Ample opportunity, however, has already been afforded for addressing the House on the Queen's Speech, and in accordance with the Notice which I gave only a few minutes ago, I must entreat the House to dispose of the Address this evening, and to deal with the Report to-morrow.

MR. BRADLAUGH (Northampton) said he had not intended to, and regretted to obtrude on the attention of the House; but he could not help feeling pained when a Member asking for the personal indulgence and grace of the House, in a matter of serious peril, was met as the hon. Member (Mr. Dillon) had just been met by one side of the House. It should give all right-minded men some cause for pain when a Member asking for the indulgence of the House had it refused, and as it had been his (Mr. Bradlaugh's) misfortune to have laboured under the same difficulty, and to have been refused by hon. Members now sitting round him; he should deem himself wanting in the traditions of that House if he did not put, as a reason for supporting the Motion for the adjournment, that there had not been that generous treatment of a Member speaking under great difficulties which one would have expected from an assembly of English gentlemen, He was not in any fashion approaching the matter upon which Mr. Speaker had ruled the hon. Member out of Order; but he was dealing with the fact that words of earnest appeal had been met with jeers and laughter.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 119; Noes 261: Majority 142.—(Div. List, No. 13.)

Original Question again proposed.

WORKING CLASSES (DISTRESS).

MR. COX (Clare, E.), in rising to move the following Amendment to the Address:—

> "Humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the want of employment and general distress prevalent among the working classes in England and in Ireland deserve the immediate attention of this House,"

said, the Irish Members did not particularly want to be in the English House of Commons—they wanted permission to go back to Ireland to make their own laws for their own people; but if hon. Members on the other side insisted upon keeping them there, they would insist upon taking up as much of the time and the attention of the House as the interests and needs of the suffering people at home and in England demanded. They had those things more at heart than Procedure Rules for gagging Members. [MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!] He was not inclined to be disrespectful to the House or to the Government; but if the House gave them the time they demanded in the interest of the working classes, they might tie down themselves to a slate and piece of pencil, and need not open their mouths from one end of the week to the other.

MR. CONYBEARE (Cornwall, Camborne): I am glad to have an opportunity of expressing my satisfaction that the claims of the working classes in this country have not been altogether overlooked. We have arrived at the 16th day of the debate on the Address——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has already spoken to the Main Question.

MR. CONYBEARE: Have I not a right to speak on the Amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot second the Amendment.

An hon. MEMBER: I beg to second the Amendment.

MR. CONYBEARE: I rise to Order——

MR. P. McDONALD: I beg to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

> At the end of paragraph 12, to insert the words—"Humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the want of employment and general distress prevalent among the working classes in England and Ireland desire the immediate attention of this House."—(*Mr. Cox.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR—[*Cries of* "Divide!" *and* "Oh, oh!"]: I must say, on behalf of the working men of this country—of whom probably I know more than many of the hon. Gentlemen sitting opposite who jeer at me—that the hon. Member for East Clare is entitled to expressions of gratitude for not having allowed the Address to pass without putting forward some representation in their behalf. This Address, like the Gracious Speech from the Throne, to which it is an answer, appears to survey mankind from China to Peru; but there is very little notice in it of this particular country, of the people who dwell in it, or of their needs or distresses. We are told a great deal about Burmah, Bulgaria, and Egypt; we have references to meddling and muddling in Europe, Asia, and Africa;

but as to what the Government intend to do in reference to the distress that prevails in this country, we are told absolutely nothing. Well, Sir, there is no reference in this Address to that which ought to have brought to the minds of many Members of this House—the condition in which many of the people of this country now are. One of the references in the Address is to that paragraph in the Gracious Speech from the Throne which refers to the Royal Commission which Her Majesty issued in 1885 to inquire into the lamentable depression under which trade and agriculture have been suffering of late years, which has presented a valuable Report, which Report, together with the important evidence collected, is to be presented to this House. With reference to that paragraph, I would like to remind the House that the Commission in question reported some time before the House met; and that the Report was not only printed, but actually published as a Parliamentary Paper before this House met at all—before this Speech was as much as drafted. The contents of that Report were perfectly well known to all the Members of Her Majesty's Government when they came down to present to us their programme of Business for the Session; yet, beyond this passing allusion to the fact that the Commission had inquired into the subject committed to it for inquiry, we have nothing to show that the distress existing in the country has engaged the attention of Her Majesty's present advisers, or caused them any anxiety. Well, Sir, there may be those who are inclined to disbelieve in the distress and suffering which I say prevails. We are told that there has been much exaggeration, that trade is improving, that employment is more easily obtained than it used to be. We are told by those in Office, who refer to official statistics, that so far from depression extending and distress becoming worse, pauperism has very much diminished, and that the Official Returns show there is nothing like the distress that there used to be. Now, Sir, with reference to that, I beg to submit to the House that the Official Returns so quoted are of the most misleading description. The right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) has more than once referred to the diminishing number shown as in receipt of relief; but the way in which the Government, on occasions of this kind, manipulate or represent these figures, requires very careful scrutiny on the part of those anxious to arrive at the real state of things. What do these figures show? They show that whereas in 1858, with a population of something over 19,000,000, something like 750,000 in England were in receipt of out-door relief; in the year 1886, with a population of 27,000,000, there were in receipt of out-door relief, not 790,000, as there used to be, but 560,000 only. And these figures are paraded, as I have said, in order to induce the impression that there is not the distress existing in the country that once there was. Sir, these figures only show half the story—the other half is to be seen in the Returns with regard to in-door relief. And what do those Returns show? They show that whereas, in 1858, there were only 126,000 persons in receipt of in-door relief, in the year 1886 that number had increased by 50 per cent, having reached a total of 177,000. Why is that? It is simply because that Poor Law is no longer administered as it used to be 25 years ago. During late years, under pressure from the head-quarters of the Local Government Board, the amount of out-door relief has been steadily decreased, these poor people being obliged to take refuge within the workhouse. Tens of thousands of homes have been broken up within the last 25 years by reason of the inexorable forcing on of this system. In 1858, out-door relief cases, as compared with in-door relief cases, were in the proportion of more than six to one. If you multiply the present number of in-door paupers by six, you will find that the number of out-door paupers ought to be, according to the old system, not 560,000, but something considerably over 1,000,000—in other words, your old pauper roll, if you administered the Poor Law as it used to be administered some years ago, would be 1,200,000 at least—that is to say, a higher number of official paupers than has ever yet been recorded. But there is another point. In the year 1858, you had in the workhouses only 7,671 able-bodied men; whereas, in the last month of the year 1886, you had no less than 12,000 male adult able-bodied paupers. Now, it is not to be supposed that these 12,000 able-bodied adult males go into the workhouses for the love of the thing. They go into the workhouses because they have absolutely no other resource left open to them. And why is there no other resource left open to them? It is because they are not allowed to have access to the means of living that ought to be accorded to the poor in this country. Only yesterday the Duke of Rutland, I think, whose authority will scarcely be contested by hon. Gentlemen opposite, presided at a meeting at which a resolution was carried *nem. con.*, urging on the attention of the Government to the very serious condition of the agricultural population and agricultural interests in England. Well, what did this Trade Depression Commission ascertain, amongst other things? They ascertained this—that your agricultural population in England had, within a comparatively short time, diminished by no less than eight per cent. Your agricultural population is falling off. What else did the Commission find? It found that whereas the proportion of the population engaged in agriculture was eight per cent less than it used to be, there is no corresponding increase in the number of those who are employed in manufacture — in other words, the actual proportion of population out of employment is greater now than ever it was before. Sir, in 1886—and I quote these few figures to show that not only is the present condition of things bad, but that it is likely to become very considerably worse—agriculture produced a wheat crop of 58,000,000 bushels or about 10,000,000 bushels, equal to 21½ per cent, less than in 1885. Not only was the total out-put less, but the acreage in wheat crop in 1886 shows a falling off as compared with 1885 of 8 per cent, and not only was the acreage 8 per cent less, but the yield per acre was also less by 7 per cent. Similarly, with regard to barley. The aggregate produce of barley has gone down from 79,000,000 bushels to 72,000,000 bushels in 1886 as compared with 1885, or a reduction of 10 per cent. In root crops, such as potatoes, turnips, and swedes, the out-put in 1886 was also less than the average. Under the circumstances, it is perfectly clear that the agricultural distress will, during the next twelve months, be greater and more serious than it has ever been up to the present time. The effect of the distress upon your agricultural population will be still more severe than it has been in the past, and with what result? These poor people will be coming into your centres of population, into your manufacturing centres, heaping distress on distress and rendering the obtaining of employment more difficult even for those who are in the towns than it is at present. You complain in this House that the Irish Members with persistent and unreasonable reiteration urge on Parliament the claims of Ireland, and you tell us, with all fairness, the claims of England have to be considered as well; and in the Speech from the Throne, to which this Address is an echo, and in which we have foreshadowed the programme of the Government for the present Session, we do find that Ireland, however miserable and hideous in her condition, is relegated to the back-ground, and that England obtains the foremost place. I ask the Government to let us know what it is they propose to do for those classes of their fellow-countrymen who stand most in need of their care? What measures of relief do they propose for these poor people in their distress? What do they propose to do for the thousands of starving men and women in England—what beginning, even of useful action are they proposing to make in order to relieve the distress of which they must be aware, but which, apparently, has, so far, received so little attention at their hands? We are told that there are thousands of people in Ireland who, even if they were allowed their holdings rent free, could never manage to get a living out of them. Well, I ask, are there not tens of thousands in this country too, who cannot earn bread for their children, though they are perfectly ready to work? Are there not tens of thousands of honest, sober, willing, industrious men who cannot get work—are there not tens of thousands of poor men whose miserable rooms echo every night with the cries of famished children—are there not tens of thousands of these poor men who must almost be driven to desperation by the sobs and tears of their starving wives and little ones? Yes; then what does the Government propose to do for these people? There is nothing in the Speech from the Throne, or in this Address, to show that the Government are heedful of this misery at their door; and it does appear to me to be a strange thing that it should be left to the hon. Member for East Clare at this hour of night—[*laughter*]—I am speaking what is the fact—that it should have been left to the hon. Member for East Clare to bring forward this subject. This matter has not been brought before the House in the Address. It does appear to me that whilst we are discussing matters relating to other parts of the world, the affairs of the working people of this country are passed over in silence by the great Conservative Party and by the Conservative Government. The noble Marquess the Member for Rossendale (the Marquess of Hartington), who has great authority with Her Majesty's present Advisers—because, though he is not in Office, he is in power—told us that Her Majesty's Government were not averse to some measures for employing the people of Ireland in their own districts, in the development of the resources of their country. Well, but are there no people in England who might be employed in developing the resources of their country too? What is the Government going to do for the distressed classes in England, that they also may be employed in the different districts in developing the resources of the country? Are there no resources of England undeveloped? Are there not in England many thousands of acres of good lands now lying idle? Are there not, even in Essex, many thousands of acres of good land which are practically now waste land? Some time ago, I was offered by a solicitor 1,000 acres of land in Essex if I would undertake to pay the rates and taxes of the property. I said I would accept the offer on one condition, and that was that I should be allowed to keep the land on those terms as long as I liked. "Oh, no!" was the answer, "Not as long as you like, but as long as the owner likes." There is the rub, Mr. Speaker. This owner was not able to utilize the land over which he had dominion. It was lying on his hands, useless to him and to the community, and there are tens of thousands of men within walking distance of that land who are willing to work, but who have no access to this good land which is thus lying idle. The bane that has worked so much mischief in Ireland is producing its natural effect in England too; and that curse that has depopulated and impoverished Ireland is ruining your agricultural districts and thinning your agricultural population, and the Government, no doubt, are perfectly well aware of it. It is because the owners of lands, like this land I have referred to in Essex, who are unable to pay their proportion of Imperial and local expenditure in respect of that land, are yet allowed to remain in unchallenged and exclusive occupation of it—that there is so much agricultural distress existing in this country. The same curse is affecting your mining industry, and the proof of it is to be found in the volume which is referred to in this Address. And not alone is this curse observable in connection with your agriculture and your mining industries, but in your manufacturing centres you find precisely the same mischief. There is a very wealthy nobleman who owns, practically, half of Sheffield. He is a most edifying gentleman. He gives thousands of pounds away for the building of churches; he makes pilgrimages in pleasure yachts and saloon carriages, but all the while he is grinding the faces of the poor. He draws thousands upon thousands a-year in the shape of ground rents from an industrial centre where there are tens of thousands of men vainly seeking for employment. I wonder what this nobleman thinks of the doctrine of ransom. I must say that when I heard the evidence adduced before the Commission, I thought the doctrine of ransom a very reasonable one. Here you have tens of thousands of men in your manufacturing centres and in this great Metropolis—particularly in the East End, around the docks—in enforced idleness, though willing and anxious to work; here you have tens of thousands of acres of good land lying idle, and here also in London you have millions of capital vainly seeking for employment—I say these three facts are sufficient to justify immediate action on the part of the Government, or, at any rate, to justify them in taking this problem into their most serious consideration. What do the people of this country care about the nebulous claims of Prince Alexander of Bulgaria? Why, the people do not care a button about them. We are told in the Address that order is slowly being restored in Egypt; but it would be much more to the interest of the people of this country if the Government would devote less attention to the question of order in Egypt, and more to the advancement of order and progress at home. That would be better than all the consideration the Government are giving to Prince Henry of Battenburg, or Prince Alexander of Bulgaria. At home, they are only thinking of completing and perfecting their police arrangements. They may complete and perfect their police arrangements as much as they like; but they will never solve the social problem which the condition of the poor presents before their eyes in that way. Is it nothing that you have, and have had now and again for some months, immense bodies of hungry men coming from the East of London to the West, and parading before their fellow-countrymen, who are better off, the spectacle of their misery and wretchedness? You have seen these men, a hungry horde, coming from the East of Aldgate pump to Trafalgar Square, and walking down Pall Mall, where the windows are tapestried with tooth-picking idlers. [*Laughter.*] You have seen these men visit this part once and go away. You have seen them come a second time and go away; but it is worthy of consideration whether some day they may not come and not be so ready to go away. When you have reached that point—that East of Aldgate pump—you have hundreds of thousands of human beings whose lot in life is such that scarcely any imaginable change can make them much worse off than they are—you have arrived at a point in your social history that is a very critical point. As a matter of fact, in the East of London, and round about the different suburbs, you have an amount of misery that is simply appalling. The hon. Gentleman laughed at me when I spoke of it in my opening words. The misery I have referred to I have seen myself; I have been in the dwellings of these people, and therefore I am speaking of what I know and understand. There are tens of thousands of homes in London in which there is hardly a stick of furniture, and in which there is not a vestige of food to be discovered, where the children are attired in rags, which, to say nothing about keeping them warm, are hardly sufficient to cover them. No help comes to these people, and they seem to be almost without hope. I heard, not long ago, of a case in which a poor man with his wife and family were reduced to destitution. The man goes out, as he has often done before, to seek work. When he comes home, what does he find? Why, that his poor wife, driven to desperation by hunger, has cut the throats of his two children, and is herself a lunatic. That is an incident very horrible, no doubt. It is like the grating of a harp-string in the night—it startles one with its suddenness; but it is only indicative of a great deal more misery that exists undiscovered and unknown. One can imagine this—that while two children have been deprived of life in their infantile misery, thousands and thousands are living and crying out daily for food which their parents are unable to give them. And what relief is offered by Her Majesty's Government—what do they do? Why, this—they say that the statistics of pauperism show a diminution of this kind of misery and suffering. I say that the statistics do nothing of the kind. I say they show that the amount of official relief is very much greater and of a much more inhuman kind than it ever was before. That is the real secret of these Poor Law Returns. Well, I would ask the Government to say, whether they are really alive to the social dangers and social difficulties which beset the community in England, and not only in England, but in Scotland also? Are the riots and disturbances in Lanarkshire, about which we have heard so much, to go for nothing? Are these symptoms of social anarchy nothing—are the disturbances occurring in different parts of the country nothing to the English Administration? What do the Government propose to do? The working men of London are not represented in this House directly, and that is a great pity. I should have thought that the Government, seeing that these people are not represented, would have become alive to the fact that men who are without representation are forced to adopt other means to secure attention to their grievances; and unless the Government shows itself alive to the distress which exists, unless it manifests some good-will and some desire to bring forward a measure which will be a first step in the direction of finding employment for the distressed classes of this Metropolis, I do not see what is left for these classes other than to seek any and every opportunity of obtruding again and again their distresses upon that portion of the community which seeks only its own ease. We have already seen that these distressed classes have taken to attending churches. Silks rustle against what has never before been in contact with silk, or, at any rate, has not been in contact with it for a long time. That sort of movement is likely to spread. What is done on Sunday is likely to be repeated on week-days. What would hon. Gentlemen, who laughed at what I said with reference to Pall Mall just now, say if they saw these men coming, and not by violence, but by sheer force of numbers, entering the doors of the clubs in Pall Mall, and actually eating up all the provisions they could find there? How many people would blame them? If there was a prospect of the poor of the Metropolis following that course, I dare say the members of these clubs would only be too anxious to support measures brought forward on the Government, or any other, side of the House likely to relieve them from such unpleasant experience. I would remind hon. Gentlemen opposite that there are rights of human nature, as well as rights of property. The rights of property are held sacred in this country, and the rights of humanity are not always readily conceded; but I trust that the Amendment brought forward by the hon. Member for East Clare will, at any rate, have the effect of eliciting from the Government some declaration, to show that they are not altogether oblivious to the claims of a most deserving class of their own countrymen.

Mr. BLANE (Armagh, S.): It would ill-become working-men Representatives in this House if they failed to support the Motion that is now before the Chair. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] Hon. Members on the other side may shout "Divide." They are what are called the ornamental members of society. I do not pretend to be ornamental myself—my endeavour is to make myself useful, and I desire to point out that, in my opinion, one thing the Government of this country altogether fails to grasp is that, by reason of labour-saving instruments and scientific appliances being used in the factories and workshops, tens of thousands of working men are put out into the streets. Very many of the trades, I may say nearly all the trades, in England at the present moment use an immense amount of machinery, to the saving of manual labour. These labour-saving appliances which are now in the market send men into the streets. It may be said that labour-saving machinery is a blessing, and no doubt it is. But though a blessing to the country generally, it has been a curse to a great many people, as it has shut out two-thirds of the work from the working people of this country. Where will these working people who have lost their work go to, or what will they do? If they turn to any other trade or profession they are again met by machinery. So vast has been the introduction of machinery in every department of trade, that it has come to be a difficult question with a man as to what trade he should put his son to. Labour-saving machinery is a blessing to this or any other country if the lands of the country are open to the people; but the lands of this country are not open to the people, hence it is that you have this disgraceful state of affairs—that one in every 13 of your population is a pauper, that one out of every 13 of the people of Great Britain is dependent for his existence either on the poor rate, or the assistance he receives from his neighbour. I hold that to be a most disgraceful state of affairs. These facts go a long way towards making up this army of Socialists you have in the Metropolis. It may be said that these Socialists are very bad men; but, in my opinion, those engaged closing up the lands of the country against the labour of the country are far worse. Communism may be bad; but the absorption of the lands of this country, and the placing of them in a few private hands, to the shutting out of labour, is still worse. The royalties paid on mines, and the comparative freedom from taxation of lands not in use, puts a premium upon laziness itself. The classes who are not useful, but highly ornamental, escape the taxation of the country, and those that are useful have to pay all the taxation. We hear a great deal in this House about the rights of property. In my opinion, property has no rights. Land has no rights. There are no rights attached to it except those that are reflected from the rights of man himself—reflected from the whole community. I hold, I say, as a first principle, that land in the abstract has no rights. They are only reflected from the people at large, and the owners of lands hold them at the will of the people at large; and it is to the negation of this first principle that is owing the fact that one out of every 13 of your population is a pauper. When I state in this House that property has no rights, it is a startling doctrine to hon. Gentlemen opposite; but, as a matter of fact, all the rights they possess are merely reflected from individuals or from the community. It will be a long time before you will be able to override a protest against the rights of man. We protest against the rights of property ever being allowed to override the rights of man. That they have overridden the rights of man in England to a certain extent is manifested by the fact that pauperism exists in your midst to an extent that you find in no other country in the world. The landlords of this country have stolen the lands from the people. These landlords who are constantly talking about defending the Empire are not the men who rush to the front when the Empire needs defence. We know that during the Crimean War 2,000 aristocratic cowards in this country laid down their swords. ["Oh, oh!"] I am only quoting the articles in *The Times* newspaper. The country was in peril in those days, and *The Times* accused these people of laying down their swords—these ornamental gentlemen. The useful men of the community did not lay down their swords. The working men of the country fought the battles of their country, and whether they were right or wrong in so doing, they have received but a poor return for their gallantry. You do not see one word in this Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne about the working classes, or about the distress that exists in the country. There is pauperism in this country and distress deeper than you will find in any other country of the world. I have seen pauperism in London of a worse type than I have ever seen it in Ireland. The fact that I am an Irish Representative does not prevent me from sympathizing with English and Scotch working men. If Englishmen are in distress in their own country, they have as good a right to our advocacy as our own countrymen have. We are bound to, in the spirit of charity; and I do not envy the spirit of those who, when questions affecting the welfare of the working people—of the people on whom the safety of the Empire depends, for it rests with the useful, and not with the ornamental members of society—are brought before them, laugh and jeer, and cry "Divide!" Even Stephenson was mocked and laughed at in this House when he put forward his project for railways. Anyone who makes an attack on what are called "vested interests," or who defends the rights of working people, is said to be a Communist or a Socialist, or some other "ist." I have much pleasure indeed in supporting the Amendment now before the House.

Mr. CONYBEARE (Cornwall) rose, when——

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my opinion that the subject has been adequately discussed—that it is the evident sense of the House that the subject has been fully and fairly debated. It is my duty accordingly to inform the House of that opinion.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Sir, in accordance with the Standing Order, I now beg to move that the Question be now put.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Question be now put."—(*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 291; Noes 81: Majority 210.

AYES.

Addison, J. E. W.
Ainslie, W. G.
Allsopp, hon. G.
Ambrose, W.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Anstruther, Colonel R. H. L.
Anstruther, H. T.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Asquith, H. H.
Baggallay, E.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Baird, J. G. A.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, G. W.
Banes, Major G. E.
Baring, Viscount
Barry, A. H. Smith-
Bartley, G. C. T.
Bates, Sir E.
Baumann, A. A.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Beadel, W. J.
Beaumont, H. F.
Beckett, E. W.
Bective, Earl of
Bentinck, rt. hn. G. C.
Beresford, Lord C. W. de la Poer
Bethell, Commnder G. R.
Bickford-Smith, W.
Biddulph, M.
Birkbeck, Sir E.
Blake, T.
Blundell, Col. H. B. H.
Bond, G. H.
Bonsor, H. C. O.
Borthwick, Sir A.
Bridgeman, Col. hon. F. C.
Bristowe, T. L.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Brown, A. H.

Bruce, Lord H.
Bruce, hon. R. P.
Burdett-Coutts, W. L. Ash.-B.
Burghley, Lord
Caine, W. S.
Caldwell, J.
Campbell, Sir A.
Chamberlain, rt. hn. J.
Chamberlain, R.
Chaplin, right hon. H.
Charrington, S.
Clarke, Sir E. G.
Cochrane-Baillie, hon. C. W. A. N.
Coddington, W.
Coghill, D. H.
Cohen, L. L.
Coleridge, hon. B.
Collings, J.
Colomb, Capt. J. C. R.
Cooke, C. W. R.
Corbett, A. C.
Corry, Sir J. P.
Cotton, Capt. E. T. D.
Courtney, L. H.
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. S.
Crossman, Gen. Sir W.
Currie, Sir D.
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davenport, W. B.
Dawnay, Colonel hon. L. P.
De Cobain, E. S. W.
De Lisle, E. J. L. M. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dimsdale, Baron R.
Dixon-Hartland, F. D.
Dorington, Sir J. E.
Duncan, Colonel F.
Duncombe, A.
Dyke, right hon. Sir W. H.
Ebrington, Viscount
Edwards-Moss, T. C.
Elliot, hon. A. R. D.
Elliot, hon. H. F. H.
Elton, C. I.
Evelyn, W. J.
Ewart, W.
Ewing, Sir A. O.
Eyre, Colonel H.
Fellowes, W. H.
Field, Admiral E.
Feilden, T.
Finch-Hatton, hon. M. E. G.
Fisher, W. H.
Fitzgerald, R. U. P.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Folkestone, right hon. Viscount
Forwood, A. B.
Fowler, Sir R. N.
Fraser, General C. C.
Fuller, G. P.
Fulton, J. F.
Gardner, R. Richardson-
Gathorne-Hardy, hon. A. E.
Gedge, S.
Gent-Davis, R.
Giles, A.
Gilliat, J. S.
Godson, A. F.
Goldsmid, Sir J.
Gorst, Sir J. E.
Goschen, rt. hn. G. J.
Gray, C. W.
Greene, E.
Grimston, Viscount
Gully, W. C.
Gunter, Colonel R.
Hall, C.
Halsey, T. F.
Hambro, Col. C. J. T.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, Col. C. E.
Hamley, Gen. Sir E. B.
Hanbury, R. W.
Hanbury-Tracy, hon. F. S. A.
Hankey, F. A.
Hardcastle, E.
Hardcastle, F.
Hartington, Marq. of
Havelock-Allan, Sir H. M.
Heath, A. R.
Heathcote, Capt. J. H. Edwards-
Heaton, J. H.
Heneage, right hon. E.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hermon-Hodge, R. T.
Hervey, Lord F.
Hill, right hon. Lord A. W.
Hill, Colonel E. S.
Hill, A. S.
Hoare, S.
Hobhouse, H.
Holland, right hon. Sir H. T.
Holmes, right hon. H.
Houldsworth, W. H.
Howard, J.
Howorth, H. H.
Hozier, J. H. C.
Hughes, Colonel E.
Hughes-Hallett, Col. F. C.
Hulse, E. H.
Hunt, F. S.
Hunter, Sir W. G.
Isaacs, L. H.
Isaacson, F. W.
Jackson, W. L.
James, rt. hon. Sir H.
Jarvis, A. W.
Jennings, L. J.
Johnston, W.
Kelly, J. R.
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Kenrick, W.
Kerans, F. H.
Kimber, H.
King, H. S.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, hon. H. T.
Knowles, L.
Kynoch, G.
Lafone, A.
Lambert, I. C.
Laurie, Colonel R. P.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Lees, E.
Legh, T. W.
Leighton, S.
Lewisham, right hon. Viscount
Llewellyn, E. H.
Long, W. H.
Low, M.
Lowther, hon. W.
Lowther, J. W.
Lubbock, Sir J.
Macartney, W. G. E.
Macdonald, right hon. J. H. A.
Maclean, F. W.
Maclean, J. M.
Maclure, J. W.
M'Calmont, Captain J.
M'Lagan, P.
Malcolm, Col. J. W.
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J. J. R.
March, Earl of
Marjoribanks, rt. hon. E.
Marriott, rt. hn. W. T.
Maskelyne, M. H. N. Story-
Matthews, rt. hn. H.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Mayne, Admiral R. C.
Mildmay, F. B.
Mills, hon. C. W.
Milvain, T.
More, R. J.
Morgan, O. V.
Morley, A.
Mount, W. G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. Sir J. R.
Mowbray, R. G. C.
Mulholland, H. L.
Muntz, P. A.
Murdoch, C. T.
Newark, Viscount
Noble, W.
Norris, E. S.
Northcote, hon. H. S.
Norton, R.
O'Neill, hon. R. T.
Paget, Sir R. H.
Parker, C. S.
Parker, hon. F.
Paulton, J. M.
Pearce, W.
Pelly, Sir L.
Penton, Captain F. T.
Plunket, right hon. D. R.
Plunkett, hon. J. W.
Price, Captain G. E.
Puleston, J. H.
Quilter, W. C.
Raikes, rt. hon. H. C.
Rankin, J.
Rasch, Major F.
Reed, H. B.
Ritchie, rt. hn. C. T.
Robertson, W. T.
Robinson, B.
Rollit, Sir A. K.
Ross, A. H.
Rothschild, Baron F. J. de
Round, J.
Russell, Sir G.
Russell, T. W.
St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Sellar, A. C.
Selwyn, Capt. C. W.
Seton-Karr, H.
Sidebottom, T. H.
Sidebottom, W.
Sinclair, W. P.
Smith, rt. hn. W. H.
Smith, A.
Spencer, hon. C. R.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Stanley, E. J.
Stewart, M.
Sutherland, T.
Talbot, J. G.
Tapling, T. K.
Temple, Sir R.
Thorburn, W.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Tottenham, A. L.
Townsend, F.
Trotter, H. J.
Vernon, hon. G. R.
Vincent, C. E. H.
Walsh, hon. A. H. J.
Waring, Colonel T.
Watson, J.
Webster, Sir R. E.
Webster, R. G.
West, Colonel W. C.
White, J. B.
Whitley, E.
Whitmore, C. A.
Winn, hon. R.
Winterbotham, A. B.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wolmer, Viscount
Wood, N.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wright, H. S.
Wroughton, P.
Yerburgh, R. A.
Young, C. E. B.

TELLERS.

Douglas, A. Akers-
Walrond, Col. W. H.

NOES.

Abraham, W. (Glam.)
Abraham, W. (Limerick, W.)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, J. A.

Blane, A.
Brown, A. L.
Byrne, G. M.
Campbell, H.
Carew, J. L.
Clancy, J. J.
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Cobb, H. P.
Conway, M.
Cox, J. R.
Crawford, W.
Cremer, W. R.
Dillon, J.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Ellis, J. E.
Ellis, T. E.
Evershed, S.
Fenwick, C.
Flynn, J. C.
Foley, P. J.
Fox, Dr. J. F.
Gill, T. P.
Graham, R. C.
Harrington, E.
Hayden, L. P.
Hayne, C. Seale-
Healy, M.
Holden, I.
Hooper, J.
James, hon. W. H.
Jordan, J.
Kenny, M. J.
Labouchere, H.
Lalor, R.
Lane, W. J.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leahy, J.
M'Cartan, M.
M'Donald, P.
M'Donald, W. A.
M'Ewan, W.
Marum, E. M.
Molloy, B. C.
Murphy, W. M.
Nolan, Colonel J. P.
Nolan, J.
O'Brien, J. F. X.
O'Brien, P.
O'Brien, P. J.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, J. (Tippry.)
O'Hanlon, T.
O'Hea, P.
O'Kelly, J.
Picton, J. A.
Pinkerton, J.
Power, P. J.
Pyne, J. D.
Quinn, T.
Rowlands, J.
Rowlands, W. B.
Rowntree, J.
Sexton, T.
Shaw, T.
Sheehan, J. D.
Sheil, E.
Stack, J.
Stanhope, hon. P. J.
Stuart, J.
Sullivan, D.
Tuite, J.
Wallace, R.
Watt, H.
Wayman, T.
Will, J. S.
Williams, A. J.

TELLERS.

Conybeare, C. A. V.
Gilhooly, J

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 84; Noes 283: Majority 199.

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Glam.)
Abraham, W. (Limerick, W.)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, J. A.
Blake, T.
Blane, A.
Brown, A. L.
Byrne, G. M.
Cameron, C.
Campbell, H.
Carew, J. L.
Clancy, J. J.
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Cobb, H. P.
Coleridge, hon. B.
Conway, M.
Crawford, W.
Cremer, W. R.
Dillon, J.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Ellis, T. E.
Esslemont, P.
Evershed, S.
Fenwick, C.
Flynn, J. C.
Foley, P. J.
Fox, Dr. J. F.
Gilhooly, J.
Gill, T. P.
Graham, R. C.
Harrington, E.
Hayden, L. P.
Hayne, C. Seale-
Healy, M.
Holden, I.
Hooper, J.
Jordan, J.
Kenny, M. J.
Labouchere, H.
Lalor, R.
Lane, W. J.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leahy, J.
M'Cartan, M.
M'Donald, P.
M'Donald, W. A.
M'Ewan, W.
M'Laren, W. S. B.
Marum, E. M.
Molloy, B. C.
Morgan, O. V.
Murphy, W. M.
Nolan, Colonel J. P.
Nolan, J.
O'Brien, J. F. X.
O'Brien, P.
O'Brien, P. J.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, J. (Tippry.)
O'Hanlon, T.
O'Hea, P.
O'Kelly, J.
Paulton, J. M.
Picton, J. A.
Pinkerton, J.
Power, P. J.
Pyne, J. D.
Quinn, T.
Rowlands, J.
Rowlands, W. B.
Rowntree, J.
Sexton, D.
Shaw, T.
Sheehan, J. D.
Sheil, E.
Stack, J.
Stanhope, hon. P. J.
Sullivan, D.
Tuite, J.
Wallace, R.
Watt, H.
Wayman, T.
Will, J. S.

TELLERS.

Conybeare, C. A. V.
Cox, J. R.

NOES.

Addison, J. E. W.
Ainslie, W. G.
Allsopp, hon. G.
Ambrose, W.
Amherst, W. A. T.
Anstruther, Colonel R. H. L.
Anstruther, H. T.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Baggallay, E.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Baird, J. G. A.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, G. W.
Banes, Major G. E.
Baring, Viscount
Barry, A. H. Smith-
Bartley, G. C. T.
Bates, Sir E.
Baumann, A. A.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Beadel, W. J.
Beaumont, H. F.
Beckett, E. W.
Bective, Earl of
Bentinck, rt. hn. G. C.
Bentinck, W. G. C.
Beresford, Lord C. W. De la Poer
Bethell, Commander G. R.
Bickford-Smith, W.
Biddulph, M.
Birkbeck, Sir E.
Blundell, Col. H. B. H.
Bond, G. H.
Bonsor, H. C. O.
Borthwick, Sir A.
Bridgeman, Col. hon. F. C.
Bristowe, T. L.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Brown, A. H.
Bruce, Lord H.
Burdett-Coutts, W. L. Ash.-B.
Burghley, Lord
Caine, W. S.
Caldwell, J.
Campbell, Sir A.
Chamberlain, rt. hn. J.
Chamberlain, R.
Chaplin, right hon. H.
Charrington, S.
Clarke, Sir E. G.
Cochrane-Baillie, hon. C. W. A. N.
Coddington, W.
Coghill, D. H.
Cohen, L. L.
Collings, J.
Colomb, Capt. J. C. R.
Cooke, C. W. R.
Corbett, A. C.
Corry, Sir J. P.
Cotton, Capt. E. T. D.
Courtney, L. H.
Cranborne, Viscount
Cross, H. S.
Crossman, Gen. Sir W.
Currie, Sir D.
Curzon, Viscount
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, H. T.
Davenport, W. B.
Dawnay, Colonel hon. L. P.
De Cobain, E. S. W.
De Lisle, E. J. L. M. P.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dimsdale, Baron R.
Dorington, Sir J. E.
Duncan, Colonel F.
Duncombe, A.
Dyke, right hon. Sir W. H.
Ebrington, Viscount
Edwards-Moss, T. C.
Elliot, hon. A. R. D.
Elliot, hon. H. F. H.
Elton, C. I.
Evelyn, W. J.
Ewart, W.
Ewing, Sir A. O.
Eyre, Colonel H.
Fellowes, W. H.
Field, Admiral E.
Fielden, T.
Finch, G. H.

Finch-Hatton, hon. M. E. G.
Fisher, W. H.
Fitzgerald, R. U. P.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Folkestone, right hon. Viscount
Forwood, A. B.
Fowler, Sir R. N.
Fraser, General C. C.
Fuller, G. P.
Fulton, J. F.
Gardner R. Richardson-
Gathorne-Hardy, hon. A. E.
Gedge, S.
Gent-Davis, R.
Giles, A.
Gilliat, J. S.
Godson, A. F.
Goldsmid, Sir J.
Goldsworthy, Major-General W. T.
Gorst, Sir J. E.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gray, C. W.
Greene, E.
Grimston, Viscount
Gunter, Colonel R.
Hall, C.
Halsey, T. F.
Hambro, Col. C. J. T.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, Col. C. E.
Hamley, General Sir E. B.
Hanbury, R. W.
Hankey, F. A.
Hardcastle, E.
Hardcastle, F.
Hartington, Marq. of
Havelock-Allan, Sir H. M.
Heath, A. R.
Heathcote, Capt. J. H. Edwards-
Heaton, J. H.
Heneage, right hon. E.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hermon-Hodge, R. T.
Hervey, Lord F.
Hill, right hon. Lord A. W.
Hill, Colonel E. S.
Hill, A. S.
Hoare, S.
Hobhouse, H.
Holland, rt. hon. Sir H. T.
Holmes, rt. hon. H.
Houldsworth, W. H.
Howard, J.
Howorth, H. H.
Hozier, J. H. C.
Hughes, Colonel E.
Hughes-Hallett, Col. F. C.
Hulse, E. H.
Hunt, F. S.
Hunter, Sir W. G.
Isaacs, L. H.
Isaacson, F. W.
Jackson, W. L.
James, rt. hon. Sir H.
James, hon. W. H.
Jarvis, A. W.
Jennings, L. J.
Johnston, W.
Kelly, J. R.
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Kenrick, W.
Kerans, F. H.
Kimber, H.
King, H. S.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, hon. H. T.
Knowles, L.
Kynoch, G.
Lafone, A.
Lambert, I. C.
Laurie, Colonel R. P.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Lees, E.
Legh, T. W.
Leighton, S.
Lewisham, right hon. Viscount
Llewellyn, E. H.
Long, W. H.
Low, M.
Lowther, hon. W.
Lowther, J. W.
Lubbock, Sir J.
Macartney, W. G. E.
Macdonald, rt. hon. J. H. A.
Maclean, F. W.
Maclean, J. W.
Maclure, J. W.
M'Calmont, Captain J.
Malcolm, Col. J. W.
Manners, right hon. Lord J. J. R.
March, Earl of
Marjoribanks, rt. hon. E.
Marriott, rt. hn. W. T.
Maskelyne, M. H. N. Story-
Matthews, rt. hon. H.
Maxwell, Sir H. E.
Mayne, Adml. R. C.
Menzies, R. S.
Mildmay, F. B.
Mills, hon. C. W.
Milvain, T.
More, R. J.
Mount, W. G.
Mowbray, rt. hon. Sir J. R.
Mowbray, R. G. C.
Mulholland, H. L.
Muntz, P. A.
Murdoch, C. T.
Newark, Viscount
Noble, W.
Norris, E. S.
Northcote, hon. H. S.
Norton, R.
O'Neill, hon. R. T.
Paget, Sir R. H.
Parker, C. S.
Parker, hon. F.
Pearce, W.
Pelly, Sir L.
Penton, Captain F. T.
Plunket, right hon. D. R.
Plunkett, hon. J. W.
Price, Captain G. E.
Puleston, J. H.
Quilter, W. C.
Raikes, rt. hon. H. C.
Rankin, J.
Rasch, Major F. C.
Reed, H. B.
Ritchie, rt. hon. C. T.
Robertson, W. T.
Robinson, B.
Rollit, Sir A. K.
Ross, A. H.
Rothschild, Baron F. J. de
Round, J.
Russell, Sir G.
Russell, T. W.
St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Sclater-Booth, right hon. G.
Sellar, A. C.
Selwyn, Captain C. W.
Seton-Karr, H.
Sidebottom, T. H.
Sidebottom, W.
Sinclair, W. P.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smith, A.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Stanley, E. J.
Stewart, M. J.
Sutherland, T.
Talbot, J. G.
Tapling, T. K.
Temple, Sir R.
Thorburn, W.
Tollemache, H. J.
Tomlinson, W. E. M.
Tottenham, A. L.
Townsend, F.
Trotter, H. J.
Vernon, hon. G. R.
Vincent, C. E. H.
Walsh, hon. A. H. J.
Waring, Colonel T.
Watson, J.
Webster, Sir R. E.
Webster, R. G.
West, Colonel W. C.
White, J. B.
Whitley, E.
Whitmore, C. A.
Winn, hon. R.
Winterbotham, A. B.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Wolmer, Viscount
Wood, N.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-
Wright, H. S.
Wroughton, P.
Yerburgh, R. A.
Young, C. E. B.

TELLERS
Douglas, A. Akers-
Walrond, Col. W. H.

Main Question again proposed.

DR. CLARK rose to address the House, when——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! It is my duty to report to the House that, in my opinion, the Address has been adequately discussed—[Dr. CLARK: I rise, Sir—*Cries of* "Order!"]—and that it is the evident sense of the House that the Question should now be put.

MR. W. H. SMITH: Sir, It is my duty to move that the Question be now put.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Question be now put."—(*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

The House *divided*:—Ayes 289; Noes 74: Majority 215.—(Div. List, No. 16.)

Main Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 283; Noes 70: Majority 213.—(Div. List, No. 17.)

The following is the Entry in the Votes:—

And it appearing to Mr. Speaker that the subject had been adequately discussed, and that it was the evident sense of the House that the Question be now put, he so informed the House :—

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Question be now put :"—(*Mr. William Henry Smith* :)—The House *divided ;* Ayes 291, Noes 81.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted :"—The House *divided ;* Ayes 84, Noes 283.

Main Question again proposed :—

And it appearing to Mr. Speaker that the subject had been adequately discussed, and that it was the evident sense of the House that the Question be now put, he so informed the House :—

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Question be now put :"—(*Mr. William Henry Smith* :)—The House *divided ;* Ayes 289, Noes 74.

Main Question put :—The House *divided ;* Ayes 283, Noes 70.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Committee be appointed to draw up an Address to be presented to Her Majesty upon the said Resolution."—(*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

MR. SEXTON (Belfast, W.): I beg to move that the Committee be appointed to-morrow (Friday).

MR. SPEAKER: This is a purely formal and supplemental matter to what has been done, and no Motion can be made upon it.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* to draw up an Address to be presented to Her Majesty upon the said Resolution :—Viscount WEYMOUTH, Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Mr. WILLIAM HENRY SMITH, Mr. Secretary MATTHEWS, Secretary Sir HENRY HOLLAND, Mr. Secretary STANHOPE, Mr. GOSCHEN, Lord JOHN MANNERS, Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, Mr. ARTHUR BALFOUR, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS; Three to be the quorum :—To withdraw immediately :—Queen's Speech *referred.*

MOTION.

——o——

PETTY SESSIONS DISTRICTS BOUNDARIES (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Thomas Gill, Bill to empower the Lord Lieutenant to alter the boundaries of Petty Sessions Districts in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Thomas Gill, Mr. Sheil, and Mr. Mahony.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 174.]

House adjourned at ten minutes after One o'clock.

[INDEX.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK AND SON, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

VOLUME CCCX.

FIRST VOLUME OF SESSION 1887.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1ª, 2ª, 3ª, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—1*st. Div.*, 2*nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speeck is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

Some subjects of debate have been classified under the following "General Headings:"—ARMY — NAVY — INDIA — IRELAND — SCOTLAND — PARLIAMENT — POOR LAW—POST OFFICE—METROPOLIS — CHURCH OF ENGLAND — EDUCATION — CRIMINAL LAW — LAW AND JUSTICE—TAXATION, under WAYS AND MEANS.

ABRAHAM, Mr. W., *Glamorgan, Rhondda*
  Metropolis, Distress in — Unemployed Dock Labourers at Poplar, 1555

ABRAHAM, Mr. W., *Limerick, W.*
  Ireland—Questions
    Evictions—Evictions at Rathkeale, 647
    Magistracy — Petty Session at Hospital, Co. Limerick, 1221
    Royal Irish Constabulary — District Inspector Greene, 1556
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 310

Access to Mountains (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Bryce, Mr. Haldane, Mr. J. C. Bolton, Sir Henry Roscoe, Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. A. L. Brown*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 51]

Accumulations Bill
(*Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Haldane*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 31]

ACLAND, Mr. C. T. D., *Cornwall, Launceston*
  Harbours and Passing Tolls Act, 1861—The Guarantee of Loans, 1547
  Public Health—Contagious Diseases Hospitals in Garrison Towns, 897

ADMIRALTY—First Lord (*see* HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord G. F.)

ADVOCATE, The LORD (*see* MACDONALD, Right Hon. J. H. A.)

Admiralty—see *Navy*

Africa (East)
Massowah—Defeat of an Italian Expedition, Question, Mr. Legh; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 4, 652; Questions, Mr. W. H. James, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 11, 1237
Revival of the Slave Trade, Question, Mr. A. E. Pease; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 14, 1404
The Sultan of Zanzibar—The London Conference — The Delimitation Commission, Question, Mr. F. S. Stevenson; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 4, 649

Africa (South)—Affairs of Zululand
Question, Commander Bethell; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) *Feb* 11, 1217

Africa (West Coast)—Revival of the Slave Trade
Question, Mr. M'Arthur; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 11, 1216

Agricultural Department
Cultivation of Hops, Question, Mr. Brookfield; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) *Feb* 1, 390
Agriculture, 1881-2, *Commission on—Maintenance of the Indoor Poor*, Question, Mr. E. Hubbard; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Feb* 1, 388
Agricultural Statistics — Return of Owner-Farmers, Question, Mr. Jasper More; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) *Feb* 10, 1094

Agricultural Holdings Bill
(*Mr. Channing, Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Francis Stevenson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 87]

Agricultural Labourers' Wages Bill
(*Mr. Charles Acland, Mr. Theodore Fry, Mr. Channing, Mr. Cossham, Mr. Stewart*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 93]

Agricultural Tenants (Ireland) Relief Bill (*Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Arthur O'Connor*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 7]

Agricultural Tenants Relief Bill
(*Mr. Seale-Hayne, Sir Bernhard Samuelson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 133]

AINSLIE, Mr. W. G., *Lancashire, N. Lonsdale*
Ambleside Railway, 2R. 1746
Drainage of Lands—Compensation to Riparian Owners, 1215

Aliens, Naturalization of—Fees
Questions, Mr. James Stuart; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 4, 649

Allotments and Cottage Gardens Compensation Bill
(*Sir Edward Birkbeck, Mr. Finch-Hatton, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Gurdon, Viscount Curzon, Sir Savile Crossley, Mr. Norton*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 167]

Allotments of Land Bill (*Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Newnes, Mr. Cyril Flower, Mr. Winterbotham, Mr. Pitt-Lewis*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 60]

Ambleside Railway Bill (by Order)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Charles Forster*) *Feb* 17, 1728
Amendt. to leave out "now," add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Bryce*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 189, N. 177; M. 12 (D. L. 10)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

ANDERSON, Mr. C. H., *Elgin and Nairn*
Inland Revenue—Carriage Tax and Gun Tax, 269
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1421, 1423

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Feb* 4 (No. 15)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Feb* 7, 745
Committee *Feb* 10, 1059
Report *Feb* 17, 1726 (No. 25)

Arbitration of Poor Law Questions (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. Mason, Mr. E. R. Russell, Mr. Macdonald Cameron, Mr. Watt, Mr. Williamson, Mr. Lacaita*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 2]

Arklow Harbour Act
Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Feb* 8, 877

ARMY (*Questions*)
Afghan Prize Money, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Feb* 3, 539
Billet Money, Question, Sir Joseph Bailey; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 10, 1101
Cameron, John, Seaforth Highlanders, Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 3, 537
Gillen, Case of Private James, Question, Mr. Peter M'Donald; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 17, 1765
Dover Barracks, Insanitary State of, Questions, Mr. Norris; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 8, 888
Dublin Royal Barracks, Insanitary Condition of, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Feb* 17, 1763
Horse and Field Artillery, Conversion of, Question, Colonel Hamilton; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Jan* 31, 272; Question, Captain Cotton; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 4, 651
The "Maiwand" Battery, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 7, 773
The Royal Artillery—Rumoured Reduction of the Force, Question, Observations, Lord Napier of Magdala, Lord Ellenborough; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) *Feb* 15, 1513
Kit Bags, Issue of, Question, Viscount Baring; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 3, 551
Medical Officers, Rank of, Question, Sir Guyer Hunter; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 15, 1559
Military Armaments and Organization, Question, Observations, The Earl of Wemyss, Lord Ellenborough, The Earl of Northbrook, Viscount Sidmouth; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) *Jan* 28, 145
Military Ballooning, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 7, 762
Officers' Quarters—Sale of Premises, Portsmouth, occupied by the Commanding Officer of Royal Engineers, Question, Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 7, 755
Practice in Use of the Revolver, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 10, 1088
Purchase of Horses for Army Purposes, Question, Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 14, 1390
Quartermasters and Riding Masters, Question, Colonel Duncan; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Jan* 31, 269

ARMY—*cont.*
Rifle Ranges, Question, Mr. King; Answer The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E Stanhope) *Feb* 11, 1212
Royal Military Colleges at Woolwich and Sandhurst, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 3, 540
Royal Military Academy, Woolwich—Improved Accommodation, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 14, 1402

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT
Arms of Officers—The Revolver, Question, Mr. Brookfield; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Feb* 4, 653
Army Manufacturing Accounts, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Feb* 17, 1753
Contract for Cartridges for Queensland, Question, Mr. Hunter; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Feb* 8, 888; Questions, Colonel Bridgeman, Mr. Hanbury; Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Feb* 10, 1081; Questions, Mr. Hanbury, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Feb* 11, 1231; Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Feb* 15, 1565
The Explosives Acts, Question, Mr. De Lisle; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) *Feb* 14, 1402

Guns Supplied to Army and Navy, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Feb* 8, 884
Krupp Guns, Question, Colonel Hughes-Hallett; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Feb* 7, 772
The Lee-Burton Magazine Rifle, Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 17, 1773
The Royal Gun Factory, Woolwich—Deductions from Pay, Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Feb* 7, 760

Defective Weapons
Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets, Question, Observations, The Earl of Erne; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) *Feb* 7, 743; Questions, Mr. Hanbury; Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote), 753; Question, Observations, Lord Balfour, The Earl of Morley, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris) *Feb* 10, 1063; Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote), 1087; Questions, Commander Bethell, Mr. Hanbury, Sir Henry Tyler, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton), The Secretary of State for War

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

ARMY—*Defective Weapons*—cont.
(Mr. E. Stanhope), 1096; Question, Observations, The Earl of Harrowby; Reply, Lord Elphinstone (A Lord in Waiting) *Feb* 11, 1198
The Committee of Inquiry, Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 11, 1240

Ordnance Store Department—Clothing Contracts, Questions, Mr. Coghill, Mr. J. O'Connor (Tipperary, S.); Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote) *Feb* 14, 1397

THE AUXILIARY FORCES
Militia
City of Cork Militia Artillery, Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 8, 883
Monaghan Militia—Orange Lodges, Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 8, 883
The Militia (Scotland), Question, Dr. R. Macdonald; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 10, 1084

Volunteers
The Volunteer Capitation Committee—The Capitation Grant, Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Jan* 28, 162; Question, Colonel Laurie; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 4, 651

ASHBOURNE, Lord (Lord Chancellor of Ireland)
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 46, 49

Assistant County Surveyors (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Macartney, Colonel King-Harman, Colonel Waring*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 92]

ATHERLEY-JONES, Mr. L., *Durham, N.W.*
Merchant Shipping Acts — Loss of the "Kapunda," 1544

ATTORNEY GENERAL (*see* WEBSTER, Sir R. E.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (*see* HOLMES, Right Hon. H.)

BAGGALLAY, Mr. E., *Lambeth, Brixton*
Brixton Market, 2R. 1075
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 798

BAILEY, Sir J. R., *Hereford*
Army—Billet Money, 1101

BALFOUR, Lord
Navy—H.M.S. "Indus"—Defective Weapons—Sword Bayonets, 1070
War Office (Ordnance Department)—Defective Weapons—Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets, 1064

BALFOUR, Right Hon. A. J. (Secretary for Scotland), *Manchester, E.*
Scotland—Questions
Crofters' Act — Sheep Farms and Deer Forests, 1084
Crofters' Commission—Lewis and Skye Crofters, 1085, 1210, 1211; — Sheriff Ivory, 271
Fishery Board—Loans to Crofting Parishes, 655
Prisons—Death of a Prisoner in Calton Gaol, Edinburgh, 1551
Salmon Fishing — Tweed Fisheries Acts, 1770
Sea Fishings Act — Defective Operation, 1080
Scotland—Education—Questions
Elementary Schools and University Teaching, 755
Lenzie Public School, 640, 1100, 1405
Poor and School Rates in Skye, 877
State-aided and Non-State-aided Schools, 1083
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1423, 1426, 1427, 1429, 1438, 1485, 1487, 1580, 1583, 1584, 1600, 1602, 1629, 1635, 1684, 1690, 1692, 1694, 1710

BALFOUR, Right Hon. J. B., *Clackmannan, &c.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1610, 1699

BALFOUR, General Sir G., *Kincardineshire*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1431

BALFOUR, Mr. G. W., *Leeds, Central*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 86

Ballot Act (1872) Amendment Bill (*Colonel Saunderson, Colonel Waring, Mr. Macartney*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Colonel Saunderson*) *Jan* 31, 379; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° [Bill 138]

Bankruptcy (County Courts) (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Mulholland, Colonel King-Harman, Colonel Waring, Mr. Macartney, Mr. O'Neill*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 88]

Bankruptcy Court (Belfast) Bill (*Mr. Ewart, Sir James Corry, Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Macartney*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 69]

Bankruptcy Courts (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Sexton, Mr. Chance, Mr. O'Hea, Mr. M'Cartan, Mr. Reynolds*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 121]

Bankruptcy (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Sexton, Mr. M'Cartan*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 94]

Barclay, Mr. J. W., *Forfarshire*
Parliament—Arrangement of Public Business, 1648
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1452, 1457, 1459, 1647, 1667
Post Office—Investment in Government Securities of Small Sums, 1752
Railway Rates and Charges, 1571
Scotland—Questions
Police Bill, 651
Reduction of Rents—Trustees of Landed Estates, 645
Western Islands—Procurators Fiscal, 269

Baring, Viscount, *Bedfordshire, Biggleswade*
Army—Issue of Kit Bags, 551

Bartley, Mr. G. C. T., *Islington, N.*
Inland Revenue—A Rating Clause for Hoardings, 1567
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 191, 193

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks- (Chief Secretary for Ireland), *Bristol, W.*
Ireland—Questions
Armagh Town Commissioners—Audit of Accounts, 891
Arms Act—Bantry District, 1761;—Mr. James O'Mahony, 1394
Dispensary Districts—Mohigeela, 169
Fishery Piers and Harbours—Pullendiva Pier, 644
Inflammatory Language—Mr. W. O'Brien's Speech at Woodford, Co. Galway, 1412
Inland Navigation and Drainage—River Barrow, 1082
Irish Land Act, 1870—The Bright Clauses, 538
Irish Land Court—Sittings in Co. Louth, 1758
Labourers' Act and Labourers' Cottages—Ardee Union, 892
Labourers' Cottages Act—Navan Union, 1219
Labourers' Acts — John Kavanagh, Co. Wexford, 1388;—Rathdrum Union, 1751
Land—Glebe Land Tenants, 895
Landlord and Tenant—Lord Charlemont's Estate—Interference of the Police, 885, 1090
Law and Police—Alleged "Police Outrage at Hospital, Co. Limerick," 1759;—Assault at Coolgreany, 1222, 1223
Local Courts of Bankruptcy, 539
Lunatic Asylums — Criminal Lunatic Asylum, Dundrum—Case of —— Lambe, 1755; — William Cribbin, Mullingar Lunatic Asylum, 648

[*cont.*

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks—*cont.*
Magistracy—Petty Sessions at Hospital, Co. Limerick, 1221, 1222;—Petty Sessions District of Boyle, 641
Mr. F. Deverell, County Surveyor of Cavan, 1392
Poor Law—Insanitary State of Rathdown Workhouse, 1222
Prisons—Prisons Act, 1877—Mr. Healy, Governor of Clare Co. Prison, 641;—Re-organization — Increase of Salaries of Officials, 892
Registration of Parliamentary Voters—Polling Districts, 882
Registration of Voters Act, 1885—Payment of Officials, 1756
Sea Fisheries—A Steam Cruiser, 543
State of Ireland — Police Protection — Denis Brennan, 1396
Tithe Rent-Charge, 1765
Trees, Re-afforesting, 1773

Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Questions
Agrarian Outrages—The Returns, 273
Moonlighters at Millstreet, Co. Cork, 1213
Riots at Belfast — Report of the Royal Commission, 169, 170, 273;—The Constabulary, 893

Ireland—Evictions—Questions
Conduct of the Constabulary, Co. Limerick, 1387, 1388
Eviction at Rathkeale, 647
Evictions on Lord Ormathwaite's Property, 1237
Marquess of Lansdowne's Estate, Queen's Co., 888
Mr. Hillas, High Sheriff, Sligo Co. 643, 644
Returns, 168
Threatened Evictions in Achill, 896
Woodford—Cost of Transport, &c. 537

Ireland — Evictions — Glenbeigh Evictions—Questions
166, 167, 274, 655, 894, 895, 1219, 1220
Allowances to the Constabulary, 393
Cost of Constabulary, 876
Notices to Relieving Officers, 554

Ireland—Fisheries—Questions
Fishermen of Lough Neagh, 646
Inspection—Collection of Statistics, 1756
Trawling in Sligo and Killala Bays, 543

Ireland—Irish Land Commission—Questions
Judicial Rents—The Returns, 168
Land Law Act, 1881—Report of the Commission, 168; — Sub-Commissioners — Sittings at Kilkenny, 265
Sale of Land, Co. Donegal, 268
Sligo Co., 1749

Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
Achill Petty Sessions — Conviction of Policemen, 1760;—Importation of Illicit Whiskey by Coastguards, 1388
Average Cost of Prosecutions, 1757
Crossmaglen Prisoners, 1216
Intimidation of Jurors, 1241
Judge Curran, 1106
Jury System — Challenges in Criminal Cases, 896, 897, 1390;—Marked Panels —The Jurors' Acts, 1764

[*cont.*

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-—*cont.*
Ireland—National Education—Questions
Commissioners of Education — School Lands at Cavan, 263
Commissioners of Endowed Schools — Abatement of Rents, 1754
National School Teachers—Delaying Payment of Result Fees, 878
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary—Questions
Constable Foster, 879
Detective Constable Kerr, 885, 886
District Inspector Tilly, 1403
Ex-Constable Martin Joyce, 639
Extra Police in Co. Clare, 642
Labourers (Ireland) Acts, 268
Police Protection— ——— Hegarty, 1761
Returns, 652
Service on Evictions, 1103
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 185, 187, 188, 212, 213, 218, 221, 223, 851, 855, 913, 994, 1266, 1328, 1335, 1336, 1337, 1828
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 225; 2R. 366, 374, 378; Comm. 633, 635, 636

Beckett, Mr. E. W., *York, N.R., Whitby*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 561, 1831

Beer Adulteration Bill (*Mr. Quilter, Mr. Heneage, Viscount Wolmer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Herbert Gardner, Mr. Francis Stevenson, Mr. Gurdon*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 46]

Beer Adulteration (No. 2) Bill (*Sir Edward Birkbeck, Baron Dimsdale, Sir Savile Crossley, Mr. Charles Hall, Mr. Fellowes, Baron F. de Rothschild*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 95]

Belfast Government Bill (*Mr. Nolan, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Justin M'Carthy, Mr. Healy, Mr. M'Cartan, Mr. O'Kelly*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 74]

Belfast Main Drainage Bill
c. Petition and Order of Leave [1st February, 1886] read; Bill read 1° and 2°; and (the Bill having been reported and considered in the last Session of Parliament),
Moved, "That the Bill be ordered to be read 3°" (*Mr. Dodds*) *Feb* 1, 385; after short debate, Motion agreed to
3R. deferred *Feb* 14, 1386
Read 3°, after short debate, Queen's Consent signified *Feb* 15, 1519

Bentinck, Right Hon. G. A. C., *Whitehaven*
Ambleside Railway, 2R. 1724

Bentinck, Mr. W. G. C., *Penryn and Falmouth*
Canada and the United States—Law of Extradition, 1405

Bethell, Commander G. R., *York, E.R., Holderness*
Admiralty — Defective Weapons — Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets, 1096, 1098, 1099
Africa (South) —Affairs of Zululand, 1217
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 511
Seychelles Islands — The Chief Officer of Police, 1216

Biggar, Mr. J. G., *Cavan, W.*
Belfast Main Drainage, 3R. 1524
Ireland—Questions
Commissioners of Education—School Lands at Cavan, 263
Commissioners of Endowed Schools — Abatement of Rents, 1754
Irish Land Commissioners—Sale of Land, Co. Donegal, 268
Land—Reduction of Interest on Mortgages, &c. 1550
Parliament—Arrangement of Public Business, 1648
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 477, 944, 1598
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Motion for Leave, 227; Comm. 633

Blake, Mr. J. A., *Carlow*
Ireland—Inspection of Irish Fisheries—Collection of Statistics, 1756

Blane, Mr. A., *Armagh, S.*
Ireland—Questions
Fisheries—Fishermen of Lough Neagh, 645
Law and Justice—The Crossmaglen Prisoners, 1215, 1216
National School Teachers—Delaying Payment of Result Fees, 878
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 140, 803, 1843

Board of Trade—President (*see* Stanley of Preston, Lord)

Board of Trade — Secretary to (*see* De Worms, Baron H.)

Board of Trade (Marine Department) — Wreck of the "Tally Ho"—Rocket Station at Eastbourne
Question, Admiral Field; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 15, 1551

Board of Works — Chairman (*see* M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J. M.)

Bolton, Mr. J. C., *Stirling*
Parliament—Queen's Speech—Address in Answer to, 1449, 1450, 1468

Bonsor, Mr. H. C. O., *Surrey, Wimbledon*
Public Health—Insanitary Condition of Battersea Park, 1080

Borough Funds Bill (*Mr. Woodall, Mr. Kenrick, Mr. Picton, Mr. Howard Vincent, Mr. Woodhead*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 129]

Brabourne, Lord
Ireland, State of—Legislation, 1368

Bradlaugh, Mr. C., *Northampton*
Army (Ordnance Department)—Royal Gun Factory, Woolwich—Deductions from Pay, 760
Brixton Market, 2R. 1077
Burmah (Upper)—Questions
Ruby Mines, 1557, 1769;—Military Expedition to—Messrs. Streeter, 260, 1087; —Military Operations, 1558
Reported Chinese Invasion, 1568
The Shan Chiefs—China, 1768
Coal Mines Regulation Bill—Extension to Ireland—The Truck System, 1401
Parliament—Elections—Sessional Orders, 56
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 225, 274, 276, 1833
Post Office—Letter Carriers' Good Conduct Badges, 760
Scotland—Truck Acts—Mines and Works in Scotland, 260

Bramwell, Lord
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 2, 1064

Bridgeman, Colonel Hon. F., *Bolton*
Army (Ordnance Department)—Contract for Cartridges for Queensland, 1081

Bright, Mr. J., *Manchester, S.W.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 966

British Honduras
Question, Sir Robert Fowler; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) *Feb* 10, 1104

Brixton Market Bill (*by Order*)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Charles Forster*) *Feb* 10, 1071
Amendt. to leave out "now," add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Broadhurst*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and negatived
Words added; Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Broadhurst, Mr. H., *Nottingham, W.*
Brixton Market, 2R. Amendt. 1071
Employers' Liability Acts, 267
Metropolitan Board of Works—The Superintending Architect, 544
Quarries Regulation, 1399

Brookfield, Mr. A. M., *Sussex, Rye*
Agricultural Department — Cultivation of Hops, 390
Army—Arms of Officers—The Revolver, 653

Brown, Mr. A. L., *Hawick, &c.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1443

Bruce, Lord H., *Wilts, Chippenham*
Parliament—Business of the House—Amendments to the Address, 1414

Bruce, Hon. R. P., *Fifeshire, W.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1457, 1458, 1459

Bryce, Mr. J., *Aberdeen, S.*
Ambleside Railway, 2R. Amendt. 1728
Egypt—Opening of Trade with the Soudan, 390
Northern Pacific—Evacuation of Port Hamilton, 389
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 716, 717

Building Societies Act (1874) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. O'Neill, Colonel Waring, Colonel Saunderson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 101]

Bulgaria
Prince Alexander of Battenberg, Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 11, 1238
The Correspondence, Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 15, 1570

Burial Act, 1880—*Consecration of Cemeteries*
The Attleborough Burial Board, Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 3, 546
The Refusal of Bishops, Question, Mr. Woodall: Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 7, 766

Burial Grounds Bill
(*Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Richard, Mr. Woodall*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 18]
Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 7, 766

Burmah (*Upper*)
The Military Expedition, Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Feb* 17, 1748
Cost of the War, Question, Mr. S. Smith; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Feb* 11, 1236

[*cont.*

Burmah (*Upper*)—cont.
The Ruby Mines
Military Occupation of the Ruby Mines, Question, Mr. Cremer; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Jan* 28, 161
Messrs. Streeter, Questions, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Jan* 31, 260; *Feb* 10, 1087; *Feb* 15, 1557, 1558; *Feb* 17, 1769
Reported Chinese Invasion, Questions, Mr. Legh, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Feb* 15, 1568
The Shan Chiefs—China, Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Feb* 17, 1768

Burt, Mr. T., *Morpeth*
Admiralty — Accountant General's Department, 163
Mines Regulation Act, 170

Butter Substitutes Bill
(*Mr. Mayne, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Lane, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Kenny*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 48]

Buxton, Mr. S. C., *Tower Hamlets, Poplar*
Metropolis—Police—"Prize Competition for Children," 1408
Renewal of the Coal and Wine Dues, 265
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1050

Cadogan, Earl (Lord Privy Seal)
Ireland—Police Acts—Corporation of Limerick—Extra Police, 1505, 1509
State of Ireland—Legislation, 1376
Solicitors (Ireland), 2R. 1059

Caine, Mr. W. S., *Barrow-in-Furness*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 672

Caldwell, Mr. J., *Glasgow, St. Rollox*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1673
Scotland—Education Department—Questions
Elementary Schools and University Teaching, 754
Lenzie Public School, 640, 1100, 1404
State-aided and Non-State-aided Schools, 1083

Cameron, Dr. C., *Glasgow, College*
Army—Afghan Prize Money, 539
Islands of the South Pacific—Island of Malayta—H.M.S. "Opal," 757
Navy—Re-testing of Cutlasses, 1393
North Borneo—Attack on Natives—H.M.S. "Zephyr," 757
Orkney Roads, 2R. 1202
Parliament—Arrangement of Public Business, 1648

[*cont.*

Cameron, Dr. C.—*cont.*
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1792
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1479; Motion for Adjournment, 1493; Amendt. 1571, 1580, 1583, 1584, 1587, 1600, 1609, 1610, 1614, 1615, 1622, 1624, 1692
Scotland—Questions
Elementary Education—Poor and School Rates in Skye, 877
Law and Justice — Robert Hume, a Maniacal Prisoner, 1210, 1211;—Myles Martin, Crofter, a Prisoner in Inverness Gaol, 1552, 1554
Prisons—Death of a Prisoner in Calton Gaol, Edinburgh, 1550
Skye Crofters, 1210

Campbell, Sir A., *Renfrew, W.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1441

Campbell, Sir G., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
Egypt (Army of Occupation)—Supplementary Estimates, 544
Finance, &c.—The Corvée, 1402
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 713, 1474; Amendt. 1475, 1487, 1493
Railways (India)—Massacre on the Quetta-Pisheen Railway, 545

Camperdown, Earl of
Glebe Lands, 2R. 1497
Ireland—Police Acts—Corporation of Limerick—Extra Police, 1510
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 52, 53

Canada and the United States
Law of Extradition, Question, Mr. W. G. Cavendish Bentinck; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 14, 1405
The Fisheries' Disputes, Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Jan* 28, 165; Questions, Mr. Gourley; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 7, 758

Canterbury, Archbishop of
Glebe Lands, 2R. 1498, 1503

Carew, Mr. J. L., *Kildare, N.*
Ireland—Labourers' Act and Labourers' Cottages—Ardee Union, 891

Cathedral Churches Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Bishop of Carlisle*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Jan* 31 (No. 9)

Chance, Mr. P. A., *Kilkenny, S.*
Haytian Government—Claims of British Subjects, 648

[*cont.*

CHANCE, Mr. P. A.—*cont.*
Ireland—Questions
Evictions—Woodford—Cost of Transport, &c. 537
Land Law Act, 1881—Sub-Commissioners—Sittings at Kilkenny, 265
Law and Justice—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 1218, 1229;—"Queen *v.* Dillon," 1093
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 1228, 1229
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 686, 688
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. 368; Amendt. 378; Comm. Amendt. 632, 636

CHANCELLOR, The LORD (*see* HALSBURY, Lord)

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (*see* GOSCHEN, Right Hon. G. J.)

CHANCELLOR of the DUCHY of LANCASTER (*see* MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R.)

CHANNING, Mr. F. A., *Northampton, E.*
Ireland—Evictions—Threatened Evictions in Achill, 896

CHAPLIN, Right Hon. H., *Lincolnshire, Sleaford*
Parliament—Business of the House—Amendments to the Address, 1413
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 410, 989

Charity Commissioners—Non-Representative Bodies
Question Mr. Howell; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Jan* 28, 164

Charity Commission Schemes—Election of Trustees
Question, Sir John Swinburne; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 3, 555

CHILDERS, Right Hon. H. C. E., *Edinburgh, S.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 296, 404
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. 367

Christchurch (Southampton) Charter (Correction of Error) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *Jan* 28 (No. 4)
Read 2ª * *Jan* 31
Committee *; Report *Feb* 3
Read 3ª * *Feb* 4

Church Discipline Amendment Bill
(*Colonel Sandys, Mr. Wardle, Mr. Joicey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 3 [Bill 156]

CHURCHILL, Right Hon. Lord R. H. S., *Paddington, S.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 276, 280, 296
Resignation of the Right Hon. Lord Randolph Churchill, Personal Explanation, 57, 71

Church Sites (Compulsory Powers Repeal) Bill
(*Mr. Francis Powell, Mr. John Talbot, Mr. Addison, Mr. Tomlinson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 53]

Church Sites (Compulsory Powers Repeal) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Bishop of Lichfield*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Feb* 15 (No. 22)

City of London Fire Inquests Bill
(*Sir Robert Fowler, Mr. Hubbard*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 10 [Bill 165]

Civil Service
Retirement of Writers, Question, Mr. Gent-Davis; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Feb* 8, 890
The Treasury Minute, Question, Mr. Gent-Davis; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Feb* 8, 890
Suspension of Appointments, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 10, 1104

CLARK, Dr. G. B., *Caithness*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 679, 1462, 1603, 1623, 1625, 1627, 1628, 1629, 1694, 1852
Scotland—Skye Crofters—Sheriff Ivory, 271

CLARKE, Sir E. G. (Solicitor General), *Plymouth*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1038, 1040, 1048

Coal and Ironstone Mines
Days of Drawing, Question, Mr. Pickard; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 4, 654
Report of Inspectors, 1886, Question, Mr. Pickard; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) *Feb* 4, 654

Coal Mines—Explosion at the Wood End Pits, Lancashire
Question, Mr. Fenwick; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 15, 1560

Coal Mines, &c. Regulation Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Matthews, Mr. Stuart-Wortley*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 31 [Bill 130]
Extension to Ireland—The Truck System, Questions, Mr. Marum, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 14, 1400

Coal Mines Regulation Act (1872) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Hayden, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Conway, Mr. Patrick O'Brien*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 39]

Cobb, Mr. H. P., *Warwick, S.E., Rugby*
Ireland—Law and Justice—The Jury System—"The Queen *v.* Dillon, M.P."—Right of Challenge, 1235
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Jury System—Right of Challenge, 1236
Post Office (England and Wales)—Stationery Clerks in Surveyor's Branch, 549

Cochrane-Baillie, Hon. C. W. A. N., *St. Pancras, N.*
Literature, Science, and Art—The National Portrait Gallery, 1772

Coghill, Mr. D. H., *Newcastle-under-Lyme*
Army (Ordnance Store Department)—Clothing Contracts, 1397
Endowed Schools Act—The Annual Financial Statement, 887
Public Health — Hydrophobia—M. Pasteur's System, 889

Coleridge, Lord (Lord Chief Justice of England)
Privilege—"The Queen *v.* Lord Graves," 247

Coleridge, Hon. B., *Sheffield, Attercliffe*
Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 1218
Parliament—Queen's Speech—Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 1003, 1025, 1040

Colomb, Captain J. C. R., *Tower Hamlets, Bow, &c.*
Emigration (Ireland)—Parliamentary Grants, 1882-3, 1240
Northern Pacific—Evacuation of Port Hamilton, 554
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1009

Colonial Representatives, Conference of—State-Directed Colonization
Questions, Mr Seton-Karr; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) *Feb* 7, 767

Colonial Service (Pensions) Bill
(*Sir Herbert Maxwell, Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Jackson*)
c. Res. considered in Committee *Feb* 3
Res. reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 4 [Bill 158]

Colonies—Secretary of State for (*see* Holland, Right Hon. Sir H. T.)

Committee of Council on Education—Vice President (*see* Dyke, Right Hon. Sir W. H.)

Contagious Diseases Acts—Effects of Suspension
Question, Mr. Howorth; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 17, 1761

Contumacy Imprisonment Abolition Bill
(*Colonel Sandys, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Wardle, Mr. Joicey*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 3 [Bill 157]

Conybeare, Mr. C. A. V., *Cornwall, Camborne*
Admiralty—The Proposed Imperial Institute,—Dockyard Subscriptions, 1562;—Devonport Dockyard, 1223
Ballot Act (1872) Amendment, Motion for Leave, 379
Cornish and Devon Mines—Insanitary Condition, 1763
Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Return of Dues, &c., 272
Ireland—Questions
  Evictions—Glenbeigh Evictions, 167, 392, 876, 1219
  Inflammatory Language—Mr. W. O'Brien's Speech at Woodford, Co. Galway, 1411
  Law and Justice—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases—"Queen *v.* Dillon," 1093
  Royal Irish Constabulary—Service on Evictions, 1103
Parliament—New Writ for St. George's, Hanover Square, 259
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 419, 1834, 1846
Police (Metropolis)—"Prize Competition for Children," 1407

Cooke, Mr. C. W. R., *Newington, W.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 473

Copyhold Enfranchisement Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Hobhouse*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 3 (No. 13)

Corbet, Mr. W. J., *Wicklow, E.*
Arklow Harbour Act, 877

[*cont.*

Corbet, Mr. W. J.—*cont.*
Ireland—Questions
Charitable Donations and Bequests—The Eaton Bequest, 1393
Criminal Lunatic Asylum, Dundrum—Case of —— Lambe, 1754
Fishery Piers and Harbours—Greystones, Co. Wicklow, 1751
Labourers' Act—Rathdrum Union, 1750
Lunacy Acts Amendment, 653
Poor Law (England and Wales)—Paddington Workhouse—Incarceration of a Female not a Lunatic, 1776

Corn Sales Bill
(*Mr. Rankin, Sir Joseph R. Bailey, Mr. H. T. Davenport, Mr. Williamson*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 91]

Corry, Sir J. P., *Armagh, Mid*
Belfast Main Drainage, 3R. 1522

Cossham, Mr. H., *Bristol, E.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 476, 483

Cottagers' (Allotments) Bill
(*Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Finch-Hatton, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Viscount Curzon, Mr. Charles Hall, Captain Selwyn, Viscount Grimston*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 7 [Bill 161]

Cotton, Capt. E. T. D., *Cheshire, Wirral*
Army—Conversion of Horse and Field Artillery, 651

County Government (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. James O'Brien, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Healy*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 12]

Courtney, Mr. L. H. (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means and Deputy Speaker), *Cornwall, Bodmin*
Orkney Roads, 2R. 1209
Sutton District Water, 2R. 1538

Cox, Mr. J. R., *Clare, E.*
Inland Revenue—Stamp Duty on Receipts from Income Tax and Poor Rates, 1224
Ireland—Questions
Law and Justice—Achill Petty Sessions—Conviction of Policemen, 1760 ; — Importation of Illicit Whiskey by Coastguards, 1388
Magistracy—Petty Sessions District of Boyle, 640
Prisons Act, 1877—Mr. Healy, Governor of Clare Co. Prison, 641
Registration of Parliamentary Voters—Polling Districts, 882
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary—Questions
District Inspector Tilly, 1403
Extra Police in County Clare, 641
Mauritius—The Exchange, 542

Cox, Mr. J. R.—*cont.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 223 ; Amendt. 1833
Post Office (England and Wales)—Dismissal of Female Clerks, 1396

Cremer, Mr. W. R., *Shoreditch, Haggerston*
Burmah (Upper)—Military Occupation of the Ruby Mines, 161
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 632 ; Amendt. 656, 717, 729

Crilly, Mr. D., *Mayo, N.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 495, 509

Criminal Law (Ireland) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Sexton, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Chance, Mr. Healy, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Donal Sullivan*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 27]

Criminal Law (Scotland) Procedure Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Matthews, Mr. Secretary Balfour, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 131]

Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act (1886) Amendment (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Anderson, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Provand*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 100]

Crofters (Scotland) Act (1886) Amendment Bill
(*Dr. Clark, Mr. Barclay, Mr. Esslemont, Dr. M'Donald, Mr. Mackintosh*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 52]

Cross, Viscount (Secretary of State for India)
Glebe Lands, 1R. 879 ; 2R. 1501, 1503
India (Madras)—The Covenanted Civil Service—Land Speculations—Case of Mr. Sullivan, 743

Crossman, Major General Sir W., *Portsmouth*
Army—Officers' Quarters—Sale of Premises, Portsmouth, occupied by the Commanding Officer of Royal Engineers, 755
Purchase of Horses for Army Purposes, 1390
Defences of the Empire—Coaling Station at Castries (West Indies), 756
Coaling Stations in the Eastern Colonies, 1569
Egypt — War Decorations to the English Troops, 1750

[*cont.*

CUBITT, Right Hon G., *Surrey, Mid*
Sutton District Water, 2R. 1534

CURRIE, Sir D., *Perthshire, W.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1470

CURZON, Hon. G. N., *Lancashire, Southport*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 340, 350

Customs Law Amendment Bill
(*Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Seymour King, Mr. Gourley*)
c. Considered in Committee; Res. agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb 2* [Bill 155]

Cyprus—The Mail Service—The Annual Payment to the Porte
Question, Sir Edmund Lechmere; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) *Feb* 15, 1559

DALRYMPLE, Mr. C., *Ipswich*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 688

Deacons (Church of England) Bill
(*Mr. Gedge, Viscount Folkestone, Mr. Hoare, Mr. MacInnes*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 31 [Bill 134]

DE COBAIN, Mr. E. S. W., *Belfast, E.*
Belfast Main Drainage, 3R. 1523
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1139, 1142, 1143, 1144, 1145

Deep Sea Oysters Bill
(*Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Mr. Colman*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 2 [Bill 151]

Defences of the Empire—see title *Imperial, &c. Defences*

DE LA WARR, Earl
Railways—Railway Brakes, Motion for a Return, 1354

DE LISLE, Mr. E. J. L. M. P., *Leicestershire, Mid*
Contract for Cartridges for Queensland—The Explosives Act, 1402
India—The Punjab—Forced Labour, &c. 1078
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 715
Post Office—An Imperial Penny Postage, 393

DENMAN, Lord
Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. 751; Comm. 1059; *cl.* 1, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1063; Report, 1726
State-Directed Emigration, 383
Women's Suffrage, 2R. 256

DE ROS, Lord
Ireland, State of—Legislation, 1375
Navy—H.M.S. "Indus"—Defective Weapons—Sword Bayonets, 1070

DE WORMS, Baron H. (Secretary to the Board of Trade), *Liverpool, East Toxteth*
Board of Trade (Marine Department)—Wreck of the "Tally Ho"—Rocket Station at Eastbourne, 1552
Commissioners of Irish Lights, 538;—Clothing Contracts, 1083;—The "Princess Alexandra," 539
Egypt—Port Dues on Shipping, 1561
Emigration Statistics for 1886, 1230
Fishery Department (England and Wales)—Beam Trawling, 773, 774
Fishing Boats Amendment, 1224
Gold and Silver Plate—Hall-Marking—Indian Gold and Silver Plate at the Colonial Exhibition, 548
Revenue Act, 1887, 769
Harbours of Refuge—Lundy Island, 1079
Lighthouse Illuminants—Experiments at the South Foreland, 266
Limited Liabilities Acts — Registration of Limited Companies, 1770
Mercantile Marine — Life-Saving Gear on "Kapunda," and certain Casualties in 1886, 645
Merchant Shipping—The "Andrew Johnson" and the "Thirlmere," 1563
The Register of Shipping—Vessels moved by Towing, 1397
Merchant Shipping Acts—Loss of the "Kapunda," 1545
North Sea Fisheries—Report of the Committee, 1560
Railway Rates and Charges, 1571
Railways—Return of Rates for Carriage of English and Foreign Produce, 272
Refuge and Life Harbours—Appropriation of Public Money, 1394
Statistics of Trade and Labour — Labour Bureaux, 1407
Thames Preservation Act, 1885—Conservancy Bye-Laws, 876
Trade and Commerce—International Conference on the Sugar Bounties, 1560
Weights and Measures Act—Sale of Coal in the Midland Mining Districts, 886

DILLON, Mr. J., *Mayo, E.*
Ireland—Evictions—Evictions on Lord Ormathwaite's Property, 1236
Law and Police—Assault at Coolgreany, 1223
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 847, 851, 855, 933, 977, 982, 1053, 1123, 1336, 1337, 1826, 1828, 1829, 1830

DILLWYN, Mr. L. L., *Swansea, Town*
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1780
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure (1882)—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 1777

Distress for Rent Amendment Bill (*Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Burt, Mr. Arthur Williams*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 2 [Bill 154]

DIXON-HARTLAND, Mr. F. D., *Middlesex, Uxbridge*
Hampton Court Palace—Safety of the Art Treasures, &c. 261, 262
Members of Parliament—Return of Members, 1880—Index of Names, 1211
Railways—Return of Rates for Carriage of English and Foreign Produce, 272

Dogs
Liability for shooting Stray Dogs, Question, Mr. M'Laren ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 8, 880
Rabies among Dogs—Police Precautions—The Rabies Order, 1887, Question, Mr. H. S. Wright ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Lord John Manners) *Feb* 8, 886

DOUGLAS, Mr. A. AKERS- (Secretary to the Treasury), *Kent, St. Augustine's*
Newspaper Advertising—Treasury Patronage, 1103

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Bill (*Mr. Jackson, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 127]
Read 2° * *Feb* 8

DUFF, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 451, 452, 453, 454

DUNCAN, Colonel F., *Finsbury, Holborn*
Army—Quartermasters and Riding Masters, 269
High Court of Justice—Chancery Taxing Master's Office, 763
Parks (Metropolis)—Greenwich Park, 1764
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 675

DUNCOMBE, Mr. A., *York, E.R., Howdenshire*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 579

DUNRAVEN, Earl of
Resignation of the Earl of Dunraven, Personal Explanation, 1715

DYKE, Right Hon. Sir W. H. (Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education), *Kent, Dartford*
Endowed Schools Acts—The Annual Financial Statement, 887

Early Closing Bill (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. John Barry, Mr. Burt, Mr. A. Cohen, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Whitley*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 99]

EBRINGTON, Viscount, *Devon, Tavistock*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1007

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. Mark Stewart, Mr. J. A. Campbell*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 11]

Ecclesiastical Assessments (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Finlay, Mr. M'Lagan*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 4 [Bill 160]

Ecclesiastical Commissioners
Churchyard Bottom Wood, Highgate, Question, Mr. Pickersgill ; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, *Feb* 4, 642
St. Mary, Hornsey, Question, Mr. Picton ; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) *Feb* 4, 643
Return of Dues payable by Mines, Quarries, &c., Question, Mr. Conybeare ; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) *Jan* 31, 272

Education (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill (*Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Buchanan, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Thorburn*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 79]

Egypt
Army of Occupation—Health of the Troops, Question, Mr. Henry J. Wilson ; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 1, 393
Supplementary Estimates, Question, Sir George Campbell ; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 3, 544
Neutralization of Egypt—Rumoured Negotiations, Question, Sir Henry Tyler ; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 10, 1105
Port Dues on Shipping, Question, Mr. T. Sutherland ; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 15, 1561
Sir Henry Drummond Wolff—Expenses of His Mission, Questions, Mr. S. Williamson ; Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 14, 1410
War Decorations to the English Troops, Question, General Sir William Crossman ; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 17, 1750

Finance, &c.
Abolition of the "Corvée," Question, Sir John Lubbock ; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 10, 1079 ; Questions, Mr. Labou-

[*cont.*

Egypt—Finance, &c.—cont.
chere, Sir George Campbell; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 14, 1401

The Soudan
Opening of Trade with the Soudan, Questions, Mr. Bryce; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 1, 390
Relief of Emin Bey, Question, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Jan* 31, 273
Military Expedition—Scientific Reports on the Soudan, Question, Mr. Norris; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 4, 648

ELCHO, Lord, *Ipswich*
Statistics of Trade and Labour — Labour Bureaux, 1407

Electric Lighting Act (1882) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Watt, Mr. Graham, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Howell, Mr. Crossley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 89]

Electric Lighting Act (1882) Amendment Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Thurlow*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Jan* 31 (No. 10)

Elementary Education (Evening Schools) Bill (*Mr. James Stuart, Mr. A. H. Dyke Acland, Mr. H. J. Wilson, Mr. T. E. Ellis, Sir Henry Roscoe*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 49]

ELLENBOROUGH, Lord
Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. 747
Army—Military Armaments and Organization, 149
Royal Artillery—Rumoured Reduction of the Force, 1516
Navy—H.M.S. "Indus"—Defective Weapons —Sword Bayonets, 1070

ELLIS, Mr. J. E., *Nottingham, Rushcliffe*
Burial Grounds Bill—Consecration of Cemeteries, 766
Ireland—Questions
Agrarian Outrages—The Returns, 273
Evictions—The Returns, 168
Irish Land Commission—Judicial Rents—The Returns, 168
Law and Justice—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 896;—"Queen *v.* Dillon," 1233;—Marked Panels—The Jurors' Acts, 1764
Purchase of Land Act, 1885—Amount of Advances, 1411
Royal Irish Constabulary—Returns, 652
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1805
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 312

ELLIS, Mr. T. E., *Merionethshire*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 602
Quarries Regulation, 1226
Town Holdings, Nomination of Select Committee, 868

ELPHINSTONE, Lord (A Lord in Waiting)
Navy—H.M.S. "Indus"—Defective Weapons —Sword Bayonets, 1068, 1070
War Office (Ordnance Department)—Defective Weapons—Sword Bayonets, 1198

Emigration
State-Directed, Petition presented, Lord Denman *Feb* 1, 383
Emigration Statistics for 1886, Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 11, 1230

Employers' Liability Acts—Legislation
Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Jan* 31, 267

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment Bill (*Mr. William M'Donald, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Chance, Mr. Clancy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 38]

Employers' Liability Act (1880) Amendment (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Joicey, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Lockwood*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 9 [Bill 163]

Endowed Schools Act, 1869, *and Amending Acts*
Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, to inquire into the operation of "The Endowed School Act, 1869," and the amending Acts, and to consider and report how far it may be expedient to amend the powers exercised under them by the Charity Commissioners; List of the Committee *Feb* 7, 869

Endowed Schools Acts — The Annual Financial Statement
Question, Mr. Coghill; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Sir William Hart Dyke) *Feb* 8, 887

ERNE, Earl of
Navy—H.M.S. "Indus"—Defective Weapons —Sword Bayonets, 1067
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 10
War Office (Ordnance Department)—Defective Weapons—Sword Bayonets, 743

ESHER, Lord (Master of the Rolls)
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 1, 1060

ESMONDE, Sir T. H. G., *Dublin Co., S.*
- Ireland—Questions
  - Collector of Rates' Office, 1546
  - Commissioners of Irish Lights—The "Princess Alexandra," 539
  - Crime and Outrage—Assault at Coolgreaney, 1222;—Assaults in Wexford Co., 1545
  - Labourers' Acts—John Kavanagh, Co. Wexford, 1388
  - Poor Law—Insanitary State of Rathdown Workhouse, 1222
- Merchant Shipping—Detention of the "Telegrapho" by the Dominican Government, 1566
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 195

ESSLEMONT, Mr. P., *Aberdeenshire, E.*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 1353; Amendt. 1415, 1427, 1429, 1450, 1468

EWART, Mr. W., *Belfast, N.*
- Belfast Main Drainage, 3R. 1386, 1525
- Ireland — Railways — Dublin "Loop Line" Scheme, 770

FENWICK, Mr. C., *Northumberland, Wansbeck*
- Coal Mines—Explosion at the Wood End Pits, Lancashire, 1560

Europe (South Eastern), Affairs of — Austria and Russia
- Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Jan* 31, 271

Fairs and Markets (Ireland) Bill
(*Dr. Tanner, Dr. Commins, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Lane, Mr. Healy*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 166]

Felonious Use of Firearms Bill
(*Mr. Howard Vincent, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Seager Hunt, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Hulse*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 119]
- Bill withdrawn, after short debate *Feb* 1, 479

FERGUSSON, Right Hon. Sir J. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Manchester, N.E.*
- Africa (East)—London Conference—Sultan of Zanzibar, 649
- Africa (West Coast)—Revival of the Slave Trade, 1216, 1404
- Bulgaria — Prince Alexander of Battenberg, 1238, 1240
- Canada and the United States—The Fisheries' Disputes, 165, 759
  - Law of Extradition, 1406
- Commercial Treaty with France, 1882 — Surtaxe D'Entrepôt, 1095

[cont.

FERGUSSON, Right Hon. Sir J.—*cont.*
- Egypt — Abolition of the "Corvée," 1079, 1401, 1402
  - Neutrality—Rumoured Negotiations—The Neutralization of Egypt, 1106
- Egypt—Soudan—Questions
  - Disaster to Italian Arms at Massowah, 652, 1237, 1238
  - Opening of Trade with the Soudan, 390
  - Relief of Emin Bey, 274
- Haytian Government—Claims of British Subjects, 648
- Madagascar — Expulsion of —— Wilkinson, 1558
- Merchant Shipping—Detention of the "Telegrapho" by the Dominican Government, 1566
- Morocco—Imprisonment of the Free Negro, Fattah, 1403
- Northern Pacific—Evacuation of Port Hamilton, 389
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 663, 664, 665, 675
- South-Eastern Europe—Austria and Russia, 271
- United States—The Homestead and Exemption Laws, 548
- Venezuela—Seizure of the "Henrietta" and "Josephine"—Claims of British Subjects, 768

FIELD, Admiral E., *Sussex, Eastbourne*
- Admiralty—Torpedo Boats—A "Committee of Designs," 1095
- Board of Trade (Marine Department)—Wreck of the "Tally Ho"—Rocket Station at Eastbourne, 1551

FINLAY, Mr. R. B., *Inverness, &c.*
- Orkney Roads, 2R. 1206

FINUCANE, Mr. J., *Limerick, E.*
- Ireland—Questions
  - Evictions—Conduct of the Constabulary, Co. Limerick, 1387
  - Law and Police—Alleged "Police Outrage at Hospital, Co. Limerick," 1759
  - Magistracy — Petty Session at Hospital, Co. Limerick, 1221

First Offenders Bill (*Mr. Howard Vincent, Lord Randolph Spencer Churchill, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Hoare, Mr. Addison, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Molloy*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 132]

Fishery Department (England and Wales) —Beam Trawling
- Questions, Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Marjoribanks; Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 7, 773

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Harrington, Mr. Sexton, Mr. J. A. Blake, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Hooper, Mr. O'Hea*)
- *c.* Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 54]

Fishing Boats Amendment Bill—Legislation
Question, Mr. Heneage; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 11, 1224

Fishings, &c. Valuation (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Caldwell, Dr. Cameron, Dr. Clark*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 114]

FitzGerald, Lord
Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. 747; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1062
Ireland—Police Acts—Corporation of Limerick —Extra Police, 1512
State of Ireland—Legislation, 1382
Privilege—"The Queen *v.* Lord Graves," 254
Solicitors (Ireland), 2R. 1058, 1059

Fitzgerald, Mr. R. U. P., *Cambridge*
Law and Justice (Ireland)—Judge Curran, 1106

Flynn, Mr. J. C., *Cork, N.*
Parliament — Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1821
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 587

Foreign Affairs—Secretary of State (*see* Salisbury, Marquess of)

Foreign Affairs—Under Secretary of State (*see* Fergusson, Right Hon. Sir J.)

Fortescue, Earl
Iddesleigh, The Late Earl of, 9

Fowler, Right Hon. H. H., *Wolverhampton, E.*
Ireland—Law and Justice—Salary of the Attorney General, 890
Law and Justice—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 765
Prosecution of Rev. Walter Davies, 535
Navy—Prices of Coal, Iron, Steel, &c. to the Dockyards, 542
Parliament—Business of the House, 145
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1176, 1185, 1278
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. 365; Comm. 635

Fowler, Sir R. N., *London*
British Honduras, 1104
India (Madras)—The Conflagration, 1085
Queen's Jubilee Celebration—Clerks and other Employés in the Civil Service, 1775

Foynes Harbour (Transfer) Bill
(*Sir Herbert Maxwell, Mr. Jackson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 4 [Bill 159]

France, Commercial Treaty with, 1882—*Surtaxe D'Entrepôt*
Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 10, 1095

Fraser, Major-Gen. C. C., *Lambeth, N.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1175

Free Libraries Acts Amendment Bill
(*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Arthur Cohen, Mr. Collings, Sir John Kennaway, Sir Lyon Playfair*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 122]

Free Libraries Acts Consolidation Bill
(*Mr. Caldwell, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Cameron Corbett*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 115]

Free Libraries and Mechanics' Institutions—Supply of Parliamentary Reports
Question, Mr. C. Wright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) *Feb* 15, 1556

Friendly Soceities Act (1875) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Norton, Viscount Folkestone, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Hoyle*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 6]

Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Francis Stevenson, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Sir Savile Crossley, Mr. Channing, Mr. Burt, Mr. Mason*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 20]

Friendly Societies (Transmission of Money) Bill
(*Viscount Curzon, Sir Edward Birkbeck, Captain Fellowes, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Godson, Sir Albert Rollit*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 86]

Fry, Mr. T., *Darlington*
Ireland—Evictions—Glenbeigh Evictions, 165, 166, 167
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 212, 213

Fulton, Mr. J. F., *West Ham, N.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 207, 212

Gardner, Mr. H., *Essex, Saffron Walden*
Depression of Trade and Agriculture—Cost of the Commission, 1571

Gent-Davis, Mr. R., *Lambeth, Kennington*
Civil Service Writers—Retirement of Writers, 890
The Treasury Minute, 890
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 202

Gibson, Mr. J. G. (Solicitor General for Ireland), *Liverpool, Walton*
Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
Juries Act, 1871—Jury Panel at Sligo, 1228
Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 1220, 1229;—"Queen *v.* Dillon," 1090, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1094, 1233, 1234, 1235
Winter Assize Courts, 881, 1225
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 975, 977, 979, 980, 982, 987

Gilhooly, Mr. J., *Cork, W.*
Ireland—Questions
Arms Act—Mr. James O'Mahoney, 1394;—The Bantry District, 1760
Law and Police — Thomas Scully and Robert Kelly, 1549
Police Protection— —— Hegarty, 1761

Gill, Mr. T. P., *Louth, S.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1013

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., *Edinburgh, Mid Lothian*
Iddesleigh, The Late Earl of, 74, 94

Glebe Lands Bill [H.L.] (*The Viscount Cross*)
l. Presented; read 1ª, after short debate *Feb* 8, 870 (No. 16)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Feb* 15, 1494

Glebe Lands Bill
(*Mr. Baggallay, Mr. Childers, Mr. John Talbot, Mr. Tomlinson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 8 [Bill 162]

Gorst, Sir J. E. (Under Secretary of State for India), *Chatham*
Army—Afghan Prize Money, 540
India—Questions
Bombay—Abstinence from Strong Drink, 1230
Income Tax on Travelling Allowances, 761
Madras—The Conflagration, 1086
Railways — Massacre on the Quetta-Pisheen Railway, 545
Reform in the Indian Telegraph Department, 1545
The Punjab—Forced Labour, &c. 1078
India—Burmah (Upper)—Questions
Military Expedition, 1748
Military Occupation of the Ruby Mines, 161, 261, 1557, 1558, 1769; — Mr. Streeter, 1087

Gorst, Sir J. E.—*cont.*
Military Operations—Cost of the War, 1236
Reported Chinese Invasion, 1568
The Shan Chiefs—China, 1769
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 707

Goschen, Rt. Hon. G. J. (Chancellor of the Exchequer), *St George's, Hanover Square*
Free Libraries and Mechanics' Institutions—Supply of Parliamentary Reports, 1557
Inland Revenue—A Rating Clause for Hoardings, 1567
Income Tax—The Married Women's Property Act, 1750
Inhabited House Duty—Lodging Houses, 1762
Merchant Shipping—Refuge and Life Harbours, 1767

Gourley, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*
Canada and the United States—The Fishery Dispute, 758
Post Office—Conveyance of American Mails, 761

Graham, Mr. R. C., *Lanark, N.W.*
Ambleside Railway, 2R. 1744
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 441
Scotland—Distress in Lanarkshire, 1559

Granville, Earl
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. 1061
Army—Military Armaments and Organization, 158
Glebe Lands, 1R. 873, 874
Iddesleigh, The Late Earl of, 8
Ireland, State of—Legislation, 1375
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 20, 31, 49

Gray, Mr. C. W., *Essex, Maldon*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 199, 1457

Greenwich Markets Act (1849) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Boord*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 2 [Bill 152]

Grey, Sir E., *Northumberland, Berwick*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 920

Grimthorpe, Lord
Glebe Lands, 2R. 1500

Haldane, Mr. R. B., *Haddington*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1425, 1632

Hall-Marking
- *Indian Gold and Silver Plate at the Colonial Exhibition,* Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 3, 548
- *The Revenue Act,* 1884, Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 7, 768

HALSBURY, Lord (Lord Chancellor)
- Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. 745, 747, 752; Comm. 1062; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1063
- Lunacy, 2R. 741
- Lunacy Acts Amendment, 2R. 737
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, 2
  - Privilege—"The Queen *v.* Lord Graves," 253
  - Roll of the Lords, 258
  - Speaker of the House, 737

HAMBRO, Colonel J. C. T., *Dorset, S.*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 494

HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord G. F. (First Lord of the Admiralty), *Middlesex, Ealing*
- Admiralty—Questions
  - Accountant General's Department, 163
  - Administration of the Dockyards, 759
  - Appointments—The Director of Dockyards, 1392
  - Defective Weapons — Sword Bayonets, 1097, 1098, 1758, 1771
  - Dr. Allen Shone, Chaplain, R.N., 1393
  - Dry Dock, Haulbowline, 1100
  - Imperial Institute, The Proposed—Dockyard Subscriptions, 1562;—Devonport Dockyard, 1224
  - "Old and Unserviceable Stores," 1086
  - Pensions to Widows of Seamen and Marines—Unclaimed Prize Money, &c., 1768
  - Shipbuilding—The "Anson," 1101
  - Torpedo Boats—A "Committee of Designs," 1096
- Islands of the South Pacific—Island of Malayta—H.M.S. "Opal," 757
- Navy—Questions
  - Auxiliary Forces—Naval Reserve (Scotland), 1085
  - Dockyards—Prices of Coal, Iron, Steel, &c., 542
  - Naval Contracts—Report of the Committee, 1405
- North Borneo—Attack on Natives—H.M.S. "Zephyr," 758
- Northern Pacific—Evacuation of Port Hamilton, 554
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 365, 394, 452
- Post Office—Conveyance of American Mails, 762

HAMILTON, Lord C. J., *Liverpool, West Derby*
- Post Office—Conveyance of Mails to the Gambia, 271

HAMILTON, Lord E., *Tyrone, N.*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 328, 329

HAMILTON, Colonel C. E., *Southwark, Rotherhithe*
- Army—Royal Horse Artillery, 272

HAMLEY, General Sir E. B., *Birkenhead*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 445, 451

HANBURY, Mr. R. W., *Preston*
- Admiralty—Defective Sword Bayonets, 1096, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1758
- Army (Ordnance Department)—Contract for Cartridges for Queensland, 1081, 1231, 1565
  - Defective Weapons, 753, 754, 1087;—Committee of Inquiry, 1240
- Parliament — Parliamentary Procedure — "Blocking," 1105
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 815

Harbours and Passing Tolls Act,* 1861—*Guarantee of Loans
- Question, Mr. C. T. Dyke Acland; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Feb* 15, 1547

Harbours of Refuge—Lundy Island
- Question, Mr. Llewellyn; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 10, 1079

HARCOURT, Right Hon. Sir W. G. V., *Derby*
- Bulgaria—The Correspondence, 1570
- Irish Land Commission, 1570
- Parliament—Business of the House—Amendments to the Address, 1413, 1414
- Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure) Res. 1781, 1793
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1276, 1308, 1318, 1330, 1335, 1689
- Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. 373, 374

Hares Preservation Bill (*Colonel Dawnay, Sir John Lubbock, Lord Elcho, Mr. Dillwyn, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Beach, Mr. Staveley Hill*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 4]

HARRINGTON, Mr. E., *Kerry, W.*
- Ireland — Evictions — Glenbeigh Evictions, 895, 1220;—Cost of Constabulary, 876
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 945, 946, 979, 1282, 1488

Harrington, Mr. T. C., *Dublin, Harbour*
- Ireland—Evictions—Glenbeigh Evictions, 167
  - Law and Justice—Judge Curran, 1106 ;—Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 1092, 1093 ;—" Queen *v.* Dillon," 1235
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 183, 185, 187, 188, 192, 193, 221, 1282

Harris, Lord (Under Secretary of State for War)
- Army—Royal Artillery—Rumoured Reduction of the Force, 1517
  - Small Arms—Defective Sword Bayonets, 744, 1066
- Military Armaments and Organization, 147, 154, 155
- Navy—H.M.S. "Indus"—Defective Sword Bayonets, 1069, 1071

Harrowby, Earl of
- Army (Small Arms)—Defective Sword Bayonets, 1198, 1199
- Navy—H.M.S. "Indus"—Defective Sword Bayonets, 1070

Hartington, Right Hon. Marquess of, *Lancashire, Rossendale*
- Law and Justice—Grant of Quarter Sessions to Blackburn, 1564
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1113, 1123

Hayden, Mr. L. P., *Leitrim, S.*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 801

Hayne, Mr. C. Seale-, *Devon, Ashburton*
- Inland Revenue—Inhabited House Duty—Lodging Houses, 1762

Haytian Government, The — Claims of British Subjects
- Question, Mr. Chance ; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 4, 648

Healy, Mr. M., *Cork*
- Belfast Main Drainage, 3R. 1526
- Ireland—Questions
  - Court of Bankruptcy—Audit of Accounts, 767 ;—Mr. L. H. James, late Official Assignee, 1543
  - Evictions—Glenbeigh Evictions, 894
  - Landlord and Tenant—Lord Charlemont's Estate—Interference of the Police, 884, 1089
  - Law and Police—Sub-Inspector Milling, Cork Co., 1757, 1758
  - Registration of Parliamentary Voters—Polling Districts, 881, 882
- Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
  - Average Cost of Prosecutions, 1757

[*cont.*

Healy, Mr. M.—*cont,*
  - Jury System, 1756 ;—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 655, 897, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1217, 1220, 1389, 1568, 1569 ;—" Queen *v.* Dillon," 1090, 1091 ;—Record of Jurors ordered by the Crown to stand by in Criminal Trials, 766 ;—Religion of Jurors, 1565 ;—Winter Assize Courts, 881, 1225, 1565
- Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Questions
  - Cost of Prosecutions at Winter Assizes, 1757
  - Jurors in Criminal Trials, 764, 765
  - Winter Assizes Act—Transfer of Prisoners and Witnesses, 882 ;—Re-arrangement of Circuits, 1225, 1226
- Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland, 2R., 371 ; Comm. 634, 635

Healy, Mr. T. M., *Longford, N.*
- Ireland—Law and Justice—The Jury System — Challenges — " Queen *v.* Dillon and others," 1233, 1235
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1276, 1341

Heaton, Mr. J. H., *Canterbury*
- Post Office—Questions
  - Money Order Office—Remittances from Australia, 1755
  - Parcel Post between France and Egypt, 388
  - Post Office Contracts—Australian Mail Contracts, 552

Heneage, Right Hon. E., *Great Grimsby*
- Fishing Boats Amendment, 1224

Herb and Ginger Beer Makers' Licence Bill (*Mr. H. S. Wright, Colonel Eyre, Mr. Whitmore, Mr. Broadhurst, Colonel Anstruther, Mr. Byron Reed*)
- *c.* Considered in Committee ; Resolution agreed to, and reported ; Bill ordered ; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 16]

Herschell, Lord
- Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. 748 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1061
- Lunacy Acts Amendment, 2R. 739
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 49, 53
- Privilege—" The Queen *v.* Lord Graves," 255

High Sheriff Disqualification (Ireland Bill (*Mr. Alderman John O'Connor, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. Cox, Mr. John O'Connor*)
- *c.* Ordered ; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 85]

Hill, Colonel E. S., *Bristol, S.*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 436
- Trade and Commerce—International Conference on the Sugar Bounties, 1775

Hill, Mr. A. S., *Staffordshire, Kingswinford*
Post Office—Foreign Telegraph Stations, 877

Holland, Right Hon. Sir H. T. (Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Hampstead*
Africa (South)—Affairs of Zululand, 1217
Army Warrant—Cyprus Mail Service, 1559
British Honduras, 1104
Conference of Colonial Representatives—State-Directed Colonization, 767
Post Office—Conveyance of Mails to the Gambia, 270, 271
Seychelles Islands—Chief Officer of the Police, 1217

Holmes, Right Hon. H. (Attorney General for Ireland), *Dublin University*
Ireland—Questions
  Arterial Drainage—Drainage Districts in Kilkenny, 1555
  Charitable Donations and Bequests—The Eaton Bequest, 1393
  Collector of Rates' Office, 1546
  Crime and Outrage—Assaults in Wexford Co., 1546 ;—Riots at Belfast—Belfast Private Act, 1865, 1767
  Evictions—Gweedore, 392
  Irish Land Commission—Sales of Holdings—Reservations, 1543
  Land—Reduction of Interest on Mortgages, &c., 1550
  Royal Irish Constabulary—District Inspector Greene, 1556
  State of Ireland — "Boycotting" at Mitchelstown, 1549
Ireland—Court of Bankruptcy—Questions
  Audit of Accounts, 767
  Mr. L. H. James, late Official Assignee, 1543
  Mr. Thomas Moroney, 552
Ireland—Law and Justice—Assizes—Questions
  Ordinary Jurors, 646
  Winter Assizes, 1565 ;— Ulster Winter Assizes—Conviction of M'Grath, 757
Ireland—Law and Justice—The Jury System—Questions
  1757
  Challenges in Criminal Cases, 1389, 1568, 1569, 1762
  Jurors in Criminal Cases, 386, 387, 388, 656
  Record of Jurors ordered by the Crown to stand by in Criminal Trials, 766
  Religion of Jurors, 1565
Ireland—Law and Police—Questions
  Millstreet Petty Sessions — Sergeant Moroney, 1548
  Orange Processions in North Antrim, 1557
  Sub-Inspector Milling, Cork Co., 1758
  Thomas Scully and Robert Kelly, 1549
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 832, 839, 843

Home Defences—See title *Imperial, &c. Defences*

Home Department—Secretary of State (*see* Matthews, Right Hon. H.)

Home Department—Under Secretary of State (*see* Wortley, Mr. C. B. Stuart-)

Hooper, Mr. J., *Cork, S.E.*
Ireland—Post Office—Improved Postal Service at Kinsale, 638

Houses in Towns (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Crilly, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Colonel Nolan, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Leahy*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 30]

Housing of Working Classes Bill
(*Mr. Pyne, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Dr. Fox, Mr. P. J. Power, Mr. Quinn*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 55]

Howard, Mr. J., *Middlesex, Tottenham*
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Publication of Evidence in Divorce and other Cases, 553

Howell, Mr. G., *Bethnal Green, N.E.*
Charity Commissioners—Non-Representative Bodies, 164
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Codification of the Criminal Law, 263
  The Revised Statutes—Issue of a New and Cheap Edition, 262
Trustee Savings Banks — Bishop Stortford Bank, 1775
  Cardiff Bank, 1409, 1410

Howorth, Mr. H. H., *Salford, S.*
Ambleside Railway, 2R. 1736
Contagious Diseases Acts—Effects of Suspension, 1761
Inland Revenue—Income Tax—Foreign Firms, 656
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 914

Hoyle, Mr. I., *Lancashire, S.E., Heywood*
Parliament—Publication of Evidence, 556

Hozier, Mr. J. H. C., *Lanarkshire, S.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 960, 963

Hubbard, Mr. E., *Bucks, N.*
Commission on Agriculture, 1881-2—Maintenance of the Indoor Poor, 388

Hughes, Colonel E., *Woolwich*
Metropolitan Board of Works—Annual Expenditure on the Parks, 1226

HUGHES-HALLETT, Colonel F. C., *Rochester*
Army—Questions
Military Ballooning, 762
Ordnance Department—Guns supplied to Army and Navy, 884;—Krupp Guns, 772
Practice in Use of the Revolver, 1088
Royal Barracks, Dublin—Insanitary Condition, 1763
Royal Horse Artillery—The "Maiwand Battery," 773
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 428, 698

HUNT, Mr. F. Seager, *Marylebone, W.*
Parks (Metropolis)—Battersea Park, 1563

HUNTER, Sir W. G., *Hackney, Central*
Army—Medical Officers, 1559

HUNTER, Mr. W. A., *Aberdeen, N.*
Army Contracts—Cartridges for Queensland, 888
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1492, 1602; Motion for Adjournment, 1647, 1650, 1651, 1664

Hyde Park Corner (New Streets) Bill
(*Mr. David Plunket, Mr. Jackson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 135]
Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Feb* 3, 557

ILLINGWORTH, Mr. A., *Bradford, W.*
Imperial Institute—Dockyard Subscriptions, 1562
Ireland—Law and Justice—Challenges in Criminal Cases—"Queen *v.* Dillon," 1762
Parliament—Business of the House—Rules of Procedure, Res. 1786
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 477, 570; Amendt. 733
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. 375

Imperial and Colonial Defences
Coaling Stations in the Eastern Colonies, Question, Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 15, 1569
Coaling Station at Castries (*West Indies*), Question, Sir William Crossman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 7, 756
Garrisons of the Thames Forts, Question, Major Rasch; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 3, 549

INCHIQUIN, Lord
Ireland, State of—Legislation, 1359

Income Tax Administration Amendment Bill (*Mr. Hubbard, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Whitley, Sir George Balfour*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 2 [Bill 149]

INDIA—Secretary of State (*see* CROSS, Viscount)

INDIA—Under Secretary of State (*see* GORST, Sir J. E.)

INDIA (*Questions*)
Income Tax on Travelling Allowances, Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Feb* 7, 761
Railways—Massacre on the Quetta-Pisheen Railway, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Feb* 3, 545
Reform in the Indian Telegraph Department, Question, Mr. King; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Feb* 15, 1545
The Punjab—Forced Labour, &c., Question, Mr. De Lisle; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Feb* 10, 1078

BOMBAY
Abstinence from Strong Drink, Question, Mr. S. Smith; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Feb* 11, 1230

MADRAS
The Conflagration, Question, Sir Robert Fowler; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for India (Sir John Gorst) *Feb* 10, 1085
The Covenanted Civil Service—Land Speculations—Case of Mr. Sullivan, Question, Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, The Secretary of State for India (Viscount Cross) *Feb* 7, 741

Indian Ocean, The—The Seychelles Islands—The Chief Officer of Police
Question, Commander Bethell; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) *Feb* 11, 1216

IRELAND (*Questions*)
Armagh Town Commissioners — Audit of Accounts, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 891
Arms (Ireland) Act—Mr. James O'Mahoney, Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 14, 1394
The Bantry District, Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1760
Charitable Donations and Bequests — The Eaton Bequest, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 14, 1393
Collectors of Inland Revenue, Question, Mr. Peter M'Donald; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Feb* 17, 1765
Collector of Rates' Office (Dublin), Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1546

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Dispensary Districts — Mohigeela, Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Chief Secretary, for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 28, 169

Emigration—Parliamentary Grants, 1882-3, Question, Captain Colomb; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 11, 1240

Landlord and Tenant — Lord Charlemont's Estate—Interference of the Police, Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 884; *Feb* 10, 1089

Mr. F. Deverell, County Surveyor of Cavan, Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 14, 1392

Orange Societies—Officers of the Army and Militia, Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Jan* 31, 266

Police Acts (Ireland)— The Corporation of Limerick—Extra Police, Question, Observations, The Duke of St. Albans; Reply, The Lord Privy Seal (Earl Cadogan); short debate thereon *Feb* 15, 1503

Registration of Parliamentary Voters—Polling Districts, Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. Cox; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 881

Registration of Voters (Ireland) Act, 1885—*Payment of Officials,* Question, Mr. Sheil; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1756

Tithe Rent-Charge, Question, Mr. P. J. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1765

Trees—Re-afforesting, Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1773

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)

Audit of Accounts, Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 7, 767

Mr. L. H. James, late Official Assignee, Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1543

Mr. Thomas Moroney, Question, Mr. P. M'Donald; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 3, 551

Local Courts of Bankruptcy — Legislation, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 3, 539

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS

Labourers' Cottages—Ardee Union, Question, Mr. Carew; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 891

Navan Union, Question, Mr. Mahony; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 11, 1219

Rathdrum Union, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1750

IRELAND—*Labourers Acts*—cont.

John Kavanagh, Co. Wexford, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 14, 1388

LAND (IRELAND)

Glebe Land Tenants, Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 895

Reduction of Interest on Mortgages, &c., Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1550

Land Act (Ireland), 1870—*The Bright Clauses,* Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 3, 538

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881—*Sub-Commissioners — Sittings at Kilkenny,* Question, Mr. Chance; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 31, 265

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, *and the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act,* 1885, *The Royal Commission on the—Report of the Commission,* Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 28, 168; —*Legislation,* Questions, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 15, 1570

Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1885 — *Amount of Advances,* Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 14, 1411

IRISH LAND COMMISSION

Judicial Rents—The Returns, Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 28, 168

Sales of Holdings — Reservations, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1543

Sligo County, Question, Mr. Mulholland; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1749

Sale of Land, Co. Donegal, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 31, 268

Irish Land Court, The—Sittings in County Louth, Question, Mr. Nolan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1758

COMMISSIONERS OF IRISH LIGHTS

Clothing Contracts, Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 10, 1082

Legislation, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 3, 538

[*cont.* [*cont.*

Ireland—*Commissioners of Irish Lights*—cont.
  The "Princess Alexandra," Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 3, 539

Education (Ireland)
  Commissioners of Education (Ireland)—School Lands at Cavan, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 31, 263
  Commissioners of Endowed Schools—Property in Land—Abatement of Rents to Tenants, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1754
  National School Teachers—Delaying Payment of Result Fees, Question, Mr. Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 878

Fisheries (Ireland)
  Fishermen of Lough Neagh, Question, Mr. Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 4, 645
  Inspectors of Irish Fisheries—Collection of Statistics, Question, Mr. J. A. Blake; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1756
  Trawling in Sligo and Killala Bays, Questions, Colonel Nolan, Mr. P. M'Donald; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 3, 543

Fishery Piers and Harbours (Ireland)
  Greystones, County Wicklow, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Feb* 17, 1751
  Pullendiva Pier, Question, Mr. P. M'Donald; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 4, 644

Sea Fisheries (Ireland)
  A Steam Cruiser, Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 3, 543

Inland Navigation and Drainage (Ireland)
  Arterial Drainage—Drainage Districts in Kilkenny, Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1554
  The River Barrow, Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 10, 1082

Lunatic Asylums (Ireland)
  Criminal Lunatic Asylum, Dundrum—Case of —— Lambe, Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1754
  William Cribbin, Mullingar Lunatic Asylum, Question, Mr. Tuite; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 4, 648

Poor Law (Ireland)
  Insanitary State of Rathdown Workhouse, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 11, 1222

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*
Post Office (Ireland)
  Accommodation at Grangegeith and Slane, Question, Mr. O'Hanlon; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 3, 541
  Improved Postal Service at Kinsale, Question, Mr. Hooper; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 4, 638
  Postal Accommodation at Newry, Question, Mr. M'Cartan; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 14, 1395
  Sub-Postmaster of Gurteen, Co. Galway, Questions, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 11, 1214
  Telegraph Department—Case of Patrick Ward, Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 14, 1399

Railways (Ireland)
  The Dublin "Loop Line" Scheme, Question, Mr. Ewart; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 7, 770

Law and Justice (Ireland)
  Attorney General, Salary of the, Question, Mr. Henry H. Fowler; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Feb* 8, 890
  Crossmaglen Prisoners, The, Question, Mr. Blane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 11, 1215

  Achill Petty Sessions—Importation of Illicit Whiskey by Coastguards, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 14, 1388
  Average Cost of Prosecutions, Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1757

The Jury System
  Juries (Ireland) Act, 1871 — *Intimidation of Jurors,* Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 11, 1241
  Religion of Jurors, Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1565
  Judge Curran, Questions, Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald, Mr. T. C. Harrington; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 10, 1106
  Jury Panel at Sligo, Questions, Dr. Kenny; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) *Feb* 11, 1227; Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1764

Assizes
  Ordinary Jurors, Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 4, 646
  Ulster Winter Assizes—Conviction of M'Grath, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 7, 756

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*Assizes*—cont.

The Winter Assize Courts, Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) *Feb* 8, 881; *Feb* 11, 1225; Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1565

Challenges in Criminal Cases, Questions, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 1, 386; Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 4, 655; *Feb* 7, 766; Questions, Mr. J. E. Ellis, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 896; Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. R. T. Reid, Mr. J. E. Redmond, Mr. Chance; Answers, the Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 11, 1217; Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), 1220; Question, Mr. Chance; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), 1229; Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes), The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 14, 1389; Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1568; *Feb* 17, 1756

The "Queen v. *Dillon, O'Brien, and others,"* Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) *Feb* 10, 1090; Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. T. C. Harrington, Mr. Chance, Mr. Conybeare; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), 1091; Questions, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answers, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), Mr. Speaker *Feb* 11, 1233; Question, Mr. Cobb; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson), 1235; Question, Mr. Illingworth; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 17, 1762

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)

The Petty Sessions District of Boyle, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 4, 640

Petty Session at Hospital, County Limerick, Questions, Mr. Finucane, Mr. M'Cartan, Mr. W. Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 11, 1221

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)

Alleged "Police Outrage at Hospital, Co. Limerick, Question, Mr. Finucane; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1759

Assault at Coolgreaney, Questions, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Dillon; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 11, 1222

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*Law and Police*—cont.

Millstreet Petty Sessions—Sergeant Moroney, Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1547

Orange Processions in North Antrim, Question, Mr. Pinkerton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1557

Sub-Inspector Milling, Cork County, Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 17, 1757

Thomas Scully and Robert Kelly, Question, Mr. Gilhooly; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1549

THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY

Achill Petty Sessions—Conviction of Policemen, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1760

Extra Police in County Clare, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 4, 641

Labourers (Ireland) Acts, Question, Mr. O'Hea; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 31, 268

Returns, Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 4, 652

Service on Evictions, Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 10, 1103

Constable Foster, Question, Mr. O'Hanlon; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 879

District Inspector Greene, Question, Mr. W. Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1556

Ex-Constable Martin Joyce, Question, Mr. D. Sullivan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 4, 639

Detective Constable Kerr, Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 885

District Inspector Tilly, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 14, 1403

PRISONS (IRELAND)

Prisons (Ireland) Act, 1877—Mr. Healy, Governor of Clare County Prison, Questions, Mr. Cox; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 4, 641

Re-organization—Increase of Salaries of Officials, Question, Mr. M'Cartan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 892

STATE OF IRELAND

"Boycotting" at Mitchelstown, Questions, Mr. Macartney, Mr. M'Cartan; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1548

[*cont.*

Ireland—*State of Ireland*—cont.

Inflammatory Language at Public Meetings—Mr. W. O'Brien's Speech at Woodford, Co. Galway, Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 14, 1411

Legislation, Observations, Lord Inchiquin; Reply, The Lord Privy Seal (Earl Cadogan): short debate thereon *Feb* 14, 1359

Police Protection—Denis Brennan, Question, Dr. Kenny; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 14, 1395;— —— *Hegarty*, Questions, Mr. Gilhooly; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 17, 1761

Crime and Outrage (Ireland)

Agrarian Outrages—The Returns, Question, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 31, 273

Assaults in Wexford Co., Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 15, 1545

Moonlighters at Millstreet, Co. Cork, Questions, Mr. Smith-Barry, Dr. Tanner; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 11, 1213

The Riots at Belfast

Belfast Private Act, 1865, Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 17, 1766

The Constabulary, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 893

The Report of the Royal Commission, Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 28, 169; *Jan* 31, 273

Evictions (Ireland)

Conduct of the Constabulary, Co. Limerick, Questions, Mr. Finucane; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 14, 1387

Mr. Hillas, High Sheriff, Sligo Co., Question, Mr. P. M'Donald; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 4, 643

Notices to Relieving Officers—The Glenbeigh Evictions, Questions, Mr. Wootton Isaacson, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 3, 554

The Returns, Questions, Mr. J. E. Ellis; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 28, 168

Threatened Evictions in Achill, Question, Mr. Channing; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 895

The Glenbeigh Evictions, Question, Mr. T. Fry; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 28, 165; Question, Mr. O'Hea; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Jan* 31, 274; Question, Mr. Wootton Isaacson; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach)

[*cont.*

Ireland—*The Glenbeigh Evictions*—cont.

Feb 4, 655; Questions, Mr. Mahony, Mr. M. Healy; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 893; Questions, Mr. Mahony, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), 894; Questions, Mr. Mahony; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 11, 1218; Question, Mr. E. Harrington [no reply], 1220

Allowances to the Constabulary, Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 1, 392;—*Service on Evictions*, Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 10, 1103

Cost of Constabulary, Questions, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. E. Harrington; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 876

Gweedore, Question, Mr. O'Hea; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Feb* 1, 392

Rathkeale, Questions, Colonel Sandys, Mr. W. Abraham (Limerick, W.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 4, 646

Woodford—Cost of Transport, &c., Question, Mr. Chance; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 3, 537

Marquess of Lansdowne's Estate, Queen's Co., Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 8, 887

Lord Ormathwaite's Property, Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) *Feb* 11, 1236

Isaacson, Mr. F. Wootton, *Tower Hamlets, Stepney*

Ireland—Evictions—Glenbeigh Evictions, 655;
—Notices to Relieving Officers, 554
Metropolis—Theatres and Public Places—The Spitalfields Calamity, 1102
Metropolitan Water Supply—The Assessment, 1772

Jackson, Mr. W. L. (Secretary to the Treasury), *Leeds, N.*

Civil Service Writers, Retirement of, 890
 The Treasury Minute, 890
Harbours and Passing Tolls Act, 1861—Guarantee of Loans, 1547
Inland Revenue — Stamp Duty on Receipts from Income Tax and Poor Rates, 1225
Ireland—Questions
 Arklow Harbour Works, 878
 Collectors of Inland Revenue, 1766
 Fishery Piers and Harbours—Greystones, Co. Wicklow, 1751
 Law and Justice—Salary of the Attorney General, 890

[*cont.*

JACKSON, Mr. W. L.—*cont.*
Mauritius—The Exchange, 542
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. 375

JAMES, Hon. W. H., *Gateshead*
Egypt—Soudan—Disaster to the Italian Arms at Massowah, 1237
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Case of Thomas Thompson, Convicted of Murder, 261

JENNINGS, Mr. L. J., *Stockport*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 455

JOHNSTON, Mr. W., *Belfast, S.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 804, 809, 1337

JOICEY, Mr. J., *Durham, Chester-le-Street*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 609
Public Funds—Transmission of Dividends, 556

Justice of the Peace Qualification (Abolition) Bill (*Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Winterbotham, Mr. Burt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 90]

Justices' Jurisdiction Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Bramwell*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Feb* 17 (No. 24)

Justices of Peace Bill (*Mr. Seale-Hayne, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Howell, Mr. Rendel, Sir Bernhard Samuelson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 34]

KELLY, Mr. J. Richards, *Camberwell, N.*
Sutton District Water, 2R. 1532

KENNY, Dr. J. E., *Cork, S.*
Ireland—Juries Act, 1871—Jury Panel at Sligo, 1227, 1228
State of Ireland—Police Protection—Denis Brennan, 1395

KENNY, Mr. M. J., *Tyrone, Mid*
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Jurors in Criminal Trials, 764
Parliament—Business of the House—Rules of Procedure, 1714; Res. 1820
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 329, 1713, 1830
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. 376; Comm. 633

KILCOURSIE, Right Hon. Viscount, *Somerset, S.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1145

KIMBER, Mr. H., *Wandsworth*
Commons (Metropolis)—Wandsworth Common Act, 1871—Leasing of Land, 546
Gold and Silver Plate—Hall-Marking—Indian Gold and Silver Plate at the Colonial Exhibition, 548
The Revenue Act, 1887, 768
Trade and Commerce—International Conference on the Sugar Bounties, 1560
Venezuela—Seizure of the "Henrietta" and "Josephine"—Claims of British Subjects, 768

KIMBERLEY, Earl of
Glebe Lands, 2R. 1494

KING, Mr. H. S., *Hull, Central*
Army—Rifle Ranges, 1212
India—Reform in the Indian Telegraph Department, 1545

KNOWLES, Mr. L., *Salford, W.*
Marriage Law—England and Scotland, 164, 536
Newspapers—Post Office Act, 1870—Newspaper Libel and Registration Act, 1881, 1214

LABOUCHERE, Mr. H., *Northampton*
Ambleside Railway, 2R. 1740
Bulgaria—Prince Alexander of Battenberg, 1238
Chancellor of the Exchequer—Time of Taking Seat in this House, 170
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—The Corvée, 1401
Parks (Metropolis)—Cost of Maintenance, 549, 1390
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1786, 1789
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 349, 351, 361, 1713
South-Eastern Europe—Austria and Russia, 271

Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill (*Mr. Matthew Kenny, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Tuite, Mr. Lalor*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 28]

LACAITA, Mr. C. C., *Dundee*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1152

LAMBERT, Mr. Cowley, *Islington, E.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1304

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Lane, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Sheil*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 3]

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Cox, Mr. Dillon, Mr. O'Doherty, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Henry Campbell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 10]

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 3) Bill (*Mr. T. W. Russell, Lord Ernest Hamilton, Mr. Lea, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Sinclair*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 65]
2R. deferred, after short debate *Feb* 4, 735

Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 4) Bill (*Mr. Lea, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Sinclair*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 113]

Land Law (Wales) Bill (*Mr John Bryn Roberts, Mr. John Roberts, Mr. Warmington, Mr. Bowen Rowlands, Mr. Thomas Ellis*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 25]

Land Tenure (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Barclay, Sir George Balfour, Dr. Farquharson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 19]

Lands, Drainage of — Compensation to Riparian Owners
Question, Mr. Ainslie; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Feb* 11, 1215

Lane, Mr. W. J., *Cork Co., E.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 124, 302

Laurie, Colonel R. P., *Bath*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Volunteer Capitation Grant, 651
Queen's Jubilee Celebration—The Volunteers, 1749
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Publication of Evidence in Divorce and other Cases, 553

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES) (*Questions*)
Case of Thomas Thompson, Convicted of Murder, Question, Mr. W. H. James; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Jan* 31, 261
City of London Court, Question, Mr. O'Hanlon; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *Feb* 15, 1544
High Court of Justice — Chancery Taxing Master's Office, Question, Colonel Duncan; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *Feb* 7, 763
Prosecution of Rev. Walter Davies, Question, Mr. Henry H. Fowler; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *Feb* 3, 535

[*cont.*

Law and Justice (*England and Wales*)—cont.
Publication of Evidence in Divorce and other Cases, Questions, Mr. J. Howard, Colonel Laurie; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 3, 553
The Revised Statutes—Issue of a New and Cheap Edition, Question, Mr. Howell; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Jan* 31, 262

Criminal Law
Codification of the Criminal Law, Question, Mr. Howell; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Jan* 31, 263
The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy, Mr. M. J. Kenny, Mr. Henry H. Fowler, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 7, 764; Question, Mr. Chance; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *Feb* 11, 1228; Question, Mr. Cobb; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 1236
[See *Ireland—The Jury System*]

Assizes and Quarter Sessions
Cost of Prosecutions at Winter Assizes, Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 17, 1757
Re-arrangement of Circuits, Questions, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 11, 1225
Winter Assizes Act—Transfer of Prisoners and Witnesses, Question, Mr. Maurice Healy; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 8, 882
Grant of Quarter Sessions to Blackburn, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 15, 1564

Law of Evidence Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Bramwell*)
l. Presented; read 1a * *Feb* 17 (No. 23)

Lawrence, Sir J. J. Trevor, *Surrey, Reigate*
Sutton District Water, 2R. 1536

Lawson, Sir W., *Cumberland, Cockermouth*
Parliament—New Writ for the Borough of St. George's, Hanover Square, Motion for Adjournment, 259
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 457, 660, 664, 665

Lea, Mr. T., *Londonderry, S.*
Ireland—Land Act—Report of the Commission, 168

Leasehold Enfranchisement (by Purchase or Rent-Charge) Bill
(*Colonel Hughes, Mr. Fulton, Mr. Evelyn, Mr. Holloway, Major Banes*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 67]

Leaseholds (Facilities of Purchase of Fee Simple) Bill (*Mr. Lawson, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. J. Rowlands, Mr. Warmington, Mr. Reid, Mr. Puleston, Mr. T. E. Ellis*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 26]

Leaseholds (Purchase of Freeholds) Bill
(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Connolly*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 83]

LECHMERE, Sir E. A. H., *Worcestershire, Bewdley*
Army Warrant—Cyprus Mail Service, 1559

LEFEVRE, Right Hon. G. J. Shaw, *Bradford, Central*
Ambleside Railway, 2R. 1747

LEGH, Mr. T. W., *Lancashire, S.W., Newton*
Africa (East)—Massowah—Defeat of an Italian Expedition, 652
Burmah (Upper)—Reported Chinese Invasion, 1568

LEIGHTON, Mr. S., *Shropshire, Oswestry*
Ways and Means—Financial Statement—Local Taxation, 897

Licensed Premises (Earlier Closing) (Scotland) Bill (*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Mark Stewart, Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. Lyell, Mr. Provand*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 2 [Bill 153]

LICHFIELD, Bishop of
Glebe Lands, 2R. 1499

Lighthouse Illuminants — Experiments at the South Foreland
Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Jan* 31, 266

Limited Liabilities Act—Registration of Limited Companies
Question, Mr. J. M. Maclean; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 17, 1770

Limited Owners (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Haldane, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Arthur Elliot, Mr. Ferguson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 8]

Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. Lyell, Mr. M'Lagan, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Lacaita, Dr. Clark, Mr. Ferguson*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 22]

Literature, Science, and Art
Hampton Court Palace—Safety of the Art Treasures, &c., Questions, Mr. Dixon-Hartland; Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Jan* 31, 261
The National Portrait Gallery, Question, Mr. Cochrane-Baillie; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Feb* 17, 1772

LLEWELLYN, Mr. E. H., *Somerset, N.*
Harbours of Refuge—Lundy Island, 1079

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD—President (*see* RITCHIE, Right Hon. C. T.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD—Secretary to (*see* LONG, Mr. W. H.)

Lodgers' Goods Protection Act (1871) Amendment Bill
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Howard Vincent, Mr. Gent-Davis*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 137]

London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance Bill (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Sir Robert Fowler, Mr. Hubbard, Colonel Duncan, Mr. R. G. Webster*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 44]
Questions, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg); Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor [no reply] *Feb* 15, 1567

LONG, Mr. W. H. (Secretary to the Local Government Board), *Wilts, Devizes*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1019

LORD ADVOCATE, The (*see* MACDONALD, Right Hon. J. H. A.)

LORD LIEUTENANT OF IRELAND — Chief Secretary to the (*see* BEACH, Right Hon. Sir M. E. HICKS-)

Lowther, Mr. J. W., *Cumberland, Penrith*
Ambleside Railway, 2R. 1730, 1731, 1732, 1737
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), 535

Lubbock, Sir J., *London University*
Egypt—Abolition of the "Corvée," 1079

Lunacy Acts Amendment—Legislation
Question, Mr. W. J. Corbet ; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) *Feb* 4, 653

Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Jan* 31 (No. 7)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Feb* 7, 737

Lunacy Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Jan* 31 (No. 8)
Read 2ª *Feb* 7, 741

Lyell, Mr. L., *Orkney and Shetland*
Orkney Roads, 2R. Amendt. 1199, 1202, 1209
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 325

McArthur, Mr. A., *Leicester*
Africa (West Coast)—Revival of the Slave Trade, 1216
Post Office—Conveyance of Mails to the Gambia, 270

McCalmont, Captain J., *Antrim, E.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1052, 1053

McCartan, Mr. M., *Down, S.*
Ireland—Questions
  Magistracy—Petty Session at Hospital, Co. Limerick, 1221
  Post Office—Postal Accommodation at Newry, 1395
  Prisons—Re-organization—Increase of Salaries of Officials, 892
  State of Ireland—"Boycotting" at Mitchelstown, 1549

M'Carthy, Mr. J. H., *Newry*
Egypt (Soudan)—Relief of Emin Bey, 273

Macartney, Mr. W. G. E., *Antrim, S.*
Ireland, State of—"Boycotting" at Mitchelstown, 1548
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 502, 505

Macdonald, Right Hon. J. H. A. (Lord Advocate), *Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities*
Marriage Law (England and Scotland), 164, 536
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1587, 1602, 1603, 1608, 1609, 1610, 1615, 1622, 1623, 1624, 1625, 1638, 1651, 1661

[*cont.*

Macdonald, Right Hon. J. H. A.—*cont.*
Scotland—Questions
  Parliamentary Elections—Polling Places, 1566
  Police Bill, 651
  Reduction of Rents—Trustees of Landed Estates, 645
  Western Islands—Procurators Fiscal, 269

McDonald, Mr. P., *Sligo, N.*
Army—Case of Private James Gillen, 1765
Ireland—Questions
  Collectors of Inland Revenue, 1765
  Court of Bankruptcy — Mr. Thomas Moroney, 551
  Evictions—Mr. Hillas, High Sheriff, Sligo Co., 643, 644
  Fisheries—Trawling in Sligo and Killala Bays, 543
  Fishery Piers and Harbours—Pullendiva Pier, 644
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 795, 1834

McDonald, Dr. R., *Ross and Cromarty*
Scotland—Questions
  Army (Auxiliary Forces)—The Militia, 1084
  Crofters' Act—Sheep Farms and Deer Forests, 1083
  Crofters' Commission—Lewis and Skye Crofters, 1085
  Navy (Auxiliary Forces)—The Naval Reserve, 1085
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1468, 1588, 1623

Macdonald, Mr. W. A., *Queen's Co., Ossory*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 513

McGarel-Hogg, Sir J. M. (Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works), *Middlesex, Hornsey*
Brixton Market, 2R. 1077
Metropolis Coal and Wine Dues Continuance, 1567
Metropolitan Board of Works—The Superintending Architect, 544

McKenna, Sir J. N., *Monaghan, S.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 299, 300

Mackintosh, Mr. C. Fraser-, *Inverness-shire*
Army—John Cameron, Seaforth Highlanders, 537
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1479, 1646
Post Office—Postal Communication with the Outer Hebrides, 538
Sea Fishings (Scotland) Act—Defective Operation, 1080

McLagan, Mr. P., *Linlithgow*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1460

McLaren, Mr. W. S. B., *Cheshire, Crewe*
- Dogs—Liability for Shooting Stray Dogs, 880
- Mines Regulation Act, 1872—Employment of Women at the Pit's Bank, 1406
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1032

Maclean, Mr. J. M., *Oldham*
- Limited Liabilities Acts—Registration of Limited Companies, 1770

Maclure, Mr. J. W., *Lancashire, S.E., Stretford*
- Metropolis—Poor Law—Casual Relief at St. George's Workhouse, 879

Madagascar—Expulsion of ——— Wilkinson
- Question, Mr. F. S. Stevenson; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 15, 1558

Mahony, Mr. P., *Meath, N.*
- Ireland—Evictions—Glenbeigh Evictions, 893, 894, 1218, 1220
  - Labourers' Cottages Acts—Navan Union, 1219
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 526, 557; Motion for Adjournment, 1595, 1600, 1602, 1603

Malcolm, Colonel J. W., *Argyllshire*
- Orkney Roads, 2R. 1204

Manners, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R. (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster), *Leicestershire, E.*
- Agricultural Department—Agricultural Statistics—Return of Owner Farmers, 1095
  - Cultivation of Hops, 391
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 477
- Rabies among Dogs—Police Precautions, 887

Marjoribanks, Right Hon. E., *Berwickshire*
- Fishery Department (England and Wales)—Beam Trawling, 774
- Parliament—Arrangement of Public Business, 1648

Market Tolls (Ireland) Bill
(*Captain M'Calmont, Mr. Smith-Barry, Mr. Macartney*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 70]

Marriage Law (England and Scotland)—Attendance of Registrars
- Questions, Mr. Knowles; Answers, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Jan* 28, 161; *Feb* 3, 536

Marriages (Attendance of Registrars) Bill (*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Stuart-Wortley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 10 [Bill 164]

Marum, Mr. E. P. M., *Kilkenny, N.*
- Coal Mines Regulation Bill—Extension to Ireland—The Truck System, 1400
- Ireland—Arterial Drainage—Drainage Districts in Kilkenny, 1554
  - Post Office—Telegraph Service—Case of Patrick Ward, 1399
  - Trees—Re-afforesting, 1773

Maskelyne, Mr. M. H. N. Story-, *Wilts, Cricklade*
- Thames Preservation Act, 1885—Bye Laws, 876

Mason, Mr. S., *Lanark, Mid*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 518

Matthews, Right Hon. H. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Birmingham, E.*
- Burials Act—Consecration of Cemeteries—Refusal of Bishops, 766;—The Attleborough Burial Board, 546
- Burial Grounds Bill—Consecration of Cemeteries, 767
- Coal and Ironstone Mines—Days of Drawing, 654
- Coal Mines—Explosion at the Wood End Pits, Lancashire, 1561
- Coal Mines Regulation—Extension to Ireland—The Truck System, 1400, 1401
- Cornish and Devon Mines—Insanitary Condition, 1763
- Dogs—Liability for Shooting Stray Dogs, 880
- Felonious Use of Firearms, 2R. 481
- Jury System (Ireland)—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 1217, 1218
- Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Questions
  - Case of Thomas Thompson, Convicted of Murder, 261
  - Grant of Quarter Sessions to Blackburn, 1564
  - Jurors in Criminal Trials, 764, 765
  - Publication of Evidence in Divorce and other Cases, 553
  - Winter Assizes—Re-arrangement of Circuits, 1226;—Cost of Prosecutions, 1757
  - Winter Assizes Act—Transfer of Prisoners and Witnesses, 883
- Metropolis—Questions
  - Metropolitan Water Supply—The Assessment, 1772
  - Parks—Cost of Maintenance, 549
  - Police—" Prize Competition for Children," 1408
  - Theatres and Public Places—The Spitalfields Calamity, 1102
- Mines Regulation Act, 170
- Mines Regulation Act, 1872—Employment of Women at the Pit's Bank, 1406
- Naturalization of Aliens—Fees, 650, 651
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1272, 1273, 1276, 1277, 1278, 1282, 1323

[*cont.*

MATTHEWS, Right Hon. H.—*cont.*
Poor Law (England and Wales)—Paddington Workhouse—Incarceration of a Female not a Lunatic, 1776
Prison Sites—Clerkenwell Prisons, 770
Housing of the Working Classes, 770
Public Record Office—Inspection of Irish Records, 1752
Quarries Regulation, 1226, 1399
Scotland—Distress in Lanarkshire, 1559
Scotland—Law and Justice—Myles Martin, Crofter, a Prisoner in Inverness Gaol, 1553, 1554
Truck Acts—Mines and Works in Scotland, 260

Mauritius, The—The Exchange
Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Feb* 3, 542

MAYNE, Admiral R. C., *Pembroke and Haverfordwest*
Admiralty—Pensions to Widows of Seamen and Marines—Unclaimed Prize Money, &c., 1768
Shipbuilding—The "Anson," 1101
Merchant Shipping—Refuge and Life Harbours, 1767;—Appropriation of Public Money, 1394
Naval Contracts—Report of the Committee, 1405

Mercantile Marine—Loss of the "Kapunda"—Life-Saving Gear on the "Kapunda" and certain Casualties in 1886
Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 4, 644; Question, Mr. Atherley-Jones; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 15, 1544

Merchandise Marks Act (1862) **Amendment Bill** (*Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 31 [Bill 142]

Merchant Shipping
Detention of the "Telegrapho" by the Dominican Government, Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 15, 1566
Refuge and Life Harbours—Appropriation of Public Money, Question, Admiral Mayne; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 14, 1394; Question, Admiral Mayne; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) *Feb* 17, 1767
The "Andrew Johnson" and the "Thirlmere," Question, Mr. Provand; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 15, 1563
The Register of Shipping—Vessels moved by Towing, Question, Mr. J. C. Stevenson; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 14, 1396

Merchant Shipping Act (1854) **Amendment Bill** (*Mr. King, Mr. Baggallay, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Lacaita*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 76]

Merchant Shipping (**Fishing Boats**) **Acts Amendment Bill** (*Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. Jackson, Sir Herbert Maxwell*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 15 [Bill 168]

METROPOLIS (*Questions*)
Bridges—The Westminster Bridge Estate, Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Feb* 10, 1104
Commons—Wandsworth Common Act, 1871 *—Leasing of Land,* Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 3, 546
Distress — Unemployed Dock Labourers at Poplar, Question, Mr. W. Abraham, (Glamorgan, Rhondda); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Feb* 15, 1555
Holborn Workhouse, Question, Mr. Newnes; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Feb* 10, 1088
Police—"Prize Competition for Children," Questions, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Sydney Buxton; Answers, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster), The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 14, 1407
Poor Law—Casual Relief at St. George's Workhouse, Question, Mr. Maclure; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Feb* 8, 879
Renewal of the Coal and Wine Dues, Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Jan* 31, 265
Theatres and Public Places—The Spitalfields Calamity, Question, Mr. Wootton Isaacson; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 10, 1102
Water Supply—The Assessment, Question, Mr. Wootton Isaacson; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 17, 1772

The Parks
Annual Expenditure on the Parks, Questions, Colonel Hughes, Mr. Webster; Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Feb* 11, 1226; Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Feb* 14, 1390
Incidence of Cost of Maintenance, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 3, 549
Battersea Park, Question, Mr. Seager Hunt; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Feb* 15, 1563
Greenwich Park—The Regulations, Question, Colonel Duncan; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Feb* 17, 1764

[*cont.*

Metropolis—*The Parks*—cont.
  Regent's Park—Dismissal of a Constable, Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Feb* 1, 391
  St. James's Park—The Roadway, Question, Mr. Howard Vincent; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Feb* 8, 888

Metropolis Government Bill (*Mr. Isaacs, Mr. Kimber, Major-General Goldsworthy, Mr. Baumann, Sir Albert Kaye Rollit, Mr. Morgan Howard, Mr. Hunt, Sir Guyer Hunter, Colonel Duncan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 82]

Metropolis Management Acts Amendment Bill (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Colonel Hughes, Mr. Whitmore, Sir Algernon Borthwick*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 118]

Metropolis Management Acts Amendment (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Octavius Morgan, Mr. Gilliat, Mr. Kimber*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 167]

Metropolitan Board of Works (Fire Brigade Expenses) Bill
(*Mr. Webster, Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Mr. Tatton Egerton, Mr. Cochrane-Baillie, Mr. Isaacson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 108]

Metropolitan Board of Works (Theatres, &c.) Bill (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Mr. Tatton Egerton, Mr. R. G. Webster*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 117]

Metropolitan Board of Works—The Superintending Architect
  Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg) *Feb* 3, 544

Metropolitan Open Spaces Act (1881) Extension Bill (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Dalrymple, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Houldsworth, Mr. Reid, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Salt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 16 [Bill 171]

Midleton, Viscount
  Ireland, State of—Legislation, 1373

Milltown, Earl of
  Appellate Jurisdiction, 2R. 750; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1062
  Lunacy Acts Amendment, 2R. 740
  Parliament—Privilege—"The Queen *v.* Lord Graves," 255

Miners' Wages Payment Bill
(*Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, Mr. Borlase, Mr. Clancy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 140]

Mines Regulation Act, 1872
  Employment of Women at the Pit's Bank, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 14, 1406
  Legislation, Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Jan* 28, 170
  Cornish and Devon Mines—Insanitary Condition, Question, Mr. Conybeare; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 17, 1763
    [See title *Coal Mines*]

Mining Leases (Cornwall and Devon) Bill (*Mr. Acland, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Courtney, Viscount Ebrington, Mr. Bickford Smith, Mr. Seale-Hayne*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 1 [Bill 146]

Mining Royalties Bill (*Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Mason, Mr. Burt, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Borlase, Mr. Blake*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 23]

Molloy, Mr. B. C., *King's Co., Birr*
  Sutton District Water, 2R. 1542

Montagu, Mr. S., *Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel*
  Post Office—Submarine Telegraph Company, 758

More, Mr. R. J., *Shropshire, Ludlow*
  Agricultural Statistics—Return of Owner-Farmers, 1094

Morgan, Right Hon. G. Osborne, *Denbighshire, E.*
  Burial Acts—Consecration of Cemeteries—The Attleborough Burial Board, 546
  Canada and the United States—The Fisheries' Disputes, 165
  Emigration Statistics for 1886, 1230
  Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Jurors in Criminal Trials, 765
  Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1781

Morley, Earl of
  War Office (Ordnance Department)—Defective Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets, 1065

Morley, Right Hon. J., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
  Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1793
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 868, 898, 913, 986, 1143, 1144

Morocco—Imprisonment of the Free Negro, Fattah
Question, Mr. A. E. Pease; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 14, 1403

Mount - Edgcumbe, Earl of (Lord Steward of the Household)
Parliament—Queen's Speech—Her Majesty's Answer to the Address, 534

Mulholland, Mr. H. L., *Londonderry, N.*
Irish Land Commission—Sligo Co., 1749

Mundella, Right Hon. A. J., *Sheffield, Brightside*
Education Department (Scotland) — Lenzie Public School, 1405
Stationery Office—Copyright in Government Publications, 1774

Municipal Corporations Acts (Ireland) Amendment Bill (*Sir James Corry, Mr. Ewart, Mr. Johnston*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 73]

Municipal Elections (Scotland) (Corrupt Practices) Bill (*Mr. Lacaita, Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Shiress Will*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 77]

Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Carew, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. E. D. Gray, Sir Thomas Esmonde*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 21]

Municipal Rates Assessment Bill (*Mr. Rowntree, Mr. Dodds, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Craig*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 16 [Bill 173]

Murdoch, Mr. C. T., *Reading*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1031

Murphy, Mr. W. M., *Dublin, St. Patrick's*
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1820

Napier of Magdala, Lord
Army—Royal Artillery—Rumoured Reduction of the Force, 1513

National Provident Insurance
Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the best system of National Provident Assurance (*Mr. Rankin*) *Feb* 3

National School Teachers (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Tuite, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Conway, Mr. Nolan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 36]

Navy (*Questions*)
Auxiliary Forces—The Naval Reserve (Scotland), Question, Dr. R. Macdonald; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 10, 1085
Contracts—Report of the Committee, Question Admiral Mayne; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton *Feb* 14, 1405

Admiralty
Accountant General's Department, Question, Mr. Burt; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Jan* 28, 163
Appointments—The Director of Dockyards, Question, Sir William Plowden; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 14, 1392
Dr. Allan Shone, Chaplain, R.N., Question, Mr. P. O'Brien; Answer; The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 14, 1392
"Old and Unserviceable Stores," Question, Mr. J. Rowlands; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton); Question, Dr. Tanner [no reply] *Feb* 10, 1086
Pensions to Widows of Seamen and Marines—Unclaimed Prize Money, &c., Question, Admiral Mayne; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 17, 1768
Shipbuilding—The "Anson," Question, Admiral Mayne; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 10, 1101
Torpedo Boats—A "Committee of Designs," Question, Admiral Field; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 10, 1095

Defective Weapons
Re-testing of Cutlasses, Questions, Dr. Cameron, Colonel Eyre; Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Northcote), The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 14, 1393
Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets, Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 17, 1758; Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton), 1771
H.M.S. "Indus," Question, Observations, The Earl of Erne; Replies, Lord Elphinstone (A Lord in Waiting), The Under Secretary of State for War (Lord Harris); short debate thereon *Feb* 10, 1067
[See *Army—Defective Weapons*]

The Dockyards
Administration of the Dockyards, Question, Sir William Plowden; Answer, The Firs- Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilt ton) *Feb* 7, 759
Devonport Dockyard—The Imperial Institute—Collection of Subscriptions, Questions, Mr. Conybeare; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 11, 1223; *Feb* 15, 1562

[*cont.*

NAVY—*The Dockyards*—cont.
Dry Dock (Haulbowline), Question, Dr. Tanner; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 10, 1100
Prices of Coal, Iron, Steel, &c. to the Dockyards, Question, Mr. Henry H. Fowler; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 3, 542

NEWNES, Mr. G., *Cambridge, E., Newmarket*
Poor Law (Metropolis)—Holborn Workhouse, 1088

Newspapers
Advertising—Treasury Patronage, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Akers-Douglas) *Feb* 10, 1102
Post Office Act, 1870—*Newspaper Libel and Registration Act*, 1881, Question, Mr. Knowles; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 11, 1214

NOLAN, Colonel J. P., *Galway, N.*
Ireland—Fisheries—Sea Fisheries—A Steam Cruiser, 543
Trawling in Sligo and Killala Bays, 543
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1805, 1811
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 585, 1287
Town Holdings, Nomination of Select Committee, 868

NOLAN, Mr. J., *Louth, N.*
Ireland—Irish Land Court—Sittings in Co. Louth, 1758
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 203

NORRIS, Mr. E. S., *Tower Hamlets, Limehouse*
Army—Insanitary State of Dover Barracks, 888
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Scientific Reports on the Soudan, 648

North American Fisheries—See *Canada and the United States*

North Borneo — Attack on Natives — H.M.S. "Zephyr"
Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 7, 757

NORTHBROOK, Earl of
Army—Military Armaments and Organization, 150

NORTHCOTE, Hon. H. S. (Surveyor General of Ordnance), *Exeter*
Army—Royal Barracks, Dublin—Insanitary Condition, 1763
Army (Ordnance Department)—Questions
Arms of Officers—The Revolver, 653

NORTHCOTE, Hon. H. S.—*cont.*
Army Manufacturing Accounts, 1753
Clothing Contracts, 1398
Contract for Cartridges for Queensland, 888, 1081, 1231, 1233, 1565
Defective Weapons—Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets, 753, 754, 1088
Guns Supplied to Army and Navy, 884
Krupp Guns, 772
Royal Gun Factory, Woolwich—Deductions from Pay, 760
Navy—Re-testing of Cutlasses, 1393

Northern Pacific, The—Evacuation of Port Hamilton
Questions, Mr. Bryce, Mr. F. S. Stevenson, Mr. Young; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 1, 389; Question, Captain Colomb; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 3, 554

North Sea Fisheries, The—Report of the Committee
Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 15, 1560

Oaths Bill (*Mr. Bradlaugh, Sir John Simon, Mr. Courtney Kenny, Mr. Burt, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Richard, Mr. Jesse Collings*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 104]

O'BRIEN, Mr. J. F. X., *Mayo, S.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 302, 306

O'BRIEN, Mr. P., *Monaghan, N.*
Admiralty—Dr. Allan Shone, Chaplain, R.N., 1392
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Monaghan Militia —Orange Lodges, 883
Ireland — Commissioners of Irish Lights — Clothing Contracts, 1082
Mr. F. Deverell, County Surveyor of Cavan, 1392
Orange Societies—Officers of the Army and Militia, 266

O'BRIEN, Mr. P. J., *Tipperary, N.*
Ireland—Tithe Rent-Charge, 1765

O'CONNOR, Mr. A., *Donegal, E.*
Army (Ordnance Department)—Army Manufacturing Accounts, 1753
Defective Weapons—Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets, 1099
Civil Service—Suspension of Appointments, 1104
Egypt—Soudan—Disaster to the Italian Arms at Massowah, 1237, 1238
Ireland—Questions
Evictions—Marquess of Lansdowne's Estate, Queen's Co., 887

[con'.
[cont.

O'CONNOR, Mr. A.—*cont.*
Inland Navigation and Drainage — The River Barrow, 1082
Irish Land Commission—Sale of Holdings, 1543, 1544
Newspaper Advertising—Treasury Patronage, 1102
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1830; Motion for Adjournment, 1831, 1834
Post Office—Questions
Distribution of Trade Samples through the Belgian Post Office, 1753
New Postage Stamps—Report of the Committee upon Stamps, 540
Post Office Savings Bank—Limit of Deposits, 1768
Public Health—Sutton Cemetery, 391
Sutton District Water, 2R. Amendt. 1526, 1537, 1538, 1542

O'CONNOR, Mr. J., *Tipperary, S.*
Army (Ordnance Store Department)—Clothing Contracts, 1398
Felonious Use of Firearms, 2R. 481
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1822
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 135, 478, 1481

O'CONNOR, Mr. T. P., *Liverpool, Scotland*
Army (Ordnance Department)—Contract for Cartridges for Queensland, 1233
Bulgaria—Prince Alexander of Battenberg, 1239
Ireland—Law and Justice—The Jury System — Challenges in Criminal Cases, 387; — "Queen *v.* Dillon, O'Brien, and others," 1234
Metropolis Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, 1567
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 980, 987, 989, 994
Sutton District Water, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 1539

Office under the Crown (Vacating of Seats) Bill
(*Mr. W. F. Lawrence, Mr. A. D. Elliot, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Francis Stevenson, Mr. E. Robertson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 72]

O'HANLON, Mr. T., *Cavan, E.*
Ireland — Post Office Accommodation at Grangegeith and Slane, 541
Royal Irish Constabulary — Constable Forster, 879
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—City of London Court, 1544

O'HEA, Mr. P., *Donegal, W.*
Ireland — Evictions — Glenbeigh Evictions, 274;—Gweedore, 392
Royal Irish Constabulary—The Labourers (Ireland) Acts, 268
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 200, 729
Post Office — Remittances from Australia, 1755

ONSLOW, Earl of (Lord in Waiting)
Glebe Lands, 2R. 1495

Open Spaces (Dublin) Bill
(*Mr. William Redmond, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Timothy Harrington*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 80]

ORDNANCE — Surveyor General (*see* NORTHCOTE, Hon. H. S.)

Ordnance Department—see *Army*

Orkney Roads Bill (*by Order*)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Dodds*) *Feb* 11, 1199
Amendt. to leave out "now," add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Lyell*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 219, N. 139; M. 80 (D. L. 4)
Main Question put; Bill read 2°

Outlawries Bill
c. Read 1° * *Jan* 27

Parish Allotments Committees Bill
(*Mr. Cobb, Mr. Channing, Mr. Fuller, Mr. James Ellis, Mr. Herbert Gardner, Mr. Thomas Ellis*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 15 [Bill 170]

PAGET, Sir R. H., *Somerset, Wells*
Parliament—Business of the House—Amendments to the Address, 1413, 1414

PARKER, Mr. C. S., *Perth*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1299, 1466, 1468
Scotland—Fishery Board—Loans to Crofting Parishes, 655

Parliament
LORDS—
MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT *Jan* 27
The Session of Parliament opened by Commission
ROLL OF THE LORDS—Garter King of Arms attending, delivered at the Table (in the usual manner) a List of the Lords Temporal in the Second Session of the Twenty-fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom *Jan* 27
The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had prepared and laid it on the Table; The same was ordered to be printed (No. 6) *Jan* 31
Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech delivered by The LORD CHANCELLOR *Jan* 27, 3
The Queen's Speech having been reported by The LORD CHANCELLOR; An Address to HER MAJESTY thereon moved by The Earl of ERNE (the Motion being seconded by The Viscount TORRINGTON) *Jan* 27, 10; after debate, Address agreed to, *nemine dissentiente*

[*cont.*

[*cont.*

Parliament—Lords—*cont.*

Address to Her Majesty on Her Most Gracious Speech *Feb* 3, 531

Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *Feb* 3, 534

Chairman of Committees — The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos appointed, *nemine dissentiente*, to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Jan* 27

Committee for Privileges—appointed *Jan* 27

Sub-Committee for the Journals — appointed *Jan* 27

Appeal Committee—appointed *Jan* 27

Standing Orders Committee—appointed *Feb* 4; List of the Committee, 637

Committee of Selection—nominated *Jan* 28; List of the Committee, 145

Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod—appointed *Feb* 7; List of the Committee, 752

Private Bills

All Petitions relating to Standing Orders which shall be presented during the present Session referred to the Standing Orders Committee unless otherwise ordered *Feb* 4

Amendment of Standing Orders

Standing Orders Nos. 62, 64, 66, 115, 116, 117, 133a, and 177 considered and amended; and to be printed as amended (No. 18) *Feb* 11

PRIVILEGE

"*The Queen* v. *Lord Graves*," Observations, Lord Ribblesdale, Lord Coleridge (Lord Chief Justice of England); Reply, The Lord Chancellor (Lord Halsbury) *Jan* 31, 245

The late Earl of Iddesleigh, Observations, The Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (The Marquess of Salisbury), Earl Granville, Earl Fortescue *Jan* 27, 6

Resignation of the Earl of Dunraven, Personal Explanation, The Earl of Dunraven; Reply, The Prime Minister (The Marquess of Salisbury) *Feb* 17, 1715

COMMONS—

Privileges — Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed *Jan* 27

Public Petitions — Select Committee appointed; List of the Committee *Jan* 31, 381

Printing—Select Committee appointed; List of the Committee *Jan* 31, 382

Selection—Committee nominated; List of the Committee *Feb* 1, 384

Standing Orders Committee—appointed; List of the Committee *Feb* 1, 384

Committee of Public Accounts—Select Committee nominated; List of the Committee *Feb* 8, 1003

Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms (*House of Commons*)—Committee appointed; List of the Committee *Jan* 31, 382

[*cont.*

Parliament—Commons—*cont.*

ELECTIONS

Double Returns

Belfast (*Western Division*), Judges' Certificate and Report *Jan* 27, 54

Belfast Borough (*Western Division*) *and Sligo County* (*Southern Division*) *Elections*, Mr. Sexton elects to sit for the Western Division of Belfast, *Jan* 27, 54

Londonderry City and Longford (*North*), Letter received by Mr. Speaker from Justin M'Carthy, esquire, electing to serve for Derry City *Jan* 27

Londonderry City, Judge's Certificate and Report, *Jan* 27, 55

York, East Riding (*Buckrose Division*), Judges' Certificate and Report *Jan* 27, 55

County of Longford (*Northern Division*) *Election*, Return amended *Feb* 8, 875

Elections—Sessional Orders

Moved, "That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to concern himself in the Election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament, except only any Peer of Ireland, at such Elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a Candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament" *Jan* 27, 56; Motion agreed to

Address in Answer to Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech

The Queen's Speech having been reported by Mr. Speaker; An humble Address thereon moved by Viscount Weymouth (the Motion being seconded by Mr. G. W. Balfour) *Jan* 27, 77; after long debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed [Second Night] *Jan* 28, 170; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Third Night] *Jan* 31, 274; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Fourth Night] *Feb* 1, 394; after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Radcliffe Cooke*); Motion withdrawn

Original Question again proposed, 473; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Handel Cossham*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Fifth Night] *Feb* 2, 483; after long debate, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Sixth Night] *Feb* 3, 557; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Seventh Night] *Feb* 4, 656

Amendt., at end of 4th paragraph, add "And humbly to represent to Her Majesty that, inasmuch as the expenses of the prolonged

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

occupation of Egypt by a British Force have to be borne by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom, the great majority of whom have no direct interest in the Government or affairs of Egypt, and that the retention of our Troops in Egypt is a cause of suspicion and irritation to Continental Governments, and calculated to weaken the influence of this Country in the Councils of Europe, humbly to pray Her Majesty to take immediate steps for recalling the whole of Her Forces from Egypt" (*Mr. Cremer*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after long debate, Amendt. to said proposed Amendt., in line 9, leave out "immediate" (*Mr. Illingworth*); Question put, "That 'immediate,' &c.;" A. 247, N. 127; M. 120 (D. L. 3)

Question put, "That the words 'and humbly to represent to Her Majesty,' &c." be there inserted" (*Mr. Cremer*); A. 97, N. 263; M. 166 (D. L. 4)

Main Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*); Motion agreed to; Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Eighth Night] *Feb* 7, 774

Amendt. at end of 8th paragraph, insert "But humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the relations between the owners and occupiers of land in Ireland has not been seriously disturbed in the cases of those owners who have granted to their tenants such abatements of rents as are called for by the state of prices of agricultural and pastoral produce, and that the remedy for the existing crisis in Irish agrarian affairs is not to be found in increased stringency of criminal procedure, or in the pursuit of such novel, doubtful, and unconstitutional measures as have recently been taken by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland, but in such a reform of the Law and the system of government as will satisfy the needs and secure the confidence of the Irish people" (*Mr. Parnell*); Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. John Morley*); Motion agreed to; Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Ninth Night] *Feb* 8, 898; after long debate, Debate furthur adjourned

Debate resumed [Tenth Night] *Feb* 9, 1004; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Eleventh Night] *Feb* 10, 1107; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Twelfth Night] *Feb* 11, 1241; after long debate, Question put; A. 246, N. 352; M. 106

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1348

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Esslemont*); Question put, and agreed to; Debate further adjourned

Amendments to the Address, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith); short debate thereon *Feb* 14, 1412

Debate resumed [Thirteenth Night] *Feb* 14, 1415

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Amendt. at end of 10th paragraph, insert "And humbly to express regret that it is not proposed to inquire into the exceptional position of agricultural holders in Scotland, bound under nineteen years' leases, contracted and entered upon prior to the recent serious fall in the prices of all agricultural produce; a fall which has rendered stipulated rents inequitable, and in many cases impossible, under the altered circumstances of the Country; the operation of which Leases, especially those still covered by the Law of Hypothec, tends to prevent the full development of the productive capabilities of the land" (*Mr. Esslemont*), 1425; Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after long debate, Question put; A. 96, N. 198; M. 102

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1471

Amendt. at end of 12th paragraph, insert "But humbly to submit to Her Majesty that the affairs of the Realm have outgrown the capacity of this House; and humbly to pray of Her Majesty to invite Her Majesty's Ministers to consider and submit to Parliament Measures whereby great part of the special affairs of Scotland, and of other parts of Great Britain, may be relegated to bodies representing the several parts of the Kingdom, and the excessive burden on this House may be relieved" (*Sir George Campbell*) 1479; Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Main Question again proposed; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Dr. Cameron*); Motion agreed to; Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Fourteenth Night] *Feb* 15, 1571

Amendt. at end of 12th paragraph, insert "And humbly to represent to Her Majesty that recent events in Skye and Tiree, and the general administration of justice in the Highlands, have caused serious concern to the people of Scotland, and demand full inquiry" (*Dr. Cameron*), 1592; Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Mahony*); after further debate, Question put; A. 87, N. 112; M. 25 (D. L. 8)

Original Question again proposed, 1605; after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Hunter*); after further short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate further adjourned

Debate resumed [Fifteenth Night] *Feb* 16, 1649; after long debate, Question put; A. 136, N. 253; M. 117 (D. L. 9)

Main Question again proposed, 1712; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Sexton*); after short debate, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed [Sixteenth Night] *Feb* 17, 1825; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Arthur O'Connor*); after further short debate, Question put; A. 119, N. 261; M. 142 (D. L. 13)

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Amendt. at end of paragraph 12, insert "Humbly to represent to Her Majesty that the want of employment and general distress prevalent among the working classes in England and Ireland deserve the immediate attention of this House" (*Mr. Cox*), 1834; Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after debate, Mr. Speaker informs the House that it is the evident sense of the House that the Question should be now put

Moved, "That the Question be now put" (*Mr. William Henry Smith*); A. 291, N. 81; M. 210

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1846

Question put, "That those words be there inserted;" A. 84, N. 283; M. 199

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1849

Main Question again proposed; Mr. Speaker informs the House that it is the evident sense of the House that the Question should be now put

Moved, "That the Question be now put" (*Mr. William Henry Smith*); A. 289, N. 74; M. 215 (D. L. 16)

Main Question put; A. 283, N. 70; M. 213 (D. L. 17)

Entry in the Votes, 1852

Moved, "That a Committee be appointed to draw up an Address to be presented to Her Majesty upon the said Resolution" (*Mr. William Henry Smith*), 1853; Question put, and agreed to; List of the Committee, 1854

The Late Earl of Iddesleigh, Observations, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith), Mr. W. E. Gladstone *Jan* 27, 73

Resignation of the Right Hon. Lord Randolph Churchill, Personal Explanation, Lord Randolph Churchill; Observations, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Jan* 27, 57

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Jan* 28, 170

ORDER

Disallowance of Question as to Lord Cowper's Commission on Irish Land, Question, Mr. Sexton; Observations, Mr. Speaker *Feb* 7, 763

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE AND PUBLIC BUSINESS

Question, Mr. Henry H. Fowler; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Jan* 27, 145; Observations, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith); short debate thereon *Feb* 15, 1648

Notices of Motions and Orders of the Day

Ordered, That the Order of the Day for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Address, in Answer to Her Majesty's Speech, have precedence this day of the Notices of Motions (*Mr. William Henry Smith*) *Feb* 1

The Address, Ordered, That the Order for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Address have precedence this day of the Notices

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*Business of the House and Public Business*—cont.

of Motion and Orders of the Day (*Mr William Henry Smith*) *Feb* 15

Ordered, That the Order for resuming the Adjourned Debate on the Address have precedence this day of the Orders of the Day (*Mr. William Henry Smith*) *Feb* 16

Questions

Division Lists—Correction of an Error, Observations, Mr. Parnell, Mr. Speaker *Feb* 14, 1415

Members of Parliament—Return of Members, 1880—*Index of Names*, Question, Mr. Dixon-Hartland; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) *Feb* 11, 1211

Publication of Evidence given before Royal Commissions and Select Committees, Question, Mr. Hoyle; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 3, 556

Parliament — Business of the House (Rules of Procedure)

Notice of Motion, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Jan* 27, 57; Notice of Motion, Mr. J. W. Lowther, *Feb* 3, 535; Notice of Motion, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 16, 1714

The New Rules of Procedure (1882)—*Rule* 2 (*Adjournment of the House*), Motion, Mr. Dillwyn; Observations, Mr. Speaker *Feb* 17, 1777

"*Blocking*," Question, Mr. Hanbury; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 10, 1105

Moved, "That the consideration of the proposed Rules of Procedure have precedence of all Orders of the Day and Notices of Motions on every day on which the consideration of those Rules may be set down by the Government" (*Mr. William Henry Smith*) *Feb* 17, 1780; after long debate, Amendt. after the second word "day," in line 3, insert "except on Tuesday, the 22nd instant" (*Mr. Richard*); Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after further short debate, Question put; A. 158, N. 261; M. 103 (D. L. 11)

Main Question again proposed, 1793; Amendt. at end of Question, add "except upon the Wednesdays on which Bills relating to Ireland are set down" (*Mr. Parnell*); Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after debate, Question put; A. 107, N. 212; M. 105

Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1821

Main Question put, and agreed to

Parliament — Elections (Intervention of Peers, &c.)

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, "to consider the Sessional Order with reference to the intervention of Peers or Prelates in Parliamentary Elections, and to report whether any, and, if so, what alterations are advisable therein" *Feb* 4; List of the Committee, 736

Parliament—New Writ for the Borough of St. George's, Hanover Square

Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Saint George's, Hanover Square, in the room of Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, esquire, commonly called Lord Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, who since his Election for the said Borough hath accepted the Office of Steward or Bailiff of Her Majesty's Manor of Northstead, in the County of York" (*Mr. Akers-Douglas*) *Jan* 31, 259; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Wilfrid Lawson*); Question put; A. 93, N. 173; M. 80 (D. L. 1); Original Question put, and agreed to

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF LORDS

New Peers

Jan 27—John Glencairn Carter Hamilton, esquire, created Baron Hamilton of Dalzell in the county of Lanark

Edward Macnaghten, esquire, Q.C., appointed a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary, under the provisions of The Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, with the dignity of a Baron for life, by the style and title of Baron Macnaghten of Runkerry in the county of Antrim

Feb 10—Percy, Lord Shute—Was introduced by virtue of a special limitation in the Patent, dated 17th April 1880, and sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother George William, Lord Shute, and took the Oath

Sat First

Jan 27—The Earl Amherst, after the death of his father

The Earl of Strafford, after the death of his father

The Lord Monkswell, after the death of his father

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF COMMONS

New Writs Issued

During Recess

For Brighton Borough, *v.* David Smith, esquire, deceased

For Middlesex County (Brentford Division), *v.* Octavius Coope, esquire, deceased

For Liverpool Borough (Exchange Division), *v.* David Duncan, esquire, deceased

For Donegal County (Southern Division), *v.* Bernard Kelly, esquire, deceased

Jan 27—*For* Kent County (Dartford Division), *v.* The Right Hon. Sir William Hart Dyke, baronet, Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education

For Longford (Northern Division), *v.* Justin M'Carthy, esquire, who having been returned as a Member for the said County of Longford (Northern Division), and also for the City of Londonderry, elected to sit for the City of Londonderry

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT — COMMONS — *New Writs Issued—* cont.

For Antrim County (Northern Division), *v.* Edward Macnaghten, esquire, Lord of Appeal in Ordinary

Jan 28—*For* Sligo (Southern Division), *v.* Thomas Sexton, esquire, who, having been returned as a Member for the said County of Sligo (Southern Division), and also for the Borough of Belfast (Western Division), elected to sit for the Borough of Belfast (Western Division)

Jan 31—*For* The Borough of St. George's, Hanover Square, *v.* Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, esquire, commonly called Lord Algernon Malcolm Arthur Percy, who since his Election for the said Borough hath accepted the Office of Steward or Bailiff of Her Majesty's Manor of Northstead, in the County of York

Feb 14—*For* Burnley, *v.* Peter Rylands, esquire, deceased

New Members Sworn

Jan 27—William Tindal Robertson, esquire, *Brighton*

James Bigwood, esquire, *Middlesex (Brentford Division)*

Jan 28—Ralph Neville, esquire, *Liverpool (Exchange Division)*

Feb 3—The Right Hon. Sir William Hart Dyke, baronet, *County of Kent (Dartford Division)*

Feb 10—Right Hon. George Joachim Goschen, *Borough of St. George's, Hanover Square*

Timothy Michael Healy, esquire, *North Longford Division of the County of Longford*

John Gordon Swift Mac Neill, esquire, *South Donegal Division of the County of Donegal*

Edward Joseph Kennedy, esquire, *South Sligo Division of the County of Sligo*

Feb 17—Charles Edward Lewis, esquire, *North Antrim Division of the County of Antrim*

Parliamentary Elections Bill

(*Mr. Howell, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Fenwick, Dr. Clark, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Warmington*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 23 [Bill 32]

Parliamentary Elections (Closing of Public Houses) Bill

(*Mr. Shirley, Mr. Gane, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Caleb Wright*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 75]

Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt Practices) Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. De Lisle, Colonel Saunderson, Mr. Webster, Mr. Macartney*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 98]

Parliamentary Elections (Simultaneous Voting) Bill
(*Mr. H. F. Beaumont, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Craven*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 16 [Bill 172]

Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to Women) Bill
(*Mr. Woodall, Mr. Houldsworth, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. M'Laren, Sir Robert Fowler, Mr. Howorth, Mr. Maclure, Mr. Stansfeld*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 31 [Bill 128]

PARNELL, Mr. C. S., *Cork*
  Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 3), 2R. 735
  Parliament—Division Lists—Correction of an Error, 1415
  Parliament—Business of the House—Rules of Procedure, Res. Amendt. 1794, 1796, 1797, 1801
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 735; Amendt. 774, 839, 843, 1277, 1712

Parochial Boards (Scotland) Bill
(*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Barclay, Mr. Mackintosh, Mr. Graham, Mr. Esslemont*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 37]

PAULTON, Mr. J. M., *Durham, Bishop Auckland*
  Parliament—Queen's Speech—Address in Answer to, 691

Pauper Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) (Superannuation) Bill
(*Mr. Chance, Mr. William Corbet*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 62]

PEASE, Mr. A. E., *York*
  Africa (East Coast)—Revival of the Slave Trade, 1404
  Morocco—Imprisonment of the Free Negro, Fattah, 1403
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1134

PENTON, Captain F. T., *Finsbury, Central*
  Prison Sites—Clerkenwell Prisons, 770

Perpetual Pensions
  Select Committee appointed *Jan* 28, 24; List of the Committee nominated *Feb* 7, 869

Personal Property (Exemption from Sale) Bill
(*Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Picton, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Howorth*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 13]

Petty Sessions Districts Boundaries (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Thomas Gill, Mr. Sheil, Mr. Mahony*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 17 [Bill 174]

PICKARD, Mr. B., *York, W. R., Normanton*
  Coal and Ironstone Mines—Days of Drawing, 654
    Report of Inspectors, 1886, 654

PICKERSGILL, Mr. E. H., *Bethnal Green, S.W.*
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Churchyard Bottom Wood, Highgate, 642
  Hyde Park Corner (New Streets), 557
  Metropolis Coal and Wine Duties Continuance, 1567
  Metropolitan Bridges — The Westminster Bridge Estate, 1104

PICTON, Mr. J. A., *Leicester*
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners—St. Mary, Hornsey, 643
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1642

Piers and Harbours (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Biggar, Mr. Deasy, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Mahony, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Corbet*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28. [Bill 57]

PINKERTON, Mr. J., *Galway*
  Ireland—Law and Police—Orange Processions in North Antrim, 1557
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 311

Places of Worship (Sites) Bill
(*Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Borlase, Mr. Burt, Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. Henry Wilson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Jan* 28 [Bill 5]

PLOWDEN, Sir W. C., *Wolverhampton, W.*
  Admiralty—Administration of the Dockyards, 759
    Appointments—The Director of Dockyards, 1392
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 583

PLUNKET, Right Hon. D. R. (First Commissioner of Works), *Dublin University*
  Hampton Court Palace—Safety of the Art Treasures, &c. 261, 262
  Hyde Park Corner (New Streets), 557

[*cont.*

PLUNKET, Right Hon. D. R.—*cont.*
Literature, Science, and Art—National Portrait Gallery, 1772
Metropolitan Board of Works—Annual Expenditure on the Parks, 1227
Metropolitan Bridges — The Westminster Bridge Estate, 1104
Parks (Metropolis)—Questions
Battersea Park, 1563
Expenditure, 1391
Greenwich Park, 1765
Regent's Park—Dismissal of a Constable, 391
St. James's Park, 888
Public Health—Insanitary Condition of Battersea Park, 1080

Pluralities Act Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Feb* 3 (No. 14)
Read 2ª * *Feb* 4
Considered * report *Feb* 7
Read 3ª * *Feb* 8

Police Constables' Pensions Bill
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Lord Claud Hamilton, Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Sir George Russell, Mr. Gerald Balfour, Mr. Howard Vincent*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 35]

Police Force Enfranchisement Bill
(*Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Whitmore, Mr. Radcliffe Cooke, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Howard Vincent, Lord Claud Hamilton, Colonel Laurie*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 17]

Police Force Enfranchisement (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Seton-Karr, Mr. Puleston, Colonel Saunderson, Mr. Bigwood, Viscount Curzon*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 81]

Police (Scotland) Bill
Legislation, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Feb* 4, 651

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)
(*Questions*)
Paddington Workhouse—Incarceration of a Female not a Lunatic, Questions, Mr. W. J. Corbet; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 17, 1776 [See *Metropolis*]

Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Parnell, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Dwyer Gray*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 14]

Port and Harbour Authorities (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Thomas Mayne, Mr. Hooper*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 68]

POST OFFICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)
(*Questions*)
An Imperial Penny Postage, Question, Mr. Edwin De Lisle; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 1, 393
Dismissal of Female Clerks, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 14, 1396
Distribution of Trade Samples through the Belgian Post Office, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 17, 1753
Investments in Government Securities of Small Sums, Question, Mr Bartley; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 17, 1752
Letter Carriers' Good Conduct Badges, Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 7, 760
Money Order Office Remittances from Australia, Questions, Mr. Henniker Heaton, Mr. O'Hea; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 17, 1755
Negotiations with the Telephone Companies, Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 3, 550
New Postage Stamps—Report of the Committee upon Stamps, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb*, 3 540
Parcels Post between France and Egypt, Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 1, 388
Savings Bank—Limit of Deposits, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 17, 1768
Stationery Clerks in Surveyors' Branch, Question, Mr. Cobb; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 3, 549

Mail Contracts
Australian Mail Contracts, Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 3, 552
Conveyance of Mails to New York, Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 4, 639; Questions, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Whitley; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes), The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 7, 761
Conveyance of Mails to the Gambia, Questions, Mr. M'Arthur, Lord Claud Hamilton; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Henry Holland) *Jan* 31, 270

TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT
Foreign Telegraph Stations, Question, Mr. Staveley Hill; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 8, 877
The Submarine Telegraph Company, Question, Mr. Montagu; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 7, 758

POWER, Mr. P. J., *Waterford, E.*
Parliament—Business of the House—Rules of Procedure, Res. 1811, 1815
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 619, 1603

Powis, Earl of
  Glebe Lands, 2R. 1494

Primogeniture Bill (*Mr. Courtney Kenny, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Milnes-Gaskell*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 123]

Prison Sites
  Clerkenwell Prisons, Question, Captain Penton ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 7, 770
  Housing of the Working Classes, Question, Mr. J. Rowlands ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 7, 769

Private Bill Legislation Bill
(*Mr. Craig Sellar, Sir Lyon Playfair, Mr. Howorth, Mr. John Morley, Mr. Arthur Elliot*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 107]

Private Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. William Corbet, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. P. J. Power, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Molloy*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 103]

Probation of First Offenders Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Belmore*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Jan* 28 (No. 3)
  Bill withdrawn * *Feb* 14

Probation of First Offenders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Erne*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Feb* 14 (No. 20)

Provand, Mr. A. D., *Glasgow, Blackfriars, &c.*
  Merchant Shipping—The "Andrew Johnson" and the "Thirlmere," 1563
  Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1679, 1682

Public Funds, The—Transmission of Dividends
  Question, Mr. Joicey ; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 3, 556

Public Health (*Questions*)
  Contagious Diseases Hospitals in Garrison Towns, Question, Mr. C. T. D. Acland ; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 8, 897
  Hydrophobia—M. Pasteur's System, Question, Mr. Coghill ; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Feb* 8, 889
  Insanitary Condition of Battersea Park, Question, Mr. Bonsor ; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Feb* 10, 1080
  The Sutton Cemetery, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor ; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Ritchie) *Feb* 1, 39

Public Parks and Works (Metropolis) Bill (*Mr. David Plunket, Mr. Jackson*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 136]

Public Record Office—Inspection of Irish Records
  Question, Sir Charles Russell ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 17, 1752

Public Trustee Bill
(*Mr. Howard Vincent, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Edward Russell, Mr. Anderson*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 121]

Quarries Bill (*Mr. Thomas Blake, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Burt, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Abraham* (*Glamorgan*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 58]

Quarries Regulation—Legislation
  Question, Mr. T. E. Ellis ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 11, 1226 ; Question, Mr. Broadhurst ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 14, 1399

Queen, The — Celebration of the Jubilee Year
  Clerks and other Employés in the Civil Service, Question, Sir Robert Fowler ; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 17, 1775
  The Volunteers, Question, Colonel Laurie ; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Feb* 17, 1749

Raikes, Right Hon. H. C. (Postmaster General), *Cambridge University*
  Post Office—Questions
    Conveyance of American Mails, 761, 762
    Dismissal of Female Clerks, 1396
    Distribution of Trade Samples through the Belgian Post Office, 1754
    Foreign Telegraph Stations, 877
    Imperial Penny Postage, 393
    Investments in Government Securities of Small Sums, 1752
    Letter Carriers' Good Conduct Badges, 760
    Money Order Office Remittances from Australia, 1755
    Negotiations with the Telephone Companies, 550
    New Postage Stamps—Report of the Committee upon Stamps, 541
    Newspapers—Post Office Act, 1870 — Newspaper Act and Registration Act, 1881, 1215
    Parcels Post between France and Egypt, 389
    Postal Communication with the Outer Hebrides, 538
    Post Office Contracts—Australian Mail Contracts, 552 ;—Conveyance of Mails to New York, 639

[*cont.*

RAIKES, Right Hon. H. C.—*cont.*
Post Office Savings Bank—Limit of Deposits, 1768
Stationery Clerks in Surveyors' Branch, 550
Submarine Telegraph Company, 758
Telegraph Service—Case of Patrick Ward, 1399
Post Office (Ireland)—Questions
Accommodation at Grangegeith and Slane, 541
Improved Postal Service at Kinsale, 638
Postal Accommodation at Newry, 1395
Sub-Postmaster of Gurteen, Co. Galway, 1214
Railways (Ireland)—The Dublin "Loop Line" Scheme, 771

Railway Rates and Charges Bill
c. Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 15, 1571

Railway Regulation Bill (*Mr. Channing, Mr. Arthur Acland, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Charles Parker, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Lawson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 126]

Railways—Return of Rates for Carriage of English and Foreign Produce
Question, Mr. Dixon-Hartland; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry de Worms) *Jan* 31, 272

Railways—Railway Brakes
Moved, That there be laid before the House, "Return of the number of servants in the employ of each railway company who are regularly on duty for more than twelve hours consecutively" (*The Earl De La Warr*) *Feb* 14, 1354; after short debate, Motion agreed to

RASCH, Major F. C., *Essex, S.E.*
Home Defences—Garrisons of the Thames Forts, 549
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1150, 1151

Rating of Machinery Bill
(*Sir Bernhard Samuelson, Mr. Knowles, Mr. Peacock, Sir Frederick Thorpe Mappin*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 2 [Bill 148]

REDMOND, Mr. J. E., *Wexford, N.*
Ireland—Law and Justice—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 1218
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1282

REDMOND, Mr. W. H. K., *Fermanagh, N.*
Ireland—Evictions—Glenbeigh Evictions, 167
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 119, 121, 175, 505, 701, 702, 703, 1048; Motion for Adjournment, 1057, 1107

REED, Sir E. J., *Cardiff*
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1791

Registration of Voters Bill
(*Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Childers, Sir Charles Russell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 43]

Registration of Voters Bill
(*Viscount Ebrington, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Lewis Fry, Mr. Pitt-Lewis*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 2 [Bill 150]

REID, Mr. R. T., *Dumfries, &c.*
Ireland—Law and Justice—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 1218

Religious Prosecutions Abolition Bill
(*Mr. Courtney Kenny, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Crossley*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 84]

Representation of the People Bill
(*Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Timothy Harrington, Mr. Chance, Mr. Healy, Mr. M'Cartan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 40]

Returning Officers' Expenses (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. Provand, Mr. Hunter, Mr. J. Bolton, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Watt, Mr. M'Ewan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 9]

RIBBLESDALE, Lord
Parliament—Privilege—"The Queen *v.* Lord Graves," 245

RICHARD, Mr. H., *Merthyr Tydvil*
Burmah (Upper)—The Military Expedition, 1748
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. Amendt. 1784, 1786

RITCHIE, Right Hon. C. T. (President of the Local Government Board), *Tower Hamlets, St. George's*
Commission on Agriculture, 1881-2—Maintenance of the Indoor Poor, 388
Drainage of Lands—Compensation to Riparian Owners, 1215
Metropolis, Distress in—Unemployed Dock Labourers at Poplar, 1555
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1604
Poor Law (Metropolis)—Casual Relief at St. George's Workhouse, 879
Holborn Workhouse, 1088
Public Health—Hydrophobia—M. Pasteur's System, 889
Sutton Cemetery, 392

ROBERTSON, Mr. E., *Dundee*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 934
- United States—The Homestead and Exemption Laws, 548

Rod Fishing (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Laing Brown, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. Angus Sutherland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 143]

ROWLANDS, Mr. J., *Finsbury, E.*
- Admiralty—"Old and Unserviceable Stores," 1086
- Prison Sites—Housing of the Working Classes, 769

ROWNTREE, Mr. J., *Scarborough*
- Fishery Department (England and Wales)—Beam Trawling, 773

RUSSELL, Sir C., *Hackney, S.*
- Public Record Office — Inspection of Irish Records, 1752

RUSSELL, Sir G., *Berks, Wokingham*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 123

RUSSELL, Mr. T. W., *Tyrone, S.*
- Ireland—Land—Glebe Land Tenants, 895
  - Law and Justice—The Assizes—Ordinary Jurors, 646;—Intimidation of Jurors, 1241
- Land Law (Ireland) Act (1881) Amendment (No. 3), 2R. 735
- Lighthouse Illuminants—Experiments at the South Foreland, 266
- Parliament — Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1819
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 462

ST. ALBANS, Duke of
- Police Acts (Ireland)—Corporation of Limerick, Extra Police, 1503

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Saturday (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Lea*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 111]

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill (*Mr. James Stevenson, Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Cozens-Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 41]

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (No. 2) Bill (*Sir Joseph Pease, Sir Charles Palmer, Mr. Isaac Wilson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 97]

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Cornwall) Bill (*Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Borlase, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. C. T. Dyke Acland, Mr. Bickford-Smith, Mr. Courtney*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 139]

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Act (1878) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Lea, Sir James Corry, Mr. John Blake, Mr. Ewart, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. T. W. Russell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 105]

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ulster) Bill
(*Mr. Johnston, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. De Cobain*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 33]

SALISBURY, Marquess of (Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
- Glebe Lands, 1R. 874
- Iddesleigh, The Late Earl of, 6
- Ireland, State of—Legislation, 1375
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 29, 31
- Resignation of the Earl of Dunraven, Personal Explanation, 1725
- Women's Suffrage, 2R. Amendt. 257

SANDYS, Colonel T. M., *Lancashire, S. W., Bootle*
- Ireland—Evictions—Eviction at Rathkeale, 646

Sanitation of Houses (Metropolis) Bill
(*Mr. Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Tomlinson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 145]

SAUNDERSON, Colonel E. J., *Armagh, N.*
- Ballot Act (1872) Amendment, Motion for Leave, 379
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, Motion for Adjournment, 145, 170, 175, 703, 1188, 1195

School Board Elections (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Shiress Will, Mr. Lacaita*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 59]

School Board for London (Pensions) Bill
(*Sir Richard Temple, Sir Guyer Hunter, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. M'Arthur, Mr. Francis Powell, Mr. Gent-Davis*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 29]

School Fees (Non-Paupers) Bill
(*Mr. Llewellyn, Sir Richard Paget, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Whitmore, Mr. Quilter*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 106]

SCHWANN, Mr. C. E., *Manchester, N.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 430

SCOTLAND—Secretary for, &c. (*see* BALFOUR, Right Hon. A. J.)

SCOTLAND (*Questions*)
Crofters' (Scotland) Act—Sheep Farms and Deer Forests, Question, Dr. R. Macdonald; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 10, 1083
Crofters' Commission — Lewis and Skye Crofters, Question, Dr. R. Macdonald; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 10, 1085
The Skye Crofters, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 11, 1210;—*Sheriff Ivory,* Question, Dr. Clark; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Jan* 31, 271
Distress in Lanarkshire, Question, Mr. Cunninghame Graham; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 15, 1559
Parliamentary Elections — Polling Places, Question, Mr. Thorburn; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Feb* 15, 1566
Post Office—Postal Communication with the Outer Hebrides, Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Raikes) *Feb* 3, 538
Prisons—Death of a Prisoner in Calton Gaol, Edinburgh, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 15, 1550
Reduction of Rents — Trustees of Landed Estates, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Feb* 4, 645
The Truck Acts—Mines and Works in Scotland, Question, Mr. Bradlaugh; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Jan* 31, 260
The Western Islands — Procurators Fiscal, Question, Mr. Barclay; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) *Jan* 31, 269

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SCOTLAND)
Elementary Schools and University Teaching, Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 7, 754
Lenzie Public School, Questions, Mr. Caldwell; Answers, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 4, 640; *Feb* 10, 1100; Questions, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Mundella; Answers, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 14, 1404
Poor and School Rates in Skye, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 8, 877
State-Aided and Non-State-Aided Schools, Question, Mr. Caldwell; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 10, 1083

[*cont.*

SCOTLAND—*cont.*
FISHERIES (SCOTLAND)
Fishery Board—Loans to Crofting Parishes, Question, Mr. C. S. Parker; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 4, 655
Salmon Fishing—Tweed Fisheries Acts, Question, Mr. Thorburn; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 17, 1770
Sea Fishings (Scotland) Act—Defective Operation, Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 10, 1080

LAW AND JUSTICE (SCOTLAND)
Robert Hume, a Maniacal Prisoner, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Feb* 11, 1210
Myles Martin, Crofter, a Prisoner in Inverness Gaol, Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Matthews) *Feb* 15, 1552

SELBORNE, Earl of
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 2, 1063; Report *add. cl.* 1727
Glebe Lands, 1R. 875
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 37

Select Vestries
c. Bill, *pro formâ,* read 1ª *Jan* 27

Settled Land Acts Bill
(*Mr. Elton, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Puleston, Mr. Tomlinson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 63]

SELWIN-IBBETSON, Right Hon. Sir H. J., *Essex, Epping*
Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Churchyard Bottom Wood, Highgate, 642
Parliament—Business of the House—Amendments to the Address, 1413

SELWYN, Captain C. W., *Cambridge, Wisbeach*
Income Tax—The Married Women's Property Act, 1750

SETON-KARR, Mr. H., *St. Helen's*
Conference of Colonial Representatives—State-Directed Colonization, 737
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 523

SEXTON, Mr. T., *Belfast, W.*
Ballot Act (1872) Amendment, Motion for Leave, 379, 380
Belfast Main Drainage, 385, 386; 3R. 1519
Ireland—Questions
  Armagh Town Commissioners—Audit of Accounts, 891
  Commissioners of Irish Lights, 538
  Evictions—Notices to Relieving Officers—The Glenbeigh Evictions, 554, 895

[*cont.*

Sexton, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Irish Land Act, 1870—The Bright Clauses, 538
Irish Land Commission, 1570
Local Courts of Bankruptcy, 539
Post Office Contracts — Conveyance of Mails to New York, 639
Royal Irish Constabulary—Detective Constable Kerr, 885, 886
Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Riots at Belfast —Questions
Belfast Private Act, 1865, 1766, 1767
Constabulary, 893
Report of the Royal Commission, 169, 273
Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
Jurors in Criminal Cases, 388
"Queen *v.* Dillon," 1091
Ulster Winter Assizes — Conviction of M'Grath, 756
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure (1882) —Rule 2—Adjournment of the House, 1778
Parliament—Order—Disallowance of Question as to Lord Cooper's Commission on Irish Land, 763, 764
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 927; Motion for Adjournment, 1197, 1242, 1266, 1273, 1712, 1854
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), Comm. 636

Sheil, Mr. E., *Meath, S.*
Ireland—Registration of Voters Act, 1885—Payment of Officials, 1755

Shipwreck Bill
(*Mr. Howard Vincent, Sir Edward Birkbeck*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 120]

Shirley, Mr. W. S., *Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster*
Parliament—Queen's Speech—Address in Answer to, 132

Sidmouth, Viscount
Army—Military Armaments and Organization, 153

Sites for Churches, &c. (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Byrne, Mr. Macdonald, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Jordan, Colonel Nolan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 144]

Small Debts (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Thorburn, Mr. Watt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 42]

Small Holdings Bill
(*Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Robert Reid, Mr. Cobb, Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Newnes, Mr. Flower, Mr. Winterbotham, Mr. Pitt-Lewis*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan.* 28 [Bill 112]

Smith, Right Hon. W. H. (First Lord of the Treasury), *Strand, Westminster*
Bulgaria—Correspondence, 1570
Chancellor of the Exchequer—Time of Taking Seat in this House, 170
Charity Commissioners—Non-Representative Bodies, 164
Charity Commission Schemes—Election of Trustees, 556
Civil Service—Suspension of Appointments, 1105
Depression of Trade and Industry—Cost of the Commission, 1571
Employers' Liability Acts, 268
Iddesleigh, The Late Earl of, 73
Inland Revenue—Carriage Tax and Gun Tax, 269
Income Tax—Foreign Firms, 656
Ireland—Emigration—Parliamentary Grants, 1882-3, 1240
Irish Land Commission, 1570
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Codification of the Criminal Law, 263
The Revised Statutes—Issue of a New and Cheap Edition, 262
Metropolis—Renewal of the Coal and Wine Dues, 265
Parliament—Questions
Business of the House, 145, 1648;—Amendments to the Address, 1412, 1414
Elections—Sessional Orders, 56
Parliamentary Procedure — "Blocking," 1105
Publication of Evidence, 556
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 110, 119, 454, 473, 632, 723, 1197, 1353, 1599, 1647, 1712, 1832, 1846, 1852
Parliament—Rules of Procedure—Notice of Motion, 57, 714; Res. 1778, 1789, 1794, 1802, 1825
Public Funds—Transmission of Dividends, 557
Purchase of Land Act, 1885—Amount of Advances, 1411
Queen's Jubilee Celebration — Clerks and other Employés in the Civil Service, 1775
Resignation of the Right Hon. Lord Randolph Churchill, Personal Explanation, 70, 71
Sir Henry Drummond Wolff—Expenses of His Mission, 1410, 1411
Stationery Office—Copyright in Government Publications, 1774
Trade and Commerce—International Conference on the Sugar Bounties, 1775
Treasury and the Bank of England, 162
Trustee Savings Banks—Bishop Stortford Bank, 1776:—Cardiff Bank, 1409, 1410
Ways and Means—Financial Statement—Local Taxation, 897

Smith, Mr. S., *Flintshire*
India (Bombay) — Abstinence from Strong Drink, 1230
Burmah—Military Operations—Cost of the War, 1236

Smith-Barry, Mr. A. H. *Hunts, S.*
Ireland—Crime and Outrage—Moonlighters at Millstreet, Co. Cork, 1213
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1169

Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty Bill
(*Mr. O'Hea, Mr. Dwyer Gray, Mr. Sexton, Mr. A. O'Connor, Mr. Deasy*)
c. Ordered; read 1^o * *Jan* 28 [Bill 125]

Solicitors (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Fitzgerald*)
l. Presented; read 1^a * *Feb* 1 (No. 12)
Read 2^a, after short debate *Feb* 10, 1058

South Pacific, Islands of the—Island of Malayta—H.M.S. "Opal"
Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Feb* 7, 757 [See title *Northern Pacific*]

SPEAKER, The (Right Hon. ARTHUR WELLESLEY PEEL), *Warwick and Leamington*
Belfast Main Drainage, 385, 386
Ireland—Evictions—Glenbeigh Evictions, 166, 167, 1219
  Law and Justice—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 1218;—"The Queen *v.* Dillon and others," 1231
Orkney Roads, 2R. 1202, 1209
Parliament—Questions
  Business of the House—Amendments to the Address, 1413, 1414
  County Longford (Northern Division) Election—Clerical Error, 875
  Division Lists—Correction of an Error, 1415
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1786, 1793, 1796, 1797, 1800, 1801, 1811, 1814, 1818, 1819
Parliament—New Rules of Procedure (1882)—Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House), 1777, 1778
Parliament—New Writ for the Borough of St. George's, Hanover Square, 259
Parliament—Order—Disallowance of Question as to Lord Cowper's Commission on Irish Land, 763
Parliament—Queen's Speech, 77;—Address in Answer to, 193, 212, 300, 329, 473, 476, 687, 702, 729, 733, 803, 843, 979, 1145, 1195, 1475, 1491, 1600, 1601, 1681, 1712, 1829, 1830, 1831, 1834, 1846, 1852, 1854
Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland), 2R. 376; Comm. 634, 636
Sutton District Water, 2R. 1531, 1542

SPENCER, Earl
Ireland—Police Acts—Corporation of Limerick—Extra Police, 1507, 1509
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 43

STANHOPE, Earl
Glebe Lands, 2R. 1495

STANHOPE, Right Hon. E. (Secretary of State for War), *Lincolnshire, Horncastle*
Army—Questions—
  Army of Occupation (Egypt)—Supplementary Estimates, 545

[*cont.*

STANHOPE, Right Hon. E.—*cont.*
  Billet Money, 1102
  Case of Private James Gillen, 1765
  Conversion of Horse and Field Artillery, 651
  Home Defences—Garrisons of the Thames Forts, 549
  Insanitary State of Dover Barracks, 889
  Issue of Kit Bags, 551
  John Cameron, Seaforth Highlanders, 537
  Medical Officers, 1559
  Military Ballooning, 762
  Officers' Quarters — Sale of Premises, Portsmouth, occupied by the Commanding Officer of Royal Engineers, 755
  Orange Societies—Officers of the Army and Militia, 267
  Ordnance Department—Defective Weapons—Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets—Admiralty — Defective Sword Bayonets, 1098, 1099, 1100;—The Committee of Inquiry, 1240;—The Lee-Burton Magazine Rifle, 1773
  Practice in Use of the Revolver, 1088
  Purchase of Horses for Army Purposes, 1390
  Quartermasters and Riding Masters, 269
  Rifle Ranges, 1212
  Royal Horse Artillery, 272;—The "Maiwand Battery," 773
  Royal Military Colleges at Woolwich and Sandhurst, 540, 1402
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Questions
  City of Cork Militia Artillery, 883
  Militia (Scotland), 1084
  Monaghan Militia—Orange Lodges, 884
  Queen's Jubilee Celebration — The Volunteers, 1749
  Volunteer Capitation Committee, 163, 652
Commons (Metropolis)—Wandsworth Common Act, 1871—Leasing of Land, 547
Defences of the Empire—Coaling Station at Castries (West Indies), 756
  Coaling Stations in the Eastern Colonies, 1569
Egypt—Questions
  Army of Occupation—Health of the Troops, 393
  Military Expedition—Scientific Reports on the Soudan, 649
  War Decorations to the English Troops, Troops, 1750
Navy—Re-testing of Cutlasses, 1394
Public Health — Contagious Diseases Acts—Contagious Diseases Hospitals in Garrison Towns, 897
  Effects of Suspension, 1761

STANHOPE, Hon. P. J., *Wednesbury*
Weights and Measures Act—Sale of Coal in the Midland Mining Districts, 886

STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, Lord
India (Madras)—Covenanted Civil Service—Land Speculations—Case of Mr. Sullivan, 741
War Office (Ordnance Department)—Defective Weapons—Cutlasses and Sword Bayonets, 1066

STANLEY of PRESTON, Lord (President of the Board of Trade)
Railways—Railway Brakes, Motion for a Return, 1358

Stannaries Act (1869) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Acland, Sir John St. Aubyn, Mr. Courtney, Viscount Ebrington, Mr. Bickford-Smith, Mr. Seale-Hayne*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 1 [Bill 147]

STANSFELD, Right Hon. J., *Halifax*
Ireland—Law and Justice—The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 386

Stationery Office, The—Copyright in Government Publications
Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 17, 1774

Steam Boilers Bill (*Mr. William Abraham, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Flynn*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 96]

Steam Engines and Boilers Bill
(*Mr. William Crawford, Mr. Burt, Mr. William Abraham* (*Glamorgan*), *Mr. Pickard, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. A. H. Dyke Acland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 78]

STEVENSON, Mr. F. S., *Suffolk, Eye*
Africa (East)—The London Conference—Sultan of Zanzibar, 649
Madagascar—Expulsion of ——— Wilkinson, 1558
Northern Pacific—Evacuation of Port Hamilton, 389

STEWART, Mr. M. J., *Kirkcudbright*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1432

Stipendiary Magistrates (Pensions) Bill
(*Sir Richard Temple, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Godson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 116]

STUART, Mr. J., *Shoreditch, Hoxton*
Naturalization of Aliens—Fees, 649, 650
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 590, 729

STOREY, Mr. S., *Sunderland*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1162

Suffragans' Nomination Bill
(*Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. John Talbot, Mr. Powell, Baron Dimsdale, Admiral Field, Mr. Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 102]

SULLIVAN, Mr. D., *Westmeath, S.*
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary—Ex-Constable Martin Joyce, 639

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Jackson*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*) *Jan* 28, 227; after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 1]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Jan* 31, 365; after debate, Question put, and agreed to
Moved, "That the Bill be committed for To-morrow," 378; Amendt. to leave out "To-morrow," insert "this day fortnight" (*Mr. Chance*); Amendt. withdrawn; Original Motion withdrawn; Bill committed
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That this House will, To-morrow, resolve itself into the said Committee" *Feb* 3, 632
Amendt. to leave out "To-morrow," insert "Thursday next" (*Mr. Chance*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That To-morrow, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to
Main Question put, and agreed to; Committee deferred

SUTHERLAND, Mr. A., *Sutherland*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1592

SUTHERLAND, Mr. T., *Greenock*
Egypt—Port Dues on Shipping, 1561

Sutton District Water Bill (by Order)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Charles Forster*) *Feb* 15, 1526
Amendt. to leave out "now," add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Arthur O'Connor*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. T. P. O'Connor*); Question put; A. 99, N. 224; M. 125 (D. L. 7)
Original Question again proposed, 1542; Amendt. withdrawn; Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

SWINBURNE, Sir J., *Staffordshire, Lichfield*
Charity Commission Scheme — Election of Trustees, 555
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 617

TANNER, Dr. C., *Cork Co., Mid*
Admiralty—Dry Dock (Haulbowline), 1100
"Old and Unserviceable Stores," 1087
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—City of Cork Militia Artillery, 883
India—Income Tax on Travelling Allowances, 761
Ireland—Questions
Crime and Outrage—Moonlighters at Mill-street, Co. Cork, 1213
Dispensary Districts—Mohigeela, 169
Evictions—Glenbeigh Evictions, 166

[*cont.*

TANNER, Dr. C.—*cont.*
Law and Police—Millstreet Petty Sessions—Sergeant Moroney, 1547
Post Office—Sub-Postmaster of Gurteen, Co. Galway, 1214
Metropolis (Parks)—Regent's Park—Dismissal of a Constable, 391
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 212, 625, 963, 1151

Technical Education (Day Schools) Bill (*Sir Henry Roscoe, Sir Lyon Playfair, Mr. Dixon, Sir John Lubbock, Sir Richard Temple*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 56]

Technical Education (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Hooper, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. D. Sullivan, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dwyer Gray*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 50]

TEMPLE, Sir R., *Worcester, Evesham*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 681

Thames Preservation Act, 1885—*Conservancy Bye-Laws*
Question, Mr. Story-Maskelyne; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 8, 876

Theatres (Metropolis) Bill (*Mr. Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Woodall, Mr. Lawson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 15]

THORBURN, Mr. W., *Peebles and Selkirk*
Scotland—Parliamentary Elections—Polling Places, 1566
Salmon Fisheries—Tweed Fisheries Acts, 1770

THRING, Lord
Appellate Jurisdiction, Comm. *cl.* 1, 1061

Tobacco Cultivation (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Flynn, Mr. Peter M'Donald, Mr. Pyne, Mr. Mayne*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 64]

TOMLINSON, Mr. W. E. M., *Preston*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1185

TORRINGTON, Viscount
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 18

Town Holdings
Select Committee re-appointed *Jan* 28, 242
Moved, "That the Select Committee on Town Holdings do consist of Twenty Members" Colonel Nolan) *Feb* 7, 868; after short debate, Motion agreed to; List of the Committee, 869

Trade and Agriculture, Depression of—Cost of the Commission
Question, Mr. H. Gardner; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 15, 1571

Trade and Commerce—International Conference on the Sugar Bounties
Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 15, 1560; Question, Colonel Hill; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 17, 1775

Trade and Labour, Statistics of—Labour Bureaux
Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 14, 1407

TREASURY—First Lord (*see* SMITH, Right Hon. W. H.)

TREASURY—Secretary to (*see* JACKSON, Mr. W. L.)

TREASURY—Secretary to (*see* DOUGLAS, Mr. A. AKERS-)

Treasury, The, and the Bank of England
Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Jan* 28, 162

Trees (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Chance, Mr. Gilhooly, Mr. Marum, Mr. P. J. O'Brien, Mr. Sheehan, Sir Joseph M'Kenna*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 110]

Truck Bill (*Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Warmington, Mr. John Ellis, Mr. Arthur Williams, Mr. Howard Vincent, Mr. Esslemont*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 109]

Truck Law Amendment Bill (*Mr. Donald Crawford, Mr. Mason, Mr. Edmund Robertson*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 21]

Trustee Savings Banks
The Bishop Stortford Bank, Question, Mr. Howell; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 17, 1775
The Cardiff Bank, Questions, Mr. Howell; Answers, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 14, 1409

TUITE, Mr. J., *Westmeath, N.*
Ireland—Lunatic Asylums—William Cribbin, Mullingar Lunatic Asylum, 648
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1004

TYLER, Sir H. W., *Great Yarmouth*
Admiralty—Defective Sword Bayonets, 1099, 1771
Army—Royal Military Colleges at Woolwich and Sandhurst, 540, 1402
Egypt—Neutrality—Rumoured Negotiations—The Neutralization of Egypt, 1105
North Sea Fisheries—Report of the Committee, 1560

United States—The Homestead and Exemption Laws
Question, Mr. E. Robertson; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 3, 548
[See title *Canada*]

University Education (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Murphy, Mr. Dillon, Dr. Fox, Mr. Henry Gill, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Clancy, Dr. Kenny*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 47]

Venezuela—Seizure of the Ships "Henrietta" and "Josephine"—Claims of British Subjects
Question, Mr. Kimber; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson) *Feb* 7, 768

Vestrymen's Qualification Bill
(*Mr. James Rowlands, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Howell, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. James Stuart*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 23 [Bill 61]

VINCENT, Mr. C. E. H., *Sheffield, Central*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—Volunteer Capitation Committee, 162
Felonious Use of Firearms, 2R. 479, 482
Mercantile Marine—Life-Saving Gear on "Kapunda" and certain Casualties in 1886, 644, 645
Parks (Metropolis)—St. James's Park, 888

VIVIAN, Sir H. Hussey, *Swansea, District*
Parliament—Business of the House—Rules of Procedure, Res. 1784

Voters Qualification and Parliamentary Elections Bill (*Mr. Cremer, Mr. Burt, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Pickard, Mr. James Rowlands*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 28 [Bill 71]

WALLACE, Mr. R., *Edinburgh, E.*
Parliament—Business of the House (Rules of Procedure), Res. 1816, 1818
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 466, 1437, 1438, 1470, 1707 1710, 1711

WAR DEPARTMENT—Secretary of State (*see* STANHOPE, Right Hon. E.)

WAR DEPARTMENT—Under Secretary of State (*see* HARRIS, Lord)

War Office—see *Army*

WARING, Colonel T., *Down, N.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 926, 927, 933, 934, 945, 946, 1318

Waste Lands (Mining) Bill
(*Mr. Philip Stanhope, Sir John Swinburne, Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Paulton, Mr. Howell, Mr. Fenwick*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 169]

Water Companies (Regulation of Powers) Bill (*Mr. Fulton, Captain Colomb, Mr. C. R. Spencer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Jan* 31 [Bill 141]

WATT, Mr. H., *Glasgow, Camlachie*
Army (Small Arms)—The Lee-Burton Magazine Rifle, 1773
Commercial Treaty with France, 1882—Surtaxe d'Entrepôt, 1095
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1601, 1605
Post Office—Negotiations with the Telephone Companies, 550
Treasury and the Bank of England, 162

WAYS AND MEANS
Inland Revenue
A Rating Clause for Hoardings, Question, Mr. Bartley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) *Feb* 15, 1567
Carriage Tax and Gun Tax, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Jan* 31, 269
Inhabited House Duty—Lodging Houses, Question, Mr. Seale-Hayne; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) *Feb* 17, 1762
Income Tax—Foreign Firms, Question, Mr. Howorth; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 4, 656
Stamp Duty on Receipts from Income Tax and Poor Rates, Question, Mr. Cox; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Jackson) *Feb* 11, 1224
The Married Women's Property Act, Question, Captain Selwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Goschen) *Feb* 17, 1750

The Financial Statement—Local Taxation, Question, Mr. Stanley Leighton; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Feb* 8, 897

Webster, Sir R. E. (Attorney General), *Isle of Wight*
- Army (Ordnance Department)—Contract for Cartridges for Queensland, 1233
- Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Questions
  - City of London Court, 1544
  - High Court of Justice—Chancery Taxing Master's Office, 763
  - Prosecution of the Rev. Walter Davies, 535
  - The Jury System—Challenges in Criminal Cases, 1228, 1229, 1236
- Police (Metropolis)—"Prize Competition for Children," 1408

Webster, Mr. R. G., *St. Pancras, E.*
- Metropolitan Board of Works—Annual Expenditure on the Parks, 1227
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 490

Weights and Measures Act—Sale of Coal in the Midland Mining Districts
- Question, Mr. P. Stanhope; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Feb* 8, 886

Wemyss, Earl of
- Army—Military Armaments and Organization, 145, 147, 155, 157, 158

West, Colonel W. C., *Denbigh, W.*
- Parliament—Business of the House—Rules of Procedure, Res. 1792

Weymouth, Viscount, *Somerset, Frome*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 77

Whitley, Mr. E., *Liverpool, Everton*
- Post Office—Conveyance of American Mails, 762

Will, Mr. J. S., *Montrose, &c.*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1433, 1634, 1635, 1638

Williams, Mr. A. J., *Glamorgan, S.*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 582

Williamson, Mr. S., *Kilmarnock, &c.*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 491
- Sir Henry Drummond Wolff—Expenses of His Mission, 1410, 1411

Wilson, Mr. H. J., *York, W.R., Holmfirth*
- Egypt—Army of Occupation—Health of the Troops, 393

Winterbotham, Mr. A. B., *Gloucester, Cirencester*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 596

Wodehouse, Mr. E. R., *Bath*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 826

Wolmer, Viscount, *Hants, Petersfield*
- Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 360, 361

Women's Suffrage Bill [H.L.]

(*The Lord Denman*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *Jan* 28 (No. 5)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *Jan* 31, 256
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") add ("this day six months") (*The Marquess of Salisbury*); on Question, That ("now,") &c.;" resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 2ª this day six months

Woodall, Mr. W., *Hanley*
- Burials Act, 1880—Consecration of Cemeteries—The Refusal of Bishops, 766

Workmen's Certificates Bill

(*Mr. Gent-Davis, Mr. Byron Reed, Mr. Macartney*)

c. Ordered; read 1º * *Jan* 28 [Bill 45]

Works—First Commissioner (*see* Plunket, Right Hon. D. R.)

Works, Metropolitan Board of—Chairman (*see* M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J. M.)

Wortley, Mr. C. B. Stuart- (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Sheffield, Hallam*
- Coal and Ironstone Mines—Report of Inspectors, 1886, 654
- Contract for Cartridges for Queensland—The Explosives Act, 1402
- Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Return of Dues, &c., 272
  - St. Mary, Hornsey, 643
- Lunacy Acts Amendment, 653
- Members of Parliament—Return of Members 1880;—Index of Names, 1211

Wright, Mr. C., *Lancashire, S.W., Leigh*
Free Libraries and Mechanics' Institutions—Supply of Parliamentary Reports, 1556
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 509

Wright, Mr. H. S., *Nottingham, S.*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 942
Rabies among Dogs—Police Precautions, 886

Yerburgh, Mr. R. A., *Chester*
Parliament—Queen's Speech, Address in Answer to, 1293

Young, Mr. C. E. B., *Christchurch*
Northern Pacific—Evacuation of Port Hamilton, 389

END OF VOLUME CCCX., AND FIRST VOLUME
OF SESSION 1887.

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK AND SON, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.